

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Trying to wrap my head around the reasoning for the racs recommendation for no scopes on muzzy.... No noticeable increase in harvest rates... majority of people don't want anything changed... no increase in wounded deer.... No changes in antler size... yet the racs goes against all the data THEY presented and wants change because other states have done it. If we aren't making decisions by the majority and by the data in the surveys... what the [REDACTED] are we doing??? If the board doesn't see the problem in this type of wildlife management I've lost all faith.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Thank you for finally making this full recommendation for all big game permits!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? These are general season units. If people want to trophy hunt, we have limited entry units for them to do so. We need to quit restricting hunters for a small number to chase trophies.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I would rather see the scope restriction put at 4x, or even 2x, than completely eliminating scopes. However, muzzleloaders have advanced incredibly fast and 400 yard muzzleloader shots are not difficult with the right equipment.

This discussion should not be about herd health. We are talking about managing hunters here, not animals. If this state wants as a policy to have the muzzleloader hunt be different from the any weapon hunt, then restrictions are probably needed. If the state is fine with muzzleloaders performing similar to rifles, I see no reason to restrict. It's simply a policy determination we have to make. I'd lean towards making it different.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? The enforcement of these proposals seems impossible.

**Which best describes your position
regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 24, 2023 10:06 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I LOVE this plan. I would love to see it statewide. Too many yearling bucks are being taken. The seasons are too long, the weapons are too advanced. The animals don't have a chance. Get Utah mule deer hunting back to what it used to be. Love it.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

WB, this is our greatest opportunity to really make the muzzleloader hunt a truly distinct hunt separate from a ALW hunt.
Removing scopes from muzzleloaders is just barely a shade different from an ALW hunt.
I respectfully ask you to consider adopting Idaho's muzzleloader regulations and making our muzzy hunt an extremely different experience from an ALW hunt.
Thank you for your consideration.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Please keep scopes in the 1x-4x range. IMO This would wound less deer and keep the 200 yard range limitation.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 11:45 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

After hunting with open sites on muzzleloader in New Mexico this year, I came to the realization that the older generation, who needs reading glasses will have a hard time with open sites. I had a hard time siting in my gun due to the sites being blurry. This will lead to inaccurate shot placement. I would propose that open sites, and 1x scope be recommended. This would take away the long range part of the muzzleloader, but make it so everyone could still hunt effectively.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I LOVE that you are doing a mandatory report. I would Strongly agree if there were more details about that process, and adding the requirement of images of either the cut tag and animal, or the uncut tag that could be verified by the DWR.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am encouraged that the DWR and Wildlife Board are open to trying/retrying options that have been voiced to them over the years. My feedback concerning the shorter seasons would be a suggestion: when a season is shortened, make two seasons and keep total tag numbers equivalent.

For example lets say a unit currently has 1,000 archery deer tags, 1,000 muzzleloader deer tags, and 2,000 ALW deer tags.

Instead of doing a single 2 week archery hunt, 5 day muzzleloader hunt, and 5 day ALW hunt with all the tags in their respective season, I would suggest making 2 hunts for each with the tags split in two.

Archery season 1 - Similar Start Date to current structure - 2 Weeks - 500 of the total 1,000 tags

Archery season 2 - starts the day after season 1 ends - 2 weeks - 500 of the total 1,000 tags

Muzzleloader season 1 - Similar Start Date to current structure - 5 Days - 500 of the total 1,000 tags

Muzzleloader season 2 - starts the day after season 1 ends - 5 Days - 500 of the total 1,000 tags

ALW season 1 - Similar Start Date to current structure - 5 Days - 1,000 of the total 2,000 tags

ALW season 2 - starts the day after season 1 ends - 5 Days - 1,000 of the total 2,000 tags

This would provide the exact same number of tags, the seasons for each weapon type would be almost exactly the same days that they currently are, still limit the individual hunter to the shorter season, yet provide an experience that would be 50% less crowded in the field.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Your surveys show that roughly half of people want changes and roughly half don't. With that I side more with leaving it alone. My biggest concern with taking scopes is that the weapons are capable, and people know it. If people aren't comfortable taking a longer shot, no one is making them. I would rather someone be able to see what they are shooting than have them make a poor shot when tempted due to not having an optic. This also affects older hunters more than younger, for instance, my dad struggles with seeing things up close (iron sights, phones, books, etc) and I know he isn't alone. The combination of having to see a sight up close and a deer at a distance from 50-100 yards and having both in focus is an issue. If the goal is to reduce shooting distance, then the decision should land on weapon restrictions like ignition type, bullet type, powder type, etc. and still allowing a person to see what they are shooting at well. To limit range, making the caliber requirement larger and bullet weight higher would be two easy applications. Someone will be more accurate between 100-200 yards if they can see clearly. Limit the weapons capability and the scope on top won't matter. Even if you take a scope off a long range rifle, the rifle is still capable, the person is just more likely to make a poor shot. If the weapon isn't capable of being accurate at 300+ yards, the best scope in the world won't change that.

For the archery side, I don't believe the arrow length should be a factor, however arrow weight in accordance with draw weight should matter. Many low poundage draws struggle to have the energy to ethically kill big game at more than 20 yards, especially when using a mechanical broadhead. I wouldn't be in favor of changing the weight minimum as you would alienate youth and women, but I do think that if the combination of arrow weight and draw weight doesn't meet a certain level of energy, then a cut on contact-fixed blade broadhead should be encouraged, if not required.

Additionally, the harvest data suggests a very, very minute change. In addition to that small change, the harvest data can't truly be used as it doesn't capture whether the successful muzzleloader hunter even used a scope. Although they are allowed, many people I see in the field still don't have scopes, so the conclusion isn't sound.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I think making people turn their tag in physically is still needed, unless the new harvest report has a way of checking the tag for being cut.

I have a recommendation for the DH program. I would argue that buying hours shouldn't be an option unless the same person qualifies for a COR through disability. I would also argue that since the program is a deer hunting program, all hours should have to be earned by actually doing a project that positively impacts deer and on the unit your tag is good for. Dedicated Hunters and the program should be reflective of the name and should take effort and "dedication" to take part in a program that gives such expanded opportunity for a limited resource.

I am a part of the dedicated hunter program, and I enjoy it, but quite honestly... I would be a proponent of eliminating the program. It increases pressure unnecessarily by adding hundreds of people to the field in each season, not to mention the added potential of wounding loss through 3, and in some cases 4 hunts in a single year.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 3:03 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I believe you're going to have a lot more wounded animals with this change to muzzleloader hunts. There should be restrictions on the guns so we're not getting people shooting from so far away but my experience with open sights hasn't been good.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 3:57 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Mandatory reporting for all hunts should help with future tag allocations and will show more accurate harvest reports.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? You pretty much said it. Restrictions such as these doesnt really improve deer size, more deer etc. We may lose more deer to illegal harvest as mentioned already. Shorter seasons will certainly have an impact...potentially. Will be a wait and see approach. Choosing a less popular unit to do this on could be best approach.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? You have said it in the presentation on multiple occasions that the overall feeling from hunters is that there is no need to make a change +-50%. That harvest rates didnt change much and that shooting longer ranges by hunters were not affected by use of scopes. So why make this change? Will I still hunt with a muzzleloader? Yes but your stating the obvious and that is change is not needed based on hunter feedback. If you care about the majority and hunter feedback why do you choose to recommend it despite lack of popularity? Might be the hottest topic next to game cameras a couple years ago. The use of new technology certainly needs analyzed but going drastic by eliminating a technology thats been around for years and years is ridiculous. By going down this road I can see no end to the drastic changes. Scopes on rifles, range finders, slider sights on archery equipment. Are we stuck in the 1980's? Stop taking the fun out of hunting. Those that don't want scopes...dont have scopes. Hunters need to make ethical choices. Please listen to the majority and make your decision. Please.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I think a 3 point or better on one side is a better option.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I am indifferent in this matter.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I do not believe removing scopes from muzzleloaders will help to achieve the objective that the committee was created to accomplish. I believe the reporting of harvested animals is not accurate and the gauge of only 3% increase is not an realistic reflection of the reality. I do not feel many report their harvested information and those that do is heavy in the area of success in that group. And one of the goals of the committee is the align with biologists objectives which is not improved by the removal of scopes. I also believe that there was a lot of animals wounded and not killed initially and not found by hunters using open sites. And with the increase in distance being shot by hunters in the field, I think there will be a lot of injured deer not found during the open site muzzle loader hunt. Unless the trend of long distance shooting changes, new hunters to the field are going to be taking nonethical shots via open sites. And I believe if we are trying to get the new generation involved into hunting, please weigh your survey data off of newer hunters feedback. When a large sampling are 24 year plus veterans (just like myself) that are providing feedback from a pretty small sample source, the data is not providing strategies to accommodate the new generation, but creates a comfortably situation for seasoned hunters that don't care to grow the next generation in the field. And this strategy is also in conflict of the objectives of this committee.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? No

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? No

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Antler restrictions don't work. It's been tried many times in different states. Tag reductions is what saves deer.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I discourage the proposed change of taking scopes off of muzzleloaders. Being a individual that doesn't have great eyesight it would make it very difficult to use open sites. So this proposed change will basically take muzzleloader hunting out of the question for anyone not having good eyesight. And to qualify for eye site exemption is almost impossible.

In addition it will make the rifle tags more difficult to draw. Thanks, Gary D

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? No

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? No

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations? No

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? No

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I think at least a 1x scopes should still be allowed on muzzleloaders. I don't think that extends the range that hunters will shoot to. I know of bucks that were killed this year at over 500 yards during the muzzleloader hunt, and the scopes used were over 20x magnification. I think that is beyond what a muzzy scope should be. I would say 9x is probably the max I would allow if I were the one making the rule.

It makes sense that removing scopes completely would make things easier for law enforcement. I don't think that considerations should be given much weight. I have never run into a game warden in my 23 years of hunting in utah.

Removing scopes completely would alienate people that have hunted with muzzleloaders for a long time, but might not have the vision bad enough to qualify for some kind of exemption.

My recommendation is to limit muzzy scope magnification to 1x-4x.

The other technology recommendations sound good to me.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

I don't think any Limited entry tags should be allocated to any private land holders. Regardless of LOA status.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

This information was not presented clearly.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Get public land out of CWMUS's.

There should be more regulation on dates cmwu's are allowed to give private vs public hunters. The private hunters are given all the preference.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 5:10 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I just recommend a 3 point or bigger rule statewide.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I just recommend a 3 point or bigger rule statewide

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Hello, my name is Glade Harris. I am a Utah resident, an avid hunter, and own a business in the hunting industry. I watched the video that Blair made, and I do not understand how the technology board came to this conclusion. Every point he made in the video was either in support of the use of scopes, or was inconclusive. 50% of people that returned the survey said they wanted to keep scopes. The other 50% was split between against, or neutral. This is resounding support for scopes. This data does not support the board's guideline of hurting "hunting traditions". He used harvest data that showed no significant change to hunter success with scopes. This data does not support the board's guidelines of herd management. The last guideline for the board is "opportunity". This change will hurt opportunities by making hunters apply for the rifle hunts, and increasing the points necessary to draw those tags. Nowhere in the video did I hear any logical, or data driven evidence to support this change. In my opinion the only reason for the proposed change is a selfish desire to have more deer for themselves by hunters that don't even hunt with a muzzleloader.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I strongly disagree with weapons restrictions on Mount Dutton.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I strongly disagree with taking scopes off of muzzleloaders. The hunting community already decided to make it legal to use magnified scopes. Do repeal the public's decision on this matter. Very few things significantly impact deer herds, extreme winters and drought are what impact deer populations. A roughly 3% increase in muzzleloader harvest success is not dramatically impacting the deer herds.

I did not have receive this survey or have the opportunity to take it. I have been hunting in Utah for over 20 years and the survey results do not represent my views. I am an avid muzzleloader hunter. I would strongly argue magnified scopes on muzzleloaders make this hunt more ethical for the animal.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

We have a generation of new hunters who picked up muzzleloading because they could use a scope. Kids who have grown up hunting with scoped muzzleloaders.

The numbers do not bear out changing the regs.

Who benefits by this change?

Short term there will be less people putting in for muzzleloader hunts and stacking back into rifle.. pressuring up those opportunities.

The video makes a better factual case for leaving it alone. It seems as though folks with a self imposed point of view that dictates that there is only one way to do something are the ones pushing this.

The ability to use a scope has raised participation rates and has grown our hunting community. I dont see how this benefits anyone or anything.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? If you lower the hunting season length you will have more unhappy people with their hunting experience and you will also have more smaller bucks killed because they don't have time to find a mature deer. This year I have hunted every day I can get away and have not found a single mature deer. And every deer I have seen killed this year was small.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If you get rid of scopes on muzzleloaders that's fine in my opinion. But do not do it just because Utah is different from other states. Also you need to realize you will have more wounded deer because most people don't practice like they should. Most people also probably want to spend the money on the equipment to accurately shoot.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? This year if a hunter wants to buy hours instead of work on a project it jump from \$20 to \$40 which takes your 3 year total from \$640 to \$1280. With that price doubling is it possible to get 3 deer tags over the 3 year period instead of the 2. It only seems fair to double the price if the hunters who are giving the money or doing the work get something out of it too.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have hunted muzzaloder for 20 years, I have used open sights, 1 power, and 3 power scopes. The gun I now own does not even have open sights and I do not want to drill into the barrel to install them or be forced to buy a new gun to continue hunting with a muzzaloder. I have had better success with a scope. I am more comfortable making 100-200 yard shots with the scope and more accurate. Based off of your statistics what is currently allowed has not overly improved harvests to make it an issue.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 7:16 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Having a scope on a muzzleloader allows for better shot placement and for older hunters open sights are not an option.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I've seen more animals wounded because iron sight/red dot scopes. People don't care to shoot and hope they kill a animal, but more animals are wounded because of this. Utah has gone from red dot/ 1x scope to any scopes and now back to sights, now I have to go buy sights on my rifle. Utah never ends to surprise me.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 7:36 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If a scope on a muzzleloader only raised success by 3%, why mess with it?
I think we will have a lot more lost/wounded animals without a scope. It is still a primitive weapon but a scope gives a very defined aiming point

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Technology slightly improves odds of harvesting an animal. What really kills animals is access to these animals. Example the paungant it's covered in roads. Limit access across all the units and you'll improve deer quality and opportunity. There can be exceptions for disabled or youth hunters.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Instead of a 1 to 10 ratio it should be changed to a 1 to 5 ratio. CWMU operators should also be graded on the quality of hunt and services provided to the state hunters.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 8:40 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I see nothing wrong with scopes on inline muzzle loaders. Scopes are not an unfair advantage. It makes you a more ethical shot . We have fought so hard to get scopes on inline muzzle loaders. Leave it the way it is.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 8:43 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Muzzleloader should be able to have a 4x scope.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? With the removal of the scope Allowance on muzzleloaders, all you are asking for is idiots to continue taking hail.mary shots that they could do with a scope. Your injury and death due to infections they were not life threatening to the animals will rise. Thus wasting the animal they should have been harvested if the scope was still allowed. I strongly believe the "long range muzzleloader hunters" will be the destruction of the herds now that they are shooting long distances without scopes if this passes.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? 50\$ late fee is ridiculously high!!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I hate all those options. I'd rather hunt less then have any of those implemented. He even admits that those options have been tried with minimal success. So why do another study?

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Stop pitting hunters against each other. This is too divisive not supported by science or a large majority.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? We need an elk dedicated program.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I support this proposal.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I support this proposal.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I generally support this proposal. I think that the results will be similar to when we tried these management strategies previously. If the results are the same as before then I hope the DWR, the wildlife board, and members of the public that support things like antler point restrictions and shorter hunts can trust the data and stop campaigning for them.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I do NOT support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders. The data presented in this video/proposal doesn't support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders either.

The data presented here showed that success rate increases have been a non-event since allowing scopes on muzzleloaders, it also shows that the majority of the public DO NOT support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders. The RAC's and wildlife board should listen to this.

While I appreciate the data and effort it took to create this presentation, I think this proposal is an example of the technology committee making a recommendation for the sake of making one. The fact that its not causing an issue biologically and the majority of public opinion is to keep things as they are, should mean that we aren't wasting time on a proposal like this.

If the RAC's and Wildlife board push through the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders it will be another example to go along with deer permits this past season and trail cameras a couple years ago where the data and the public opinion say one thing but the RAC's and the wildlife board decide to do something else.

If for some unknown backdoor reason, the RAC's and wildlife board feel the need to make a change then I think scopes could be limited to either a variable scope that doesn't exceed a 9 power. Or a fixed power scope that doesn't exceed 4 power. But I still stand by the fact that I don't think there should be a change.

The excuses given in the video surrounding the difficulty wildlife officers might have checking scopes is ridiculous. It takes their focus to check my tag, or check if I have a round in the chamber while in a truck, or check my archery tackle. No different.

I also think the wildlife board doesn't want to be wasting time approving COR's for every single person who qualifies for a scope due to their vision. It would take a stupid amount of time. I think there is precedent to not do this as the wildlife board took the stance of not doing COR's for peep sight verifiers and clarifiers last year.

Lastly, the technology committee is concerning to me. Its not public knowledge who's on it. How long do they serve? Are they just on it forever? I feel like having this committee perpetually go on forever (which is different then the other committees we have that have a start an end date) creates an environment where the committee will meet to find/make up problems to create solutions for. Doesn't give me a warm feeling.

I support the removal of shaft length restriction on arrows and bolts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?	Strongly agree
Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?	I support this proposal. I like the change to do away with the orientation and just put all the info on a web page. I also like shortening up the required hours for the first year.
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	Somewhat disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	<p>If the private land owners feel like they need more of their own draw then I would say that no matter what draw they pull their permit from they incur a waiting period and loose all points for that species in the public draw. They can continue to apply for that species in the private draw but every year they draw a permit in the private draw they would restart their waiting period for that species in the public draw.</p> <p>Example 1: A member of the diamond mountain LOA gets a bull elk permit. That member now has a 5 year waiting period in the public draw for LE Bull elk. If that member were to get another permit the following year His waiting period would start over again.</p> <p>Example 2: A private land owner gets a deer permit for his private property that is on a general season unit. That private land owner now loses all of his points for the public general season draw.</p> <p>We shouldn't allow people to be doing this, especially on LE Deer and Elk units when we already have a major issue surrounding bonus points. I also don't like private landowners complaining that they want more opportunity when they already enjoy every opportunity a public land hunter has plus a whole other group of opportunities. If they want more of the public resource then they need to be contributing more to the public at large.</p>
Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?	Neither agree nor disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?	Happy to have LOA's that are actually doing their part and allowing public hunters on their land. Don't have a lot of patience for the ones that complain about it.
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?	Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

I don't think the Kimberly CWMU should be allowed to have a variance for elk hunting. I think that the RAC's and wildlife board should follow the recommendations of the CWMU Advisory committee and the Division and not allow this variance.

I would like the division to continue to remove public acres from CWMU's where possible and where public acres are accessible.

Other than those I agree with the proposal. Thank you wildlife board for all your efforts to serve the people and wildlife in Utah.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 10:17 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I think that mandatory harvest reports will better provide hunters as well as DWR the actual numbers regarding percent average of harvest. I believe this will be beneficial.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

Some of the earliest memories that I have involve hunting. I have been hunting since I can remember. Now I know I was too young to hunt when I was little. But hunting for my family is also about family time. Now I can remember hiking with my grandfather in the woods, I learned many things from that man about how to hunt. I also remember sitting and watching a field with my grandmother, she also was able to provide much needed knowledge regarding hunting, and those memories are memories I carry with me and now am teaching to my sons. Now I bring up these memories because as we well know the hunter is a dying breed. The generation that taught my parents to hunt, and encouraged our family to continue hunting is no longer with my family. The DWR knows this and that is why over the most recent years they have decreased the hunting age from 14 to 12, as well as made it possible for the youth to hunt with another hunter using the mentor program.

Now these programs were introduced to get the youth, (which is our future)involved interested, and wanting to continue hunting. I have eager nieces and nephews that cannot wait until they are old enough to go out on the hike for the elk hunt. So the point that I am trying to make is that hunting is not just about hunting, but it is also about family, family time, and the opportunity to teach our youth how to become even better hunters than we are ourselves. Now I remember when the General Deer season went to a draw, and I will tell you that hunting deer, has never been the same. This is due to my family and I not all being able to have tags to be able to go out and hunt together. This has divided our family and therefore caused some disinterest from the younger of us in participating in hunting.

Now I guess I am saying all of this in hopes of catching the attention of the DWR on the problem that is ongoing. I want to point out that over this last week I had the opportunity to spend time with and attempt to help my Mother fill her deer tag which took her 4 years to draw. As I am riding around in the truck with her on the dirt roads, it is sad to say she had to point out to me that due to our states current management plans of the Deer in Utah; I will need to pay for my sons to experience hunting out of state in order to hopefully hold their interest in hunting. As I sat in the back of the truck and thought about this, I came to the realization that my own mother who is now in her 50s likely will only experience maybe 5-6 more deer hunts in her life time given the current ridiculous average drawing period of 3-4 years for General Buck Deer Any Legal Weapon. I then think of my children who I only have with me for 18-20 years, they are unable to hunt until the age of 12 then I put the 3-4 year drawing average into the equation and I will maybe be lucky enough to enjoy 2 hunts with my children before they are grown. Maybe 3 if they are lucky enough to draw a youth hunt which is also not guaranteed.

If I take into account my own hunting and being able to take my children with me I may have 1-2 hunts with them while they are young (ages 3-8) for me to be able to involve them. Now we all know how challenging it can be to hunt with a 3 year old, so that is not realistic.

I feel it is ridiculous for me as a hunter to have to pay more money to hunt out of my own state in order to allow my children to be able to hunt and keep their interest in hunting. Which in doing so benefits the State of Utah.

So now the DWR proposes more restrictions on deer hunting, on units that I hunt. I have to say that I disagree. I would make the regulation in Pine Valley any point count of 3 or higher on one side.

I disagree with limiting the number of days to hunt to 5. This is a terrible proposal, this does not allow people enough time to be able to hunt, track, and find an animal. With how busy today's world is, it is nearly impossible to do any scouting and so in my opinion the first couple of the days of the hunt unless you are lucky are often used to find the herd/animal to be able to potentially harvest a deer. You will also be putting more of a time crunch on people and towards the end of it in my opinion they will be more prompt to fill their tags which will ultimately result in them harvesting younger deer as the younger bucks are more often seen.

I strongly hope that we as hunters and sportsman are able to come up with a solution that is less restrictive for an already restrictive hunt. I also hope that this message will hit home with someone on the board that the current draw system is not working and needs to be addressed for the betterment of our youth, and the future of hunting.

Thank you for your time in reading this.

Which best describes your position Somewhat agree
regarding the proposed rule changes to
the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Seems like an easy way to keep track of herd numbers.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I think this seems like a decent way to get data, for data-driven decisions.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I strongly disagree with banning scopes on muzzleloaders.

- with only a 2.6% success increase with scopes I don't think this is necessary.
- Scopes do not change how effective a modern muzzleloader is, they can still have the same range and capabilities.
- Compared to surrounding states is cherry picking. In Idaho you can't use 209 primers, in Colorado you can't use Sabots. So why are we only focused on what scopes they use, and not the other technology?
- I support making it a low-powered scope. Like in previous change proposals enforcement can be easier with self-policing in the community with cell phones and cameras. I find it easier to use the crosshairs on a scope compared to iron sights. It has nothing to do with how far I am shooting, but I want to make ethical shots.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? I am currently in the dedicated hunter program. I support these changes

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Thank you for trying to curb the out of control technology in the sport of hunting. Seems like there is not much Hunting going on. The persons with the best technological apparatuses and the know how to exploit them are ruining hunting and fishing nationwide. Good move on banning scopes on muzzleloaders. Now work on restricting the muzzleloaders which can reach out 300 yards or more. Muzzleloader seasons should be restricted to a true Primitive weapon hunt. As far as archery, I do not recall the current status of rangefinding sights in Utah, but that should be restricted if they are not or any sort of electronic sight. I also believe long range "hunting" with 50 caliber type rifles should not be allowed. I am quite sure most people attempting that are not practicing those situations in real terrain. Also most of them will not or are not physically able to go to the spot and check if there was a hit or not.

A couple years ago you partially banned trail cameras. Very sad as that is a fun sport in and of itself. I understand the purpose of "trying" to restrict outfitters and others from dominating a wallow, spring, bed areas etc. But who are you kidding? Who is policing this and how is that even possible? I would say ban transmitting trail cameras. If a person is too lazy to go check them then so be it. Some say it is better to not check often as it spooks the animals. True if doing so every day or two maybe. But anyone with half a brain does not do that and they are careful about approaching camera areas, how to go in and out, check wind etc. I am assuming that restriction on cameras is also an attempt to implement a policy favoring more of a fair chase. If so, lets have a discussion including high tech/sniper type scopes, spotting scopes/cell phone attachment that GPS exact animal locations, On x, hunt .com type apps., fish finders w/gps used all summer and now winter, just to mention a few things that are helping deplete fish and game numbers everywhere.

I do understand all this is not simple to curb and is very complicated. I read articles that hunting license numbers as well as fishing licenses sold are down. That is a little hard to believe when you are out there on a ridge or in a stream somewhere. I see people everywhere. And I hate to use the covid blame game, but it is more crowded in the outdoors nowadays, adding to the challenges you face making policies that you hope work. Keep trying and good luck.

Don Goldy, Draper

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 25, 2023 11:16 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I believe that scopes on muzzleloaders are highly beneficial to help the hunter make a more ethical and clean shot on the game animal. I don't think this proposal is a very effective change. Thank you

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 7:47 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Not being able to use a scope on a muzzleloader is unethical. Muzzleloader hunting is the second hardest hunt, next to archery. Most of the time you will get one opportunity to harvest an animal, you want that shot to be perfect for an ethical clean harvest. I believe taking a scope off the muzzleloader will increase more wounded and lost game.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? It's time to start requiring mandatory harvest reporting. Excited about this.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I'm fully in support of this. Pine Valley has so much wasted potential currently. Hope this passes.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I totally agree with pulling scopes off of muzzleloaders for the "general hunts," but feel that leaving them legal for the limited entry hunts might be a good middle ground to start off with.

Scoped muzzleloaders have definitely increased harvest on mature bucks and bulls more than 3%.

I currently work in the rifle scope optics industry/have for 24 years in the state of utah. Scoped muzzleloaders have been great for business, but I still feel the right thing to do is get back to more primitive weapon hunts. We've gotten too effective at harvesting the best of the best every fall. Currently the muzzleloader hunt is a single shot rifle hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

BLUF: I was an Inspector General for 17 years with the 388 FW HAFB, UT. I gathered facts, made decisions based on the facts for presentation/replies up to presidential inquiries.

Your decision to remove scopes from muzzleloading (ML) hunting does not support your data for what the public/hunters want. I do agree on getting a handle on scope technology and how MLs are loaded/technology; DWR and RAC's duty/job/charge.

"No changes" and the less than 200 yard shot is not accurate interpretation. What other states do or not do, should not be a player, except to analyze data. Utah hunters and deer management are the bottom lines.

Your data shows no significant harvest increase since introduction of scopes. FYSA: I have missed all shots with my muzzleloader, with a 1X and then a variable powered scope--thought I was a good shot. My personal belief is better shot assistance/placement with a powered scope. A 200 yard shot with open sights doesn't give you same definition as a scope. If a static magnification is decided I'd advise at least 4X. Variable power scopes are easily recognizable upon closer inspection.

I started to ML hunt 25 years ago here in Utah to get away from the crowds. Maybe ran across one or two hunters. This is no longer the case in the unit I traditionally hunt.

No changes: All muzzleloader (ML) hunters want variable power scopes to remain they just don't ML want hunters to have scopes with lasers, range finders etc.

The easy answer is to just get rid of scopes. If the powers to be (DWR/RAC/LE) have to adjust every year, so be it.

Thank you for your time.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Why are these restrictions not applied to the other units within the state? As a lifetime hunter, I would much rather draw a deer tag every other year and enjoy quality hunting rather than see dozens of other hunters on every single ridge looking for the one or two bucks in each canyon.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Unless you know the owner or have a connection with the CWMU, the hunting restrictions that many of the CWMU's implement become a deterrent to hunt this units.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

So technology has changed with every weapon in the state, so why is the the muzzle loader the focal point. Scopes are more ethical and your stats show it don't change the success rate hardly at all. A ethical shot no matter the weapon is on the hunter not the equipment. Every Tom, Dick and Harry that rifle hunts runs a turret scope, they go to the range and smack a gong at 1000 yard then heads out hunting looking to make a 1000 plus yard shot mainly to brag how far they shot. Is this ethical? Please consider all technology if where going down this road and not let the money guys make this decision. Being older a scope only increases my accuracy not my distance. Thanks

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:21 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

People have muzzleloaders that can shot up to 500 yards now days. If you take away the scope all your going to do is have more wounded animals. People will still take the long shots without the scopes. Resulting in bad shots that wound animals that are possibly not found. Give less tags and charge more money for a tag if money is the issue. Less tags = less deer killed.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

While none of these changes are desirable, I especially don't like the rule requirement of four points or more. I don't object to the principle, I actually like the idea of letting deer mature, but I dislike the rule for a couple of reasons.

First, it could potentially turn an honest, well intentioned hunter into a violator because of an incorrect assessment made in the heat of the moment. A miss-identified point could turn a positive experience into a negative one in an instant. What recourse would this individual have at that juncture? It's a bad rule.

Second, some of the largest, most mature bucks that I have ever taken were 3 points on each side. This rule would eliminate the opportunity to harvest these deer. If the ideal deer is the four point or better, then we would be eliminating those desirable genes from the pool and allowing these other mature deer to step in and influence the genetic traits of future generations.

The proposed rule creates more problems than it solves.

If we need to protect the herd and allow it to grow, the short term solution is less permits, not more restrictions.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

No objections to the rule change for archery.

Walking back the rules for muzzle-loading rifles would have little impact on overall harvest. 2% isn't enough of a data point to implement equipment restrictions and modify the hunt experience. If a change is needed to help the deer herd, a reduction in permits over the short term makes more sense, if our goal is truly to help the herd.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:48 am

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:48 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Please do an antler size restriction on half the deer units in the state. PLEASE.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

After watching the video here a few things that bothered me

1. your survey size of 2500 people and a response size of 650 people is a very small percentage of the hunting public. But what the hunting public did respond with is that they wanted to keep scopes. The question needed to be asked, what range do rifle hunters feel comfortable at shooting. I believe that you would see similar results.
2. Changing the rules just to match what other states are doing is following, just to follow.
3. All the data shows an increase of harvest of 2.6% since the regulations changed that allowed scopes of all powers. by removing scopes completely the harvest rate will go down and the rate of woundings/not recovered animals will go up and then people will shoot another animal, and that will result in less animals overall. REMOVING SCOPES WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE OVERALL NUMBERS.
4. If this proposal is approved then you will see a lot of muzzleloader hunters change back over to the any legal weapon hunts and this will make point creep worse.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 9:59 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If you remove the scopes on muzzleloaders for all muzzleloader hunts there will be a lot of animals wounded that wont be found

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Basically the entire presentation said hunters don't want it to change and that 400 more bucks were killed a year. Minimal Impact, and yet the recommendation is to make a huge change. It seems like it would be a better option to keep a technology muzzleloader hunt, but add a traditional hunt. For elk we could move the current muzzleloader hunt back a week and add a traditional hunt in its place. Give people the choice and see what they really want. The same thing could be done for deer. Shorten both the current muzzleloader and the current rifle, and split the time between the 2 hunts. Traditional Muzzleloader, Rifle, and Technology Muzzleloader.

Does the DWR plan on compensating people who have invested in muzzleloading to take advantage of current rules? It seems this type of change, without any real justification, in fact the data rejects this change, creates a large liability for the division and possibility of a class action lawsuit for all current muzzleloader hunters in Utah.

This just seems like a proposal that is completely contradictory to the responses in the survey.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Hopefully this is just a continuing trend to push back on tech overreach

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Landowner permits are becoming an outfitter lottery. Landowners should be able to rags on, but not sell. No other tag owner is allowed to sell a rag.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? The DWR should be trying to create more access via walk in, rather than creating more corporate hunting areas

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 10:11 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

i love hunting with my muzzle loader i have spent a lot of money building mine you have allowed us to use scope leave the hunt the way it is if overall harvest hasn't change why mess with it it just more rules if you really want to fix the deer numbers problem start with the highways by your own article we loose 20k wildlife a year thats where we need to start

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

https://wildlife.utah.gov/.../mdwg-6_point_restrictions.pdf
Antler point restrictions have been tried in many states, many times. They don't work and the link above shows that the UDWR already knows this. I've seen with my own eyes in the Book Cliffs a degradation of antler quality, meaning an abundance of genetically inferior bucks after only a few years. I've also seen this on limited entry units that don't have a management hunt.
I assume the 4-point or better proposal will be implemented anyway. I propose that an additional study be done. 3-point or less on a couple units for comparison. I'd like to see a 3-point or less rule rotated through all the units in the state, 1/3 of the units at a time, for 2-4 years at a time.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Two comments: #1 your making it too complicated...yes the Utah deer herd needs help and if we are being honest, in more than just the 5 southern units.

Simply, significantly decrease the number of tags issued State wide...it doesn't have the desired effect when 1000 here and there are decreased, it needs to be significant.

#2. - The decisions made by the UDWR in the past have led us to this point regardless of the drought. Example...Thousand Lake unit was realistically a LE unit with very low deer numbers with small pockets of quality deer. So, what does the UDWR do...a struggling deer unit is charged from LE and the number of tags was increased by more than 10 times...absolutely devastating the deer herd. Since 2011 I have asked for a reasonable explanation of why this happened to this unit but not once has it ever been honestly answered by any official...the game officers are even baffled by this.

So, as a law abiding hunting enthusiast...the only conclusion that seems to make sense is that the State just wanted to make more revenue from tags being sold and no concern for deer herd or quality of hunt. I have not yet had anyone prove this conclusion to be incorrect.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I drew a dedicated hunter tag for the Boulder kaiparowits unit in 2022. It took me several years to draw the tag and I missed the 2022 seasons due to a military obligation. These changes are a breach of contract that the DWR and I made in 2022 when I enrolled in the program. I did not agree to these changes and only offering an opportunity withdrawal is not acceptable.

It will take another 6-8 years to draw a tag for this unit again, not an exaggeration, and I want to use my remaining tag.

Either allow current dedicated hunters to hunt the season lengths they had at the beginning of their agreement, defer some or all remaining service hours, or a combination of the two.

Utah is the most mismanaged state in the west and punishing the hunters for your mismanagement is not the answer.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? While a reporting can help know what numbers were hunted, a hunter already dealing with low animal numbers while being proposed as being blocked from getting a tag for failing to say they did not even see an animal just makes it worse. This sounds like ways to add more fines while not improving the actual hunt or animal numbers.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Use if in line muzzle loaders should be allowed, as well as scopes. These are safer and improve accuracy and less animals injured or worse by lack of sight. Private land owners being able to take animals even with low animal numbers, and also blocking access to public lands causes more issues on hunt numbers.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Use if in line muzzle loaders should be allowed, as well as scopes. These are safer and improve accuracy and less animals injured or worse by lack of sight. Use of cross bows needs to be allowed.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? There needs to be more access and availability of opportunities to complete needed hours.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Landowners should not get free permits when they block access to responsible hunters. Even when their land is at the base with public behind, block access and then believe they deserve deprivation tags. If public are not allowed, the land inner should not receive numerous tags to sell. Deprivation tags should not be allowed with heavy winter kill years like this past winter. There are very low deer numbers, but land owners that block public access still get their deprivation tags, this is not right. Land owners should have limited permits, and not in heavy winter kill years. Doe tags are over used for private land owners, when those animals will help bring back deer population, we complain of lower animal numbers, but keep allowing land owners to kill off the does and cows, hurting population numbers further.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

Landowners should not get free permits when they block access to responsible hunters. Even when their land is at the base with public behind, block access and then believe they deserve deprivation tags. If public are not allowed, the land inner should not receive numerous tags to sell. Deprivation tags should not be allowed with heavy winter kill years like this past winter. There are very low deer numbers, but land owners that block public access still get their deprivation tags, this is not right. Land owners should have limited permits, and not in heavy winter kill years. Doe tags are over used for private land owners, when those animals will help bring back deer population, we complain of lower animal numbers, but keep allowing land owners to kill off the does and cows, hurting population numbers further.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Landowners should not get free permits when they block access to responsible hunters. Even when their land is at the base with public behind, block access and then believe they deserve deprivation tags. If public are not allowed, the land inner should not receive numerous tags to sell. Deprivation tags should not be allowed with heavy winter kill years like this past winter. There are very low deer numbers, but land owners that block public access still get their deprivation tags, this is not right. Land owners should have limited permits, and not in heavy winter kill years. Doe tags are over used for private land owners, when those animals will help bring back deer population, we complain of lower animal numbers, but keep allowing land owners to kill off the does and cows, hurting population numbers further.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Please do this, wish there where shortened season in other places like the Manti, etc

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I love the idea, please do this even though the big money people are going to throw a fit. Because I got old a 1 x scope would be nice. But if not that is okay.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 11:49 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I believe Owyhee air research could help in correct population counts.
Please give me a call at 801-688-9917 or email me at
Agrieve@owyheeair.com

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Keeping in line with other western states is appropriate. The purpose to muzzleloader hunting is another hunt choice based on interest,, much like archery. However, the removal of scopes necessarily means that any legal weapons hunts must be placed after archery and muzzleloader. Restricted weapons hunts should never come after non-restricted weapons hunt.

I had an LE buck pronghorn muzzleloader hunt this year (Sept/Oct 2023). My resident state does not allow scopes, therefore I hunted open sight. Although a 200 yd shot is doable open sight, in a hunting situation, the margin of error significantly increases miss rate. Although I did successfully fill my tag, I missed twice at 205 yds and 175 yds. The tag was filled with a 55 yd shot. Closer shots would be more attainable had this hunt been placed after the archery hunt and before the any legal weapons hunt.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 12:16 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

You are moving backwards. You can't even buy an open-sight gun these days. You are taking us more primitive. This is not the answer for the declining deer herds. I feel you are going to see more waste and poached animals than ever before.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 12:30 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I totally agree with what you are proposing.
I would like to add seasonal road closures would also benefit our big game .

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Technology is taking over hunting, lets put the hunt back in hunting.
Technology restrictions needs to be pared way back.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 1:23 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I would agree to get rid of scopes on muzzleloaders.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 1:41 pm

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 1:45 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

If a little more than half of the people surveyed support no changes to the muzzleloader hunts, then why make the change? I dare say people are comfortable shooting out to 200 yards, with it without a variable scope. The difference in harvest is insignificant, and banning scopes will result in more deer injured.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I do not agree with antler point restrictions. this has been tried in many western states including Utah. Although the current data collection methods could identify why antler point restrictions don't work, and the different proposals may identify a better solution to the public concerns. I see many mature deer that will always be a two point or a three point. They will always be ineligible to be hunted.

I agree with restricting the muzzleloader equipment, the muzzleloader should not be capable of harvesting a deer at 400 yards. In my mind the muzzleloader hunt was meant to use a traditional weapon. Maybe consider a muzzleloader with small magnification for people with failing eyesight but other than that I think a muzzleloader should be a traditional arm, flint lock or cap. I do not agree with restricting the rifle or bow equipment.

I think many public hunters do not know the first thing about the art of hunting deer, even during tough years I see my fair share of mature deer. Hunters don't have to shoot the first two point that comes along, if they let one go now and then their future hunts will be more enjoyable with bigger animals to harvest.

Annually I hear of hunters who shoot at a deer and critically injure it, the deer runs off and is never found. then they keep hunting and repeat the pattern until they actually find an animal that they have shot.

I think public outreach that addresses passing one up now and then and ethics would go a long way to improve hunt quality.

I see a lot of people complain about Utah hunting and the greed of the DWR. I disagree with the people who disparage the DWR. Utah is an excellent state to hunt. The animals are good, and the opportunity is good.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 2:41 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I appreciate the divisions willingness to try new ideas. The public has spoken and you guys have listened. Some people will start to get nervous and pucker-up now that all there feedback has been taken and is about to be implemented. Stay strong and good for you guys willing to make a bold move. With that said I would just like to offer a few suggestions. I believe the antler point restrictions on the Pine Valley will increase the buck to doe ratio. I do worry that after a few years the really mature bucks will take a hit and 3 point genetics will be more common. I trust your decision, but please consider moving to 3 point or better instead of 4. If you want to stick with 4 please only give it a few years and then maybe change it to 3 or remove it altogether. Please please, don't let us shoot out all the 4 point genetics. 3 point or better would allow 3 points to be harvested which many people would be glad with, but would still protect the youngest bucks., thank you so much for your time!.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? For the restricted weapons regulations; please consider a Traditional Archery Season, and a separate Compound Bow Season. Any archery weapon already has lower hunter success and would result in more opportunity and less harvest.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Scopes on muzzleloaders did not significantly increase the hunter success rate, so removing scopes will not help manage population. Removing scopes on muzzleloaders is only supported by roughly 1/3 of those surveyed. Single shot, projectile velocity, and propellant type limit the effective range of the muzzleloader weapon. Choice of ethical range to shoot should be hunter's choice, not coerced by law. Seems like the technology committee is trying to make the recommendation based on what other states are doing, and a moral/ethical judgement of what they think would keep the hunt "traditional". Limiting to open sites only will make the hunt less approachable to younger or inexperienced hunters. At minimum, please consider a non-magnification scope sight option.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 3:57 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I failed to include in my other comment, that although I disagree with some of the weapons restrictions, that I am supportive of the 4 point or better restrictions.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:00 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If you are going to attack Muzzleloaders for being too advanced, then you must also look at the archery equipment and the rifle equipment they have also advanced on an equal scale. you might even argue that they are way more advanced than muzzleloaders with scopes on them.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I think that shutting down the deer hunt for 3 years is the only answer to completely recoup the herd. There's enough deer killed by cars, predation, disease, weather and poachers that the limited entry units should only be the ones left open. That way it manages the herd and prevents inbreeding and can carry the load of the herd vs available food. It's a hard pill for people to swallow but it's needed. People can "donate" to conservation by donating the money they would have instead of putting in for a tag. I'd be totally fine shutting the deer hunt down for 3 years if it meant improving the hunt. I see more bucks on private land and out of my unit that I do while hunting. It's very dissatisfactory enough to almost want to quit entirely. Why waste my time and money when I'm not going to see anything but does. If I wanted to go for a hike for the sake of hiking I'll go for a hike and save myself the aggravation, time, stress and money and buy a side of beef. Open up the does to a limited amount, on public land. It's Ludacris to expect people to knock on doors in the woke age and ask permission to hunt their land for a doe or any animal. I hunt public land. I don't want to knock on doors to obtain permission to hunt. That's what the public land is for.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:42 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I understand that some technology and hunting create a situation that is not "fair chase". For example using thermal scopes and finding animals before light. Things like cellular trail cameras can more or less track an animal... I get that. Non cellular cameras, one, still has to walk into the animals living room undetected or disturb an area to retrieve photos. How does that help kill the animal? It does not! One still has to hunt such animal as if the camera never existed. So rules like that are totally ridiculous to me. We are now headed that way with the other side of the whole technology side of this. If you look at those examples that does nothing for making an ethical shot, or helping a hunter get in close to the animal to present a shot. One still needs to play the wind, walk quietly... ya know hunt such animal to be successful.

Eliminating scopes on muzzleloaders is one thing even though I have my doubts that it will actually help in the slightest. However, making it so those of us that can not look through open sights due to blur vision will do nothing but wound more deer on the mountains than good. This is where I struggle with the technology rules coming out. I would rather one be confident in their ability to shoot once and only shoot one animal due to the proficiency of their equipment than to make their equipment less effective and allow them to wound 5 animals before finally harvesting an animal. Open sights cover up the entire body of an animal at even 100yds. There is no sense of precision with that. Fact is more animals will be wounded and killed eventually than if you let hunters hunt with magnified scopes. I am not saying that we need to leave magnified scopes in the picture even though as I have stated I think there will be less wounded animals, but I am saying why limit everything to only open sights? Why not go back to the 1x scope rule? Where people like myself with blur vision when looking through open sights can actually aim and see what they are shooting at. How did we arrive at the point where all optics were bad? At what point is this technology rule going to far? There are pros and cons to all technologies. Hunting boots is part of technology. Are we going to ban those now? Boots allow me to walk a lot farther and longer than if I went bare footed like the Indians did. Where is the common sense with the technology rules here? Where are the surveys for all this? Who cares what other states do on their rules. If they want to limit you to hunt bare foot and have people dying on the mountain because their feet are all cut up and they are bleeding out, let them. Just because our surrounding states limit muzzleloaders to only open sights that does not mean we have to. Other states point system does not allow for nearly half the tags to go to bonus point holders, we going to jump on that band wagon too?

Point is a lot of the technology rules being applied truly are not going to help with the herds in the end. Tag management is what will do that. Technology regression will kill more deer in the end than do good. People will always push the limits. People are still going to try and shoot further than they should with a muzzle loader. Again the point is I would rather one ethical kill than 5 wounded and 1 killed and the meat is ruined because they hit it in the hind end, so then they leave half the meat on the mountain

to go to waste. 1 is better than 6. Tag management and how many animals are being killed is the real solution. If we are killing too many animals then cut back on tags. What is the real problem with the technologies? For example what is the issue with powered scopes on muzzleloaders? That one can clearly see what they are aiming at? My assumption is the complaint is people can shoot further. Right? So does eliminating scopes really stop people from trying to take a 300 yard shot with a muzzle loader? Absolutely not! Those people are always going to be ignorant. People are shooting out to 500 yds with open sights as it is. So how is that going to help? Again find the root cause of this concern. Is it because we are killing too many animals and the public is complaining there are no herds? What will fix that in the end? Tag management!

I agree that there is a point where technology becomes unfair (night vision, thermal, etc.) , but the way we are changing things will not do a thing to help herds and in my opinion only make things worse. Muzzle loaders restricted to only open sights will not do anything other than kill more animals in my opinion. We need to come up with a better way to resolve the technology issue because soon we will be hunting naked and bare foot with home made arrows and bows. Things are getting to be too much and will just make things worse in my honest opinion.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:45 pm

**Which best describes your position
regarding the technology
recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments
about the technology
recommendations?** Get rid of scopes

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 26, 2023 4:46 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Id like to see scopes off of muzzleloaders just like every state in the west

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I agree with the reporting on game. The timeline seems tight. However, what I would propose is if you haven't reported you can't apply for hunts the next year. This seems like more of a penalty than a \$50 charge. People want to hunt and those who choose not to report will never report so make it so they have to.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Love the idea of allowing deer to grow up by reducing days to hunt and make the four point or better rule. The muzzleloader optics restriction I've commented below on being opposed to this. Good ideas other than that.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I told many wildlife board members back in 2014 when the muzzleloader scopes became an option. If you allow rifle scopes on muzzleloaders, "stay the course." Don't go back on your word and make the changes back to NO scopes.

People will be spending lots of money on their guns without iron sights or a no drilled (front sight) optics option. They will also buy a rifle scope that gives them the best possible outcome of harvesting a deer. Spend countless hours out on the range dialing in your loads for this type of set up. All the money it would cost to shoot all of these rounds. This has now become a big frustration to all of us who have gone through this process. I'm very disappointed in the state of Utah making this change and ripping the rug out from under all of us. Many people will be selling their muzzy's trying to find a gun that does have sights on it. I don't think anyone on the wildlife board, RAC, or whoever else was involved in proposing this change have spent much time or money in this type of Hunting. (muzzleloaders with scopes)

All the states around us have "stayed the course" and haven't made any major changes to their gun policies and this make things easy when you go to hunt there. You can have some type of consistency when going to these states.

If the difference is only 3% then lower the allocated tags to compensate for this. I've said for years now increase the tag price to make up for the difference here so our state employees have a paycheck. I'd rather have a good deer hunt every other year of every three years than a bad hunt chasing smaller bucks with everyone in the state of Utah. Love the Four point of better rule by the way!!!

I really got excited when you came out with the HAMS hunt options for hunters. This allowed those that wanted this type of hunt to do so and give them another option.

This new policy has me really frustrated and disappointed to be a Utah resident hunter. I enjoy hunting in Utah but am really disappointed in this muzzy optics change. I don't know that my words will change anything here but if makes me feel better hoping someone will at least consider the publics opinion and concerns. Thanks for your time.

Jake Smith
5045385 Utah ID#

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Always nice to see efforts to help out the herds.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I love that you guys are doing some testing! Data is so important and will help you make good decisions and also helps us sportsmen to get onboard with your management strategies. Please do more of this rather than randomly ban technologies based on social pressure.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I know the scope issue affects many people. It wasn't always this way, but I just cant shoot open sights or red dots safely or effectively. With my glasses, I can see the animal, but not the sights. Without, I can see the sights, but not the animal. The scope for me just made muzzleloading fun again. I have talked to a lot of people with this problem so I know that it's a bigger issue that people think. Could there be an exception for people like me?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I love the mandatory reporting. Please use the Georgia's DNR outdoor style APP for your state. Its works GREAT!!!!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Please shut the doe season down statewide until every unit reaches objective population.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Thank you for finally addressing this. Muzzleloaders are not meant to be shooting deer at 300+ yards. I truly appreciate you making these changes.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? The dedicated hunter program is being abused and should be done away with all together.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? I don't feel that there should be ANY landowner tags. I feel that this whole system is ripe for abuse. Landowners should have to put in for the tags just like everyone else.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

I don't feel that there should be ANY landowner tags. I feel that this whole system is ripe for abuse. Landowners should have to put in for the tags just like everyone else.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

As a NR I don't have a chance at any of these tags. I think that is ridiculous because my tag fees go towards the CWMU payments. Its complete bullshit.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 7:28 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? We shouldn't have scopes on muzzle loaders.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 7:29 am

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments there SHOULD NOT be scopes on muzzleloaders
about the technology
recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

No problems with the muzzleloader recommendations to go to Iron Sights. I think it's a great change that is in line with what I assume was the original intent of the seasons. Personally I think a low power scope allowance should not be allowed as a low power scope still allows for a muzzleloader to be a fairly "long range" weapon.

The archery recommendations make sense but I'd love to see a few traditional archery only seasons started. Even if it was just the same timeframe as the regular archery season but there were additional tags available to create more opportunity for people who want to hunt that way. Success would likely be low but it'd get a few more people out hunting and out of the point pool at least. Thanks for the consideration.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 7:35 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Scopes on Muzzle Loaders takes away from the rich history that is Muzzle Loader. STOP trying to take away from tradition.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? think this will be good you could add a management hunt in the future For the youth but you need to no the Rule does not state no inline muzzleloader it just says cap must be Visible

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I have muzzleloader hunted for Over 30 years and this needs to happen

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Mandatory harvest reporting is something I strongly agree with. My opinion is that this will help with understanding better the herd health and numbers in more specific areas.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I agree with trying these study's out on only a few units at a time.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I am in favor of no scopes on muzzel loaders. The recent advancements in muzzel loader technology has taken it too far past any sort of "primitive" hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I disagree with the removing of scopes on muzzleloaders. If it only effects hunting 3% then why are we wanting to do this? We cant stop technology from coming. I understand technology has outdone wildlife but we cant stop it. Rather than completely taking it away why dont we just change it back to what it was before with a 1 to 4 power scope or allow scopes but no magnified turrets on muzzleloaders. I think its more of the long range scopes that would have an effect on a muzzleloader. alot of these new muzzleloaders can shoot like a rifle. I dunno things come hand in hand. I disagree with this proposal but i do agree to make things more traditional like it used to be.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I think it's great that the DWR wants to try something different. I believe that this study is a great way to test weapon restrictions, antler restrictions and season length.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I support removing scopes on ML's.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? We need this data to make informed decisions.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? We are heavily involved in the archery industry. We also own an archery store and sell both recurve and compound bows. I never hear traditional archers complaining about having to hunt with compound archers. Nor do I hear them asking for these types of restrictions. These type of restrictions put hunters at odds with each other and cause further dissention in the hunting community.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I'm not currently a muzzleloader hunter. The problem I have with this is that you are doing something based off of perception. The data clearly shows that scopes are not making a difference on harvest. Why are we taking away more opportunity when it is already such a drastic reduction in the last twenty years. Again we are creating dissention among hunters of different types. Hunters are a dying breed and these types of regulations that cause hunters to fight against each other are not good for the future of hunting.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 12:39 pm

Which best describes your position Somewhat agree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Just as a general rule of thumb, I strongly dislike more regulation and government entities taking away anything because I feel like it always ends poorly for the common man (myself). That being said, I do see the value and need for a technology committee. It's a slippery slope though because I, along with every other outdoor sportsman, have very strong opinions backed up by many experiences throughout the years in the field. Making a trail camera season ... terrible decision. All that did was ruin a fun past time for my kids and me to get into the mountains together. Limiting magnification on muzzleloaders is tricky. I do support and strongly feel like there is a need for something to change. I witnessed a guy shoot a buck out from under another guy on the general muzzleloader this past September at over 800 yards. He had the Leupold Mark5 scope on his inline muzzleloader that probably cost as much as a car. But completely taking away scopes, I feel, would be swinging the pendulum back too far the other way. That's where it gets murky though. Why should the line be drawn in the sand at iron/peep sights? Why not draw the line in the sand at max 4x magnification ... or max 9x magnification? Personally, I feel like a 3-9x scope is probably the most common/generic scope that is used by hunters at large all over the world. Sure, some guys are capable of dialing those 9x scopes and still taking long range shots but the majority of people don't feel comfortable shooting with 9x magnification over a couple hundred yards. I think limiting magnification to 9x would be a happy medium ... it's a compromise. You have half the hunters saying they don't want any changes, and half the hunters saying changes are needed. How can you make both groups happy? Compromise. Don't completely take away scopes on muzzleloaders. Don't just allow status quo. Meet somewhere in the middle. I feel like a 9x magnification limit is meeting in the middle. If you completely removed scopes from muzzleloader hunts, half the hunters are going to be extremely upset. If you allowed things to continue as they are today the other half of hunters are going to be extremely upset. Meeting somewhere in the middle is going to be a better solution for this tricky problem. Why do I say 9x is meeting in the middle? It's just how I feel personally. I'm not saying that's the only magnification limit I would be happy with ... I could be happy with many other options. I wouldn't be happy with going back to iron/peep sights. That would require me to take my inline muzzleloader to a gunsmith to have the barrel drilled and tapped so sights could be installed. Another thing to consider, which was barely touched on in this presentation but I feel is probably the most important thing to discuss, is wounded animals. Ethical hunters aren't going to take bad shots. But sadly, they do happen. I feel like the majority of people are still going to take stupid shots with iron/peep sights and end up wounding more animals than would be if the same shot was taken with a higher magnification scope.

But I digress ... it's a tough decision. My personal opinion is to not completely take away magnification on scopes, but rather limit it to a more reasonable number.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 12:48 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am strongly in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I have powder hunted for over 20 years and would like to see it back the way it was before people were shooting animals at 500 yards with a muzzleloader. If hunters insist on using a scoped gun, there is an any legal weapon hunt they can use it on. Thanks

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I have no problem with this as it provides the DWR with better data and better data supports better decisions.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Agreed with shortened seasons while our deer herd recovers. I'm curious to see the long term effects on population and harvest rates.
Strongly disagree on the restricted weapons definition. It is simply misguided and lacks data-based decision making

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The recommendation on elimination the use of compound bows is misguided and entirely lacks science-driven decision making. If the target is to increase future hunter's opportunity by reducing success by using science, then let's please use DATA and STATISTICS to support the "science-driven" decision making. 60% of the general season deer tags are allocated to rifle hunting which accounts for roughly 80% of the harvest. Why would the DWR decide to make changes to limit the success of the archery hunt by restricting the compound bow which only accounts for roughly 10% of the harvest? This doesn't use science, data, and statistics to support a shift in harvest adequate to support improved future hunting. This uses a misguided concept of how "far" compound bows have come in technology. This doesn't even touch the root cause of the problem let alone address your objective. What is the number of harvest the DWR hopes to reduce in order to increase future opportunity and what data do you have to say the technology recommendations will address this? How about increasing opportunity for a lower-success hunt and decreasing opportunity on high-success hunts? What limits are being put in place for the ALW hunt where the strong majority of harvest takes place? The compound bow decision is based on certain people's thoughts and emotion - not science. In this state you have already limited archery hunters in every aspect despite archery hunting being the fastest growing hunting tool today. We don't get the peak of the elk rut, ALW does. Archery hunters get far less than the majority of Utah tags despite being a fraction of the success, and now you are trying to further limit this. That is not putting the "hunt" back in hunting.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Thank you for cracking down on the profit sale of our state's wildlife tags.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

Strongly agree. Landowner tags are meant to reduce challenges with wildlife on the respective owner's land - not to compete with everyone else who waited and paid for a tag to hunt all public land in the respective unit. I appreciate the DWR sticking up for the general public and putting a common-sense change in place.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I've hunted other states that do a mandatory reporting. Its easy and effective.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? We need to improve and protect their habitat. Stop selling it of.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? These restrictions have been done before by Utah and surrounding states with little to no improvement. How about improving wintering habitat instead of blaming hunters. Put in more land bridges in migration corridors. More deer are killed by cars than hunters by far.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? You allowed scopes on muzzleloaders, moved the season, and than shortened the season. You keep punishing the hunters. I'm fine with removing scopes from muzzleloaders but lengthen the season.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 4:35 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? You know what, I retract my former statement. If you guys think 4 point or better will move the needle more than three point or better, than let's do it. I trust you guys.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:11 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

The part I disagree with is the restriction of compound bows. I feel that more deer will be injured and left to die without harvest because of the lack of accuracy and penetration power rod standard and recurve bows.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Pertaining to the Antler Point Limitation, I remember that when this was used in the 1970's and 1980's there were far too many buck deer killed which did not meet the limitation because the individual hunter did not check closely enough as to the points the buck they were shooting at to ensure that buck deer met the dictated criteria.

Season Length: I believe shorter season should be utilized statewide until predator numbers are brought down to limit impact generated by coyote, cougar and black bear particularly. DWR should refrain in the future from attempting to farm or overly increase the populations of large predators. R657-5-7 should be re-worded. People have contacted UTDWR personnel in the Salt Lake office concerning the use of rifle scopes which are essentially range finders within said rifle scope, "that they should expect a citation if they have such a scope and can take the wording of the regulation up with the judge when they go to court." As it is worded, it sounds like a firing plot for a military howitzer. Especially the part which states the electronic device will once the range is found will automatically fire the weapon. It needs change.

Same for Subsection D of that regulation which states: "A projectile for which the path can be altered or electronically tracked after it is sent in motion." I know of no hunting rifle/scope combination available to the Utah hunter which can do that. Nor do I know of any such type of projectile which is available to the Utah hunter.

I believe many areas within the state should be given consideration to complete closure to hunting of deer and/or elk for a period of three to five years. We literally have deer and elk seasons which run from August to January. It is little wonder our game populations are low coupled with predation and natural mortality. They do not stand a chance. Perhaps the legislature need look at how the DWR manages budgeting if new hunts are continually being dreamed up or hunting units split to increase sales of permits/tags. Attempting to sell more and more tags does our game no good.

As stated, going back to primitive weapon hunts is smart. With new inline muzzleloaders and variable scopes the average hunter can attempt shots out to 300+ yards and with new compound bows hunters are attempting shots out at 100+ yards with bows. Whatever happened to the actual art of hunting?

Harvest surveys should be mandatory until such time the DWR can see how actually low the harvest is and stop utilizing computer models which can come up with felonious results just to make the Utah hunter think there are large populations of game out there which there are not.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?

I believe ne areas for introduction of pronghorn's should be found and animals placed there. In the introduction it stated drought and severe winters. Drought is right but we haven't had too many severe winters in the past 5 to 8 years with the exception of the winter 2022-2023. Even Wyoming was hit hard by this past winter. But I believe the plural use of severe winter should be worded differently.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I would like to see the UTDWR utilize some serious changes in Mule deer management. Work to return to a statewide hunt. Work to bring our Mule deer population to or near to what it was in the late 1070's, early 1980's when the average hunter had reason to hope for a mature buck. With a deer population at or near 500,000 statewide the Utah deer hunter had a better than average chance of harvesting a good mature buck. That opportunity to harvest a good mature buck was even higher in the 1950's and 1960's when predator control was at a premium in the west. Cougar and Black Bear had not been given protected status by the UTDWR so the impact from predation was very limited. We need to do more to make it possible for our game/big game to rebuild and then give the Utah hunter a better, possibly a premium opportunity to harvest that mature buck or even a once in a lifetime record book buck as it used to be. It can be done if management is utilized in its best form. Something which has been amiss for the past thirty to forty years.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I believe in the changes in removing the availability of scopes from muzzleloader hunting. I believe the DWR should return to the "Primitive Hunt" which it once utilized for the use of muzzle loading rifles and for archery hunting as well. Hunters using newer inline muzzle loader rifles and variable scopes have the believed capability of shooting game animals out to 300+ yards. Whereas if the Primitive Hunting label is taken back, one must actually hunt to harvest a buck deer or bull elk. I believe it will help the game animal as well and we will not see wounded/lost deer or elk because of the excessive range these animals are shot at presently.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:29 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Thank you so much for having the courage to increase our buck quality and opportunity, very impressive!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:34 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Please vote these recommendations into action. People may get nervous now that the rubbers meeting the road but please don't back down now.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:43 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments Thank you!!! Please implement these recommendations!
about the research study or the
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:49 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments Please implement these recommendations ?!
about the research study or the
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 6:51 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Take scopes off muzzleloaders

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 27, 2023 9:56 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I don't believe it's fair to Utah hunters to implement allowing scopes on muzzleloaders for only 3 years, just long enough for hundreds of people to invest lots of money and time in good scoped muzzleloader setups, and then take them back way again when you've said yourself that it only increases success rates by 3%. We'll now be left with scopes that are worthless on other guns because the drop down turrets are designed for muzzleloaders.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I commented in the Springville RAC decades ago while working as gun department manager at Sunset Sports and recommended adopting scopes for muzzleloaders. I had wounded and lost the biggest buck I ever shot at because from about 200 yards, we didn't have the technology of laser rangefinders then, I placed the conical bullet too far back. I tracked the buck for miles and until my brother-in-law and I were concerned for our own health and ability to get back to our four wheelers. Back then, I didn't think to recommend a power limitation. No one got back with me but did with the traditionalists, who recommended 1X, or no magnification, because supposedly, with magnification we hunters would attempt unethically long shots. Problem one: You can't legislate and regulate ethics. "When guns are outlawed, only outlaws will have guns!" Unethical hunters will continue being unethical regardless of your taking technologies away from the ethical hunters. Problem two: The human eye sees at 1.5x. The 1X scopes we had for years had reducer lenses and were worse than the naked eye and did not help place shots better in vital areas. Problem three: Hunters have invested in weapons with technology that you are proposing to make obsolete. You tried that decades ago with minimum caliber rifles to use on big game, which I agree with as education but not regulation. The division's good intentions were met with overwhelming push back. No, most of us won't use our technologically advanced muzzleloaders on any weapon hunts, leaving our magnum rifles with technologically advanced scopes in our safes, disadvantaging ourselves and lessening our chances for success! Virtually no one uses actual black powder any more. Technological advances in smokeless substitutes are less corrosive! Please, embrace technology and work to provide opportunities rather than pick winners and losers. Archers shoot technologically advanced compound bows that shoot technologically advanced carbon arrows 150 plus feet per second faster than the first compound bows in the 1970's equipping them with technologically advanced expanding broad heads while using technologically advanced sighting systems. My son-in-law harvested a 200-inch trophy buck with technologically advanced archery tackle from 110 yards! Hunters are shooting at game with high powdered rifles firing technologically advanced cartridges/bullets equipped with technologically advanced scopes from well over 1,000 yards. Some using target rather than actual hunting cartridges and bullets! Get my drift? Please manage like small business people, focusing on our (your clients) wants and desires rather than like an oppressive government trying to exert power to control us (your subjects) Educate vs regulate! Thanks, Todd p.s. call me if you want to discuss.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I strongly disagree with the proposal to limit scopes on muzzleloaders! I did receive and complete the public survey referenced in the presentation. I built my first muzzleloader from a kit, a Thompson Center Hawkin ball and patch in 1986. I have enjoyed muzzleloader hunting in the state of Utah since that day all while adapting to innovation. I moved to an inline muzzleloader as an early adopter because I enjoy muzzleloading. I began utilizing 209 primers and then Blackhorn 209 propellant in my most recent muzzleloader. Yes, I used a 1x scope when the regulations allowed and now I use a greater power scope to enjoy the muzzleloader sport. My story is my story and I support muzzleloaders scopes.

I was lucky to draw a Nevada unit 231 muzzleloader elk permit two(2) years ago. I hunted hard for 9 days seeing bulls and taking and missing a very nice 5x5. I had practiced at Lee Kay on the 100 yard range countless times shooting 200 rounds in practice. I did not harvest a bull in Nevada. I waited nearly 15 years to draw the permit and will most likely not draw a non-resident elk tag in Nevada again. Harvesting is not the end all however that hunt still haunts me. Contrast that with my 2023 Wyoming non-resident unit 107 muzzleloader antelope hunt. Your presentation failed to mention Wyoming allows for muzzleloader scopes! I took an ethical one(1) shot harvest shot with my muzzleloader mounted with a scope. A vastly more enjoyable hunt.

I know opinions vary, I want to voice my opinion to allow scopes on muzzleloaders in Utah.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Antler points do not determine age. Antler points can determine genetic tendencies. Harvesting 4 pt at least on one side, promotes those deer with 2 or 3 pts. I shot a mature 3 1/2 yr old 3 point buck on the La Sals. The largest buck my antlerless elk hunting group saw on a Bookcliffs hunt around the Thanksgiving deer rutting time, was a heavy antlered 2 pt, conservatively estimated to sport a 38" rack. This was in the early 90's and we laughed what antler point restrictions produced. Along the lines of genetics, spike deer should be legal if you return to point restrictions. Yes, I know a spike could simply be a "late" fawn but if it could be genetically inferior.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Strongly agree that no scopes be allowed on muzzleloaders during the muzzleloader season.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? These proposals do not address the biggest cause of our decline in deer which snow and rain.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Studies indicate that the hunters are not the cause to a great decline in the deer herd. Weapon restrictions make it hard on the hunter when it is hard already is a bad solution. Furthermore, buying new weapons is a huge financial strain on hunters like me. The guns I use do not have iron sites. My one and only muzzleloader is inline. My son who inherited a gun from his great grandfather cannot use it now. Using his inherited gun has as much or more value than possessing it. You talk about restricting technology, well it was good enough for his great grandfather many years ago. It seems you are more concerned about DWR's money rather than the money of the hunting public.

Having to count antlers points may seem somewhat of a good way to increase the deer quality, yet it puts undeserved stress on the law abiding hunter. More bucks are seen at low light hours when it is hard to count antlers points. Furthermore, it makes new hunters frustrated rather than giving them a positive first time experience.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? You listened to the hunting public. Thank you. Yet, your decisions have nothing to do with the hunters input because you stated that the DWR do not support leaving the definition "as is". This statement seems to be your only support for the changes. You say that most western states do allow scopes on muzzleloader, but you fail to mention Wyoming. What other state do should not dictate what we do, maybe they should change. Scopes only changed the success rate 2.5 percent, which is very minimal. The problem is not the amount of deer shot. The real problems consist mainly of habitat quality which dictated by rain and snow. Furthermore, each lion will kill 50 deer per year. We are still lacking studies on the affect of wolves in this state.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 10:22 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I agree with all changes except the weapons restrictions of the compound bows and muzzleloader. Why would I need to buy new equipment when bows and muzzleloader are generally harder hunts as it is. With Longbows and flintlocks people are less experienced and could lead to more errant shots and wounded animals. As with rifle, taking away scopes will only add more errors. I believe if it's just point restrictions and shorter season dates that majority of hunters will still hunt those units but will Not with the weapons restrictions

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I like the shorter hunting days
I like the weapon restrictions.
I don't like that 1 unit will be the sacrificial lamb.
I believe there needs to be more units across the state to implement these changes, not just the Boulder unit.
Please choose 4-8 more units to restrict throughout the state.
That will give better data than just 1 unit.
Please do not pass this without Adding additional Units.....

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

The division should be making it harder to join the Dedicated Hunter Program. People that are complaining about the requirements are too ██████ Lazy. Use this program to get people that are willing and dedicated to help with projects or groups for the benefit of wildlife. Don't cave to the people that are not willing to put more effort into receiving a tag.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

If a scope on a muzzleloader only increases success by 3%, I'm opposed to that change I'm 69 years old and have issues with blurring of vision sometimes. If a scope on a muzzleloader only increases success by 3%, I'm opposed to that change I'm 69 years old and have issues with blurring of vision sometimes.

I believe a scope can decrease the suffering of the animal, with better shot placement.

So the way I see it the change isn't necessary, let the muzzleloading hunter who wants to hunt more traditionalist hunt his way, and let me hunt my way, for me the scope muzzleloader is more humane to the animal, especially with my age and current hunting ability.

I would also think it discriminatory toward the Elderly who may not have many hunting years left in us.

Thank You

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

If a scope on a muzzleloader only increases success by 3%, I'm opposed to that change I'm 69 years old and have issues with blurring of vision sometimes. If a scope on a muzzleloader only increases success by 3%, I'm opposed to that change I'm 69 years old and have issues with blurring of vision sometimes.

I believe a scope can decrease the suffering of the animal, with better shot placement.

So the way I see it the change isn't necessary, let the muzzleloading hunter who wants to hunt more traditionalist hunt his way, and let me hunt my way, for me the scope muzzleloader is more humane to the animal, especially with my age and current hunting ability.

I would also think it discriminatory toward the Elderly who may not have many hunting years left in us.

I've been hunting general season Buck deer probably for about 10 years or more, I've bought an inline muzzleloader, but The 1 power scope is worthless as things look further away than they really are, I never shot a deer with a power scope totally worthless. Even with a scope, I try to be within 120 yards.

If you get rid of scopes on muzzleloaders go with a 1-power or 2-power scope or eliminate in-line muzzleloaders, I will be done with muzzleloader hunting in Utah. I totally disagree with the mob mentality of putting your finger in the air and asking what other States doing, we can be unique in our approach,

If you have to be totally blind and then you can use a scope I reject that idea also.

Like I say if you are going to totally remove scopes from muzzleloader hunting I'm done with it.

Thank You

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Second Try: I am not in favor of restricting scopes, especially 1x or non magnified red-dot sights, on muzzleloaders. Since my mid sixties, I have not been able to use iron sights effectively due to inability to focus properly on the sight and target. Apparently this is common among senior citizens. I have had several rifles in my life with peep sights, but even peep sights became difficult during my mid sixties. I have lost one big game animal in my life due to poor shot placement and I was sick about it for weeks afterward. I thoroughly enjoy being out on the spike elk muzzleloader hunt today, and I harvested my big bull elk with my muzzleloader back in 2010. I plan to continue to hunt as long as I can see well enough and have the mobility to do so. I have never used a magnifying optic on the muzzleloader. Since I entered my sixties, I have only used a red dot. I restrict my shots with my muzzleloader to 200 yards or less. Please do not restrict 1X or non magnifying red dot sights.

Note: The use of scopes may have increased the harvest by 2.5%, but that increase may be because more animals are recovered due to better shot placement. I think there are a significant number of people who would be too embarrassed if they wound and lose an animal. It is unlikely that these folks, especially younger hunters, would complete an official report of the loss. The increase in harvest accounted to the use of scopes is statistically insignificant. If the Board is concerned that that increase is problematic for the herd, reduce the number of permits by that number, and then re-evaluate the harvest periodically. If it is a matter of revenue, then increase the cost of tags to offset the loss due to a small reduction of tags. I recognize the need for more law enforcement wardens, and I support an occasional increase in fees to support them as well.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I spent much of the last Month on the East end of the Boulder mingling with hunters and hunting and would propose that it would be wise to close deer hunt there for a year. My hunting experience indicates that technology used in hunting is not that important in improving the herd or the hunting experience. I watched the deer herds drop over the last 40 years from the pressure from Cougars, coyotes and too many Elk. The highest number of deer harvested in a year was in 1961 when 132,000 were taken. By comparison, around 25,000 deer were harvested last year.

Why would we allow those with money, power and some lifetime tags dictate these changes?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 5:02 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Nice work. Stick with the four point antler restriction. Don't let them talk you into going three point or better. It will not move the needle as much. I applaud you all.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 28, 2023 5:06 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments Way to be brave and go with 4 point or better!
about the research study or the
recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Easy to do. Provides valuable information for our game managers. Really no down side.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? PLEASE DO NOT change our option to use high quality muzzle loading rifles and optics that we've make significant investment in. Your own research indicates scopes have only increased Statewide muzzle loader harvest by approximately two and a half percent or 400 bucks. That would almost certainly be less than the wound/loss from requiring open sights. Your own research also shows that muzzle loader hunters limit themselves to responsible shots at reasonable ranges of 200 yards or less. What's the upside of making that shot more difficult? Other states are doing it?! Where's the science in that statement? I live here, work and pay taxes here and hunt here. What makes sense from the research for Utah should be the main consideration, not what Colorado or someone else is doing. If the research shows we have good support for a more primitive season, then we could certainly add one for those that would enjoy this option. Point restrictions, shortened seasons, reduced tag numbers, etc are all perfectly understandable management tools that can be readily adjusted as needed to achieve population and ratio goals. I'd much rather skip a year here and there or see smaller bucks and pass them up than give up my rifle and Gold Ring. Aging eyes need a high quality sighting option. Thank you for listening.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Making mandatory harvest reporting will fix nothing. People will be able to lie when filling out reports.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Shortened seasons and changes in technology for weapons used will only cause more people to switch over units and overload other units with more people applying for those units. Tjos will make other units even harder to draw. Making weapons more primitive for hunts only encourages more animals being wounded and lost. Point restrictions on animals only encourages people to leave animals in the field that were harvested by mistake. If the number of animals that are being harvested is too "high" in a unit just cut the number of tags. None of these options will help recruit a higher deer population. You need to have better conditions like weather and doe/fawn survival rates to increase the amount of deer in a herd including better wintering grounds. These recommend changes are just silly.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

3% change in harvest is no reason to change the current law of allowing scopes on muzzleloaders. 3% is minimal in the grand scheme of things. The state does not need to follow suit with other western states. All western states are not equal when it comes to big game hunting. Wyoming for example does not even have a general muzzleloader season. This is going to cause a serious uproar in all the individuals who put scopes on their muzzleloaders to make more ethical/humane harvests per the change in the law several years ago. Is the state going to give refunds for scopes purchased for muzzleloaders? People purchased scopes to follow current laws and would now have scopes that are useless because the state flip/flopped. If you want a smaller harvest cut the tags. If the issue is muzzleloaders with "scopes" having the capabilities of shooting farther. Change the law to not allow the "new" long range muzzleloaders. There is no need to punish people for putting scopes on their muzzleloaders per state law. Taking scopes off muzzleloaders and making them open/peep sights will only encourage more wounded game. This is preposterous and having a committee to look into this in the first place is a waste of money. You might as well make electronic rangefinders illegal to use and no use of camouflage.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

As an avid muzzleloader hunter, I strongly disagree with this proposal...As stated in your "studies", it don't seem like a whole lot has changed in the harvest numbers, and the change that has occurred does not necessarily mean that it is due to the technology of the muzzleloader scope. Granted, there are some muzzleloaders that are capable of shooting greater than 200 yards, but that does not mean everyone is doing it.. it is still a muzzleloader, with several factors that lead to more inconsistent shooting than a single shot rifle. For instance, no matter what type of muzzleloader you use, it must still be loaded from the muzzle, not the breech, and with every shot consistency changes, whether using loose powder or pellets. It still takes close to a minute to reload. Banning the scopes on muzzleloaders does not take "the single shot rifle" factor out of the equation. People with the longer range muzzleloaders will still be shooting over the 200 yard mark. I believe that if you want to make the muzzleloader hunt a unique experience, take away all the in line muzzy's and make the use of traditional muzzleloaders the rule, and put the hunt back in November! Not every muzzleloader hunter has a 2k muzzleloader and a 1k scope, it just isn't in most peoples realms of reality. Or why don't we put an antler point restriction on muzzleloader hunts... there are other options out there. Why not make changes to rifle hunts? There you now have people shooting over 1 mile, with shots that are just seconds in succession.

Thank you for your time and I hope I can attend the RAC

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 29, 2023 12:58 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The use of a scope on a muzzle loader should remain as is. You state that the use of the scope only improves success by 3%. It makes no sense to remove this option from those who prefer to use a scope, and force the use of open sights. Many people are unable to use open sights effectively due to the multiple focal points. I encourage you to leave this option open to hunters.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? It's a no brainer, we as hunters should help with conservation and mandatory reporting is one of the many ways we can do that.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Antler point restrictions have never worked, other states have them and they don't work, why would we think Utah would be any different.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Muzzleloaders are a "primitive weapon" this is why it has its own season. If we are to continue allowing scopes on these weapons we might as well combine that season with the any legal weapon hunt. I know plenty of friends and others that constantly talk about being able to shoot comfortably over 300 yards. To me that's a rifle. I agree we shouldn't make officers try to distinguish between low power and high power scopes, because that's impossible for them to enforce. Get rid of scopes or make it a rifle hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Thank you. Technology makes this easy and helps management decisions.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Studying these is a good idea to get data.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Continue to allow scopes on muzzleloaders. Making a change that is the opposite of your survey results is not supported by the people. Over 50% of participants wanted to keep this the same.

If hunts are shortened according to other proposals, it is a good idea to pursue additional restrictive weapons opportunities separately.

Additionally, I personally have invested in the most effective muzzleloader I could afford for the current muzzleloader hunt. The lower number of tags compared to any weapon in the area is desirable; however, to impose lower success on each individual to promote more tags is counterproductive to my satisfaction and likely the satisfaction of all participants.

It is a struggle to find quality opportunities in this state. States that do it right (Arizona) spread the opportunity out into multiple hunts over an extended period of time instead of concentrating individuals on the landscape. 5 day hunts may have this effect as well if they are not combined with additional opportunities (2 - 5 day hunts?)

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I built my first flintlock longrifle in 1968 & I hunt exclusively with a muzzleloader, whether it's a muzzleloader or any legal weapon hunt. For me, there is something about the aesthetics of a muzzleloader hunt, where you have a single shot that you have to make count, rather than going out with a rifle capable of shooting multiple shells. I recently purchased an inline muzzleloader (with a scope), that I look forward to using on the upcoming muzzleloader elk hunt. Although I can understand limiting muzzleloader hunts to "primitive" weapons with open sights, my strong personal preference would be to maintain the status quo, and continue to allow scopes on muzzleloaders.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

While I agree that the muzzleloader hunt needs to stay a close range hunt I don't believe that completely eliminating scopes is the best method. As someone who prefers close range hunting the muzzleloader hunt is the only big game hunt I have done for the last 15+ years. As someone who has glasses I really struggle to shoot with any iron sights. I also have a done who is right handed but left eye dominate and he also struggles with iron sights. I would support a rule that still allows for 1-2x scopes, however if we switch to iron sights only I may give up the one hunt I still participate in. Limiting scopes to low power will still limit the range people are shooting without excluding those people who struggle to use iron sights. Please consider the effects this proposal has on all people who like hunting close range.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Something needs to be done with all of the herds in the state of Utah. In my opinion, I think the state needs to cut deer tags, and especially cut antler less tags on all species. Cut the rifle and muzzleloader seasons to 5 day hunts for the next 5 years and reevaluate where the herd numbers are. Also transplant some whitetail into Utah if the DWR wants to offer more hunting opportunities for people. Otherwise the DWR is driving people away from hunting.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The DWR says that Utah is one of only a few states that allows scopes on Muzzleloaders. If the DWR is so concerned about this and the advantage it gives to hunters, then why is Utah one of the only states that still has a rifle hunt in September, during the middle of the rut? If the DWR wants to make changes, then let's make changes that will actually do some good for our herds.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

This plan is not what hunters want:

1. Shortened dates are a way to control harvest, but this is not what hunters prefer. We like longer hunts resulting in higher success and more enjoyment.
2. We don't prefer weapon restrictions. This method complicates things and can be impractical for many hunters because of things like having to remove your scope and then reinstall it again to accommodate a hunt. Or having to have 2 guns, one with a scope and one without. Or having to have a recurve bow and a compound bow. Cost is a factor too.
3. We don't prefer point restrictions:
 - Sure, the number of antler points will go up, but harvest success would be drastically reduced years 1-3 until stabilized.
 - It will take 4 years for this trial to stabilize, possibly longer than that for an adequate test. So we feel the trial period is inadequate.
 - This will make the area less desirable and destroy hunting for many hunters in that area.
 - You are catering to trophy hunters, not all hunters. In today's rules, trophy hunters can always work harder or wait for the big buck, but this new plan increases trophy hunter's success at the expense of the regular or meat hunter.
 - It is cumbersome and more precarious to count points. Often times deer are too far away, equipment (scopes or no scopes, or no binoculars) is lacking, or we don't have time to count points. The fewer complications the better.
 - Illegal kills will skyrocket.
 - We still do not understand why you are doing this test when you have historical data that this method does not work.
 - Controlling herds by permit numbers is the best, most practical, and simplest method. Shortening season dates is a less desirable, less direct option. Controlling by points is very indirect and results in mostly negative outcomes.
 - Point restrictions are not what hunters want, but a pie-in-the-sky (unreachable) dream of what hunting should be like!

Always keep in mind: "THE SIMPLER, THE BETTER!" You've been analyzing, experimenting, and researching Utah hunting for 100 years, and things are getting overly analyzed and complex. I long for the simple hunts of the good old days!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 29, 2023 10:53 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed changes to the
taking big game rule?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 29, 2023 10:55 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed changes to the
taking big game rule?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 2:51 am

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

listened to this presentation multiple times and cannot understand why the committee chooses to ignore the very data they are presenting in making this recommendation. The majority of those who actually are muzzleloaders opposed this change. Better than 50% are in favor of a status quo. There was zero data presented that a rule change would have a significant impact on population dynamics. I heard no valid social or biological justification for comparing to what surrounding states are doing (or failing to do). I failed to understand the concern from conservation officers about not being able to discern between the magnification of optics because every scope I've ever used has magnification clearly marked by the manufacturer. I must be missing something there. Even so I can't see that as a deal buster on using scopes.

There appears to be an effort on the part of the committee to enforce their concept of what an ethical shot is by limiting optics, yet the data clearly indicates that muzzle loader hunters are for the most part already doing that even with unlimited magnification currently available to them. I hope it is not so but o me this survey smacks of an attempt to justify rule changes perceived by minority as being needed. Since it failed to do so they make the recommendations anyway glossing over their own data. I can't describe how unethical this appears to me. I am appalled if this is so.

I cannot see how this recommendation meets any of the described purposes. Preserve hunting traditions into the future? This recommendation does not do this for me. I've have been grateful for the change to scopes as my eyesight and iron sights no longer get along. The most memorable muzzleloader hunt success I've ever experienced would not have been so had I been limited to iron sights. If the recommended change becomes reality I loss a piece of my hunting tradition. I also loose the investment I made in optics to accommodate. This is no small matter to me. The 1x scope was a welcome change for me as was the later upgrade to higher magnifications. I use a 1.5 -5x which is ample for the 200 yard shots. I really don't wish to lose that investment to the whims of rule changes that are unjustified. The DWR established a precedent that they now do not wish to support and they provide no compelling evidence to support the change? Just a feeling that they must get ahead of technology? I feel they are looking at the wrong group of hunters.

The second objective was to help managers meet objectives of management plans. Clearly no compelling evidence that this recommendation meets that goal. In fact just the opposite.

The third was to help increase hunting opportunities (or something similar to that) Also no compelling evidence to support that either. For me it is just the opposite. As I age I can no longer go where I went, see what I could see, hunt the way I would prefer. I see this proposed recommendation as an additional limitation to my hunting experience. Its like adding insult to injury not and increase of opportunity.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I disagree with the proposal to eliminate the use of scopes on muzzleloaders. I believe that the data chart you produced addressing muzzleloader shooting distances is legitimate where the majority of hunters believe up to 200 yards is considered a realistic max efficient distance. The proposal indicates that individuals will attempt to shoot at longer distances because of optics but the data coming from the survey does not reflect that data nor that the survey indicates a 50/50 opinion to leave the regulations as they exist today. From my experiences in the field on muzzleloader hunts, I have found that there are many more quality kills since inception of scopes on muzzleloaders and would hate to see that option go away just because Utah and Arizona are the only ones allowing it at this point. We need to be leaders in these technology updates and not followers. Tools to allow for a quality kill and successful hunt should be priority one during these muzzleloader hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I'm all for the mandatory harvest reporting. The data probably won't change, but the public confidence will

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I really like the idea of trying some new hunting strategies. A major concern I have is the lifetime license holders grabbing a huge majority of the tags in the 4pt or better units. Pine Valley already has about 500, and I think it will more than double. I think there should be some sort of cap, similar to the Dedicated Hunter Program, around 15% or so.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The technology committee recommended to restrict the use of range-finding bow sights that cost \$800-\$1,000. A small percentage of hunters were using these and were affected by the change. On the rifle end of things, riflescopes that do similar things were restricted. The Burris Eliminator (\$1,500+) and the Swarovski DS (\$4,000+) are the only two mainstream scopes that do that. Again, very few people were affected by this change, with the vast majority of hunters using regular scopes with a turret/dial system. Almost EVERY muzzleloader hunter in the state will be affected by this proposal, and per the DWR's own survey data, there's "Not a lot of support for change". Also, no majority was in favor of the muzzleloader sight restrictions, the majority was in favor of the status quo - their words! So who is really pushing for this?

I find it a little puzzling that majority public opinion put the scopes on muzzleloaders, but the committee voted to defy the majority opinion with these recommendations. If someone is looking for a "unique experience", what is stopping them from using iron sights right now? It doesn't make sense to me to make such a drastic change, without majority support.

The survey says that "Most people aren't comfortable harvesting animals beyond 200 yards" That's because most people are still taking shots in the 200-300 range, and I know a LOT of people with long-range muzzleloaders capable of shooting a long way. People like to be accurate and ethically harvest animals! Was that not even part of the conversation? Do we purposefully want to reduce people's accuracy and effective ability to cleanly and quickly harvest animals? I don't think it's a good idea to go backwards there.

In my opinion the reported wounding loss data is NOT correct. Most people I know think they will get in trouble if they report an unrecovered animal - people who have been hunting their whole lives. I'm confident there is far less wounding loss with scopes on muzzleloaders.

Here's the big issue I have and I would like the RAC and Board to discuss:

The technology committee recommends that we restrict the optics that allow muzzleloaders to shoot similar distances to rifles. What are we doing to restrict the optics and sights on archery equipment that allow them to shoot more than 100 yards, crossing into muzzleloader territory? Shooting those extreme distances with a bow is far less accurate, predictable and ethical than some shooting 500 yards with these new muzzleloaders. And people ARE doing shooting those extremely long-range bow shots, because their sights allow for it! If you surveyed the general hunting public, a HUGE majority would say that people should not be shooting 100 yards (or more) with their bows. If we are going to restrict these optics on weapons, let's do it equitably and fairly. Let's not pretend like archery hunters are exempt from their weapons pushing the limits of an effective and ethical range. No preferential treatment.

I respectfully request the RAC and Wildlife Board seriously discuss and vote on restricting archery sights to a maximum of 5 fixed pins and NO SLIDING or ADJUSTABLE SIGHTS. And only then I will be in favor of the proposed muzzleloader restrictions.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? This needs to wait and come thru the mule deer committee. Also the long bow traditional archery stuff is not acceptable. As an archer who lives in the area. I do not agree with no scopes on rifles as well. 4 point of better or shorter dates are fine but don't make people have to buy new gear.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? The plan for the dutton and boulder are not acceptable. This also should have come thru the mule deer committee and not from special interest groups.
If you do implement anything 4 point or better or shortened seasons would be much more acceptable so we could at least use the equipment we currently have

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 3:00 pm

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 3:33 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Unfortunately the fish and game has created this problem. In the beginning the muzzleloader hunt was supposed to be a primitive weapon hunt. Over the years you've allowed increased modifications to the guns. Now it's pretty much a centerfire rifle hunt. Somehow this needs to be brought back to a primitive weapon hunt. Removing scopes is a move in the right direction. Understandably this won't make some people very happy.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 3:49 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I'm OK with harvest reporting as long as it has no fee

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

- 1) 1X scope is the best option.
- 2) Restricting use of 2 way radios= bad idea .. More often used to prevent lost Youth and Senior Hunters than killing more deer.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Forcing folks to become trophy hunters does nothing more than appease a few. If a 2 pt. makes someone happy then more power to them. This will not grow deer, only big bucks and that is what limited entry hunts are for. These units have big bucks now, all that has to be put in some effort.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The muzzleloader hunt has become a second rifle season. Let's make it the challenging weapon it's supposed to be.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? I like all the changes other than not turning the tag back in. So many folks are gonna say they didn't harvest when they did, this is making it so easy to do.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I think the numbers just don't add up. I'm a muzzleloader hunter, with a scope and I don't want to shoot anything over 250 yards. 2.6% more animals harvested with a scope means a change to regulations? What's the plus or minus on this data? I believe you allowed scoped muzzleloaders due to the increase of the popularity of rifle hunting at the time. Correct? So now the public, who the majority want no change, will have to put in for the rifle hunt and less opportunities. I have 19 points for my muzzleloader deer tag and now in the middle of the game, you want to change the rules. I'm frustrated because the video really showed me no data that this should be done but the DWR is still saying it should be done. I am 100% about an ethical kill. And if that means a scope to do the job, then I'm all for it. At what point do we cull the technology we use to hunt? Rangefinders? Binoculars? Spotting scopes? It's all technology that we all use while in the field. The data doesn't back up the removal of scopes on Muzzleloaders. And Utah wants to be like the rest of the western states? Since when? I'm proud of the way my state is run and that we do what's best for us not following suit on what other states are doing. That argument is just absurd.

My final thoughts are leave things the way they are. In any hunt group you will get hunters that fling an arrow too far, shoot a muzzleloader too far and for sure a rifle hunter that shoots too far. It's all about hunter ethics and not the tool they are using for the job. Thank you for hearing my voice.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I agree with mandatory harvest reporting! I like the recommendations.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I am not a fan of antler point restrictions. It would lead to waste of game, and seems complicated. Let people shoot any buck with thier permit. Example: youth may want to harvest thier first buck even if its a small one and some hunters may just want a meat buck.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I have no problem with removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I would like to see either open sites or limit to 1 power scope. I am a muzzleloader and rifle hunter. I believe It would maintain the fair chase concept. I highly recommend we look at the long range rifle shooting as well next year. As it seems an unfair advantage to wildlife to shoot them from really long distances. Long range shooting is changing hunting. I saw that first hand this year with everyone hunting from roads and not "hunting" down in the canyons where I hunted. I support the recommendations.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Seems like some good recommendations for the DH program.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

When you guys started the cwmu program it did not take long for all the cwmu unites to be ran by guide services and with that we have lost a lot of public land because now the land guides and closed off roads that you could travel on to get to the public land to hunt because it crossed a lil section of privet land so the guides have caused a lot of problems also they have put up cwmu signs were it's not a cwmu. I have had to call DNR a couple of times asking why that is now a cwmu and sent a gps to were they have closed it off and was told they put their signs in the wrong spot. Well if I was hunting in the wrong spot I am sure I would not just get told I half to move witch is what they was told. So I really believe that anything to do with this or to do anything with land owners is a bad thing. It's turned in to a way to make money for them at the cost of a lot of public land that can no longer be accessible to the public witch is a really sad deal so I am asking ether get the guids out of the cwmu or make some tougher rules on the cwmu

If they draw a tag for the area their land in on good for them they should not have special privileges because they have land. we don't have special privileges and we all own tons of land that's getting taken away each year because of the rule changes you guys have made already

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

My name is Derrick Jenkins. My comments today are on the Technology and Hunting recommendations for rule R657-5. Specifically rule R657-5-10 Muzzleloaders. The recommendations for this rule are to prohibit the use of scopes on muzzleloaders for all muzzleloader hunts. I strongly disagree with this recommendation.

I have been hunting on the General Deer Muzzleloader hunt with my family for over 20 years. When they passed a rule that you could have a high power scope on a muzzleloader, I thought that was great. So, I went out and bought a scope for my muzzleloader, my son's and my daughter's muzzleloaders.

Has having a scope on our muzzleloaders helped us to make more accurate shots? Yes, it has! Which in turn is more ethical. Have we harvested more deer having a scope on our muzzleloader compared to when we didn't have them? No, we have not! I have harvested 7 deer in 20 years. My son's last deer was 5 years ago and my daughter has not harvested one yet. My wife has a dedicated hunter's tag and has yet to punch her tag, even though she only has one year left on her dedicated tag. Having a scope on your muzzleloader doesn't guarantee you a deer - it takes practice, effort, scouting and learning about the deer's habits/movements. The end result of a scope is helping you to make an accurate shot that will kill the animal, not just wound it.

The definition of a muzzleloader is: a firearm that is loaded from the muzzle, which is the front end of the gun barrel. A scope on a muzzleloader has nothing to do with how it is loaded.

This is a muzzleloader hunt, not a scope hunt. If it was a scope hunt, it would be called a scope hunt or muzzlescope hunt.

The technology committee recommending these changes said that they don't want this to be just another rifle hunt, which I believe they are referring to the any legal weapon hunt. The any legal weapon hunt is not a rifle hunt; it is an any legal weapon hunt, which includes archery, muzzleloaders, rifles, etc. The muzzleloader hunt is just that - a hunt with a muzzleloader. Technology has been changing not only on muzzleloaders, but also on archery equipment, rifles and all hunting equipment. This has resulted in making all equipment more accurate and ethical in harvesting an animal.

I hope you will take my comments into consideration and not pass any recommendations that will change the muzzleloader hunt rule R657-5-10.

Thank you.

Sincerely, Derrick Jenkins

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 30, 2023 11:10 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am reaching out to express how much I disagree with the changes to scopes on muzzle loaders. The dwr is proposing removing scopes completely but in their video, they gave no solid reason for getting rid of them. If harvest rates did not go up significantly and the majority of people surveyed did not want significant changes, then why is the dwr so bent on making this change?

My questions that go along with this thought is how can we really determine what the success rate is when we don't require mandatory harvest surveys. Why would we make this change now until we see what the actual harvest rates really are. If we think we will get better data by doing mandatory harvest surveys then why are we making changes to something based on flawed or severely incomplete data?

If we remove scopes, it would be logical to make the calculation that wounded numbers would also go up. People will still make bad shots regardless if a scope or open sights are used but is it logical that scope use have wounded less deer than open sights.

The argument that there will be the ability to get registrations to use scopes because of a disability is laughable at best. Does this mean anyone that has poor eyesight and wears glasses will be approved? Of course it won't. I am in the mindset that I want to stay away from the chaos of the rifle hunt. I like the challenge of the muzzleloader hunt, and I hate the over restrictive weapon choice of archery hunting. I much prefer the muzzle loader hunt and if scopes were taken away, my vision isn't great and I would really struggle using open sights or a peep sight. What we are doing here is discriminating against older generation who struggle with this. This is avoidable. We don't have to be like every other western state. That argument for removing scopes is laughable as well. I can easily state that most of the eastern states allow scopes on muzzle loaders so why would we not want to be like them? I would reject that as well and I would say, I don't care what other states are doing, I care about the animals first and foremost. They deserve our respect and making things needlessly complex doesn't give the animals that respect they deserve. The younger generation believes this more than anyone and if you don't think it will drop the amount of new hunters picking up a muzzle loader, you are sorely mistaken.

I have always felt like the dwr made changes based on what was best for the wildlife but this one stinks of a government agency claiming they know but then giving zero conclusive data to back their position. In their video they essentially make this claim that it's not what every one wants. I also believe that many people don't understand the restrictions that muzzleloader hunting already puts on you. If anyone that think it's easy has never actually hunted with a muzzle loader before. It's not as simple as calling it a single shot rifle like the dwr states in the video. That over simplifies it dramatically. This statement reeks of a group of people who haven't hunted using a muzzleloader.

If this is truly trying to save the animal populations, or to do what is best for the animals, then you will keep scopes to help cut down on wounding of animals. If this is trying to cut down on success because you are too scared to do what is needed to combat point creep and other issues with the flawed point system we have, then tell us that or just change the system to a completely random drawing. Just quit making this sound like another government agency saying we are here to help but giving no justification to what they are fixing.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I think this is a great change. I think there should be some type of an app and a photo required to go along with with this. Photo of the harvest. I also think that if you are late or forget you are done, No chance to pay \$\$\$ to get back in. We are all adults and it shouldn't be that hard. We have had to check swans and others for along time. DO NOT LET \$\$\$ make up for being late. Thank you!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I would rather have a deer tag every 5 years and have the chance at killing a nice mature buck than have frequent tags and tons of hunters. I spend a lot of time on the mountain during all seasons and its crowded and seems like most agree. I have a young son and feel that hunting wont be a thing when he comes to age with what I see going on.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I know guys shooting muzzleloaders confidentiality out to 1000 yards and think that 500 is a chip shot. I am happy to see the scopes going away. I grew up on the muzzleloader and it was iron sites. I am an archery hunter at heart and I always wanna be up close and personal. Makes me sick that guys like shooting at these distances. Go shoot steel.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I completely support the 4 point or better rule (although would prefer if to be 3 pt.) My only hesitations are: 1- the lifetime hunters will gobble up the tags on the 4 pt. or better units for better hunting and 2- the shorter hunts which I have read several times in the past that these shorter hunts actually raise success rates as people "hunt harder".

We need to CAP lifetime holders on a per unit basis so they can't dominate a unit prior to the draw. (might already be set that way but I could not find it anywhere in my searches)

I love that we are going to try something new and test it out.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I strongly disagree with the proposal to remove scopes from muzzleloaders. The presentation clearly show that over 50% of the hunters do not want or are OK with scopes on the muzzy's. Our rules should be made with one thought in mind: What is best for the resource? This proposal does nothing to "help" the resource. The presentation shows that the massive majority do not even think about shooting beyond 200 yards. There is no reason to switch to iron sights besides a clear agenda to just do it.

I would ask you to consider a couple of things when you make your decisions. 1- There are a lot of us who are far sighted. We can shoot with a scope. But, trying to focus on a near iron sight without "reader glasses" while looking at a distant target is very difficult if not impossible. I can either see the sights really well or I can see the intended target. I cant clearly see both. 2- Most of us who enjoy the muzzleloader hunt just barely switched to a magnified scope. IF you choose to go back on this, at a minimum, please consider allowing us to at least put our 1x or our red dots back on the muzzy. Quite honestly there is nothing wrong with a 3x9 or a 4-12. The only thing I see this trying to attempt is to close the door on long distance muzzy hunting. You can regulate that simply by limiting the magnification.

If this were about saving deer for survival you would be targeting the rifle scopes or rangefinders. Rifle hunters kill thousands more bucks a year than archery or muzzleloaders. If you want to eliminate success equally across the board, ban rangefinders - period. That evenly distributes the impact across all hunts and would guarantee lower success.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

I strongly disagree with giving landowners 5% of the LE tags on a per unit basis. They should not get any preference over the public hunter unless it DIRECTLY benefits the public. They have no "right or entitlement" to the game of this state. This is wrong on so many levels.

I support the proposal to keep the LOA tags on their property. That should have been that way from the beginning. We need to do this to all CWMU's as well.

I also support the private lands general tags. This will help push deer and elk back off the private property they so quickly run to once the hunts begin.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I do not agree with taking scopes off muzzleloaders. I feel that it has made my young kids and myself more ethical and precise hunters. I have muzzleloader hunted my whole life, and what a blessing it has been to have my kids not be facing the same challenges with muzzleloaders as I did at there age with my open sight muzzleloader,

1. not having a good sight picture of the target,
2. I seen and heard of more people chasing wounded animals then compared to now
3. the comments of lobbing lead through the air in hopes it will hit where you think it might but it usually didn't.

The list goes on and on.

I remember when compound bows first came to the seen there was a ton of speculation and opinion but the bottom line is that compound bows have brought more hunters to the field and has helped us be more precise with pins, rangefinders, better arrows and equipment. Scopes on muzzleloaders have done the same thing. I feel like the key to the future of hunting is having our kids and others have quality, confident and enjoyable experiences out in out in the field and having scopes on muzzleloaders helps with this.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I am strongly in favor of mandatory reporting. Additionally, I think it would be useful to require reporting on the number of points on the harvested buck like Idaho does.

Anyone who can navigate the application process should easily be able to navigate reporting and having a grace year where there are no fines is more than generous and will give people an opportunity to understand the process.

The data gained from mandatory harvest reporting is easily accumulated with today's technology and the data will be extremely valuable to both hunters and wildlife biologists.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am in favor of antler restrictions. The data on western mule deer is shaky at best, however, implementing it on a unit by unit basis will allow the wildlife biologists and wildlife board to determine the effects of the restriction before applying them to more units.

I am unsure on shortened seasons. Hunters are only given a few days afield as it is, the potential to only have one weekend to hunt or possible no weekends of hunting would be a blow to hunting opportunity. Additionally, it will increase hunting pressure during those days and decrease hunter satisfaction.

I am not in favor of the restricted weapons hunts. This seems like it will cause a lot of confusion about what weapons are legal and could result in a lot of people who do not understand what they signed up for. I thinking adding restricted weapons hunts is a potential solution, however, replacing the weapons requirements on those hunts will create a lot of confusion and many unsatisfied hunters.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have mixed opinions on scopes on muzzleloaders. I do not feel it is in the spirit of using a primitive weapon. However, I enjoy muzzleloader hunting and it is usually the season I dedicate the most time hunting. The data does not indicate significant increase in harvest with muzzleloaders, however, we as hunters know that it is easier and we can be more selective with the deer we take because we will have more opportunity to take deer within a reasonable range.

I have only looked at a few units and the data associated with them but the drawing odds for rifle hunts got better and the odds for muzzleloader hunts got worse when scopes were allowed on muzzleloaders. For me personally, as a muzzleloader hunter, I would rather there be no scope and have the opportunity to hunt more often with better odds. However, from a management perspective, it would spread hunters out and help decrease the effects of point creep on rifle hunt, which would allow a greater number of hunters to be satisfied.

I do not agree with the idea that the scope is what distinguished a muzzleloader from a rifle. Many people do not want to handle powders or pellets and are intimidated by doing so. Muzzleloaders take specific care to handle safely, require frequent cleaning, are inherently less accurate, and not as commonly owned as rifles. All of these are factors that keep the muzzleloader hunt unique from an any legal weapon hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I have participated in the dedicated hunter program twice and thoroughly enjoyed the program and the opportunities it provides.

I believe all the changes would be positive for dedicated hunters.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I hunt with a muzzleloader every year in Utah, I support a no scope law for muzzleloaders.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Hate the new muzzy rule. You admitted that the success rate barely increased, 2.6%. Therefore, no reason to go after scopes since it hasn't drastically increased anything. ■■■ backwards planning. If you have too, limit it to a 4 power scope so their isn't a "long range" component to muzzleloader hunting. I've taken muzzy elk with iron sights, it makes it easier to wound an animal vs a well placed shot using a scope.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Hate the new muzzy rule. You admitted that the success rate barely increased, 2.6%. Therefore, no reason to go after scopes since it hasn't drastically increased anything. ■■■ backwards planning. If you have too, limit it to a 4 power scope so their isn't a "long range" component to muzzleloader hunting. I've taken muzzy elk with iron sights, it makes it easier to wound an animal vs a well placed shot using a scope.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? There is no reason that a hunter cannot supply reporting information, its long overdue.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? With a less than 3% harvest increase eliminating scopes from muzzle loaders will only increase injured animals. Same with thr archery electronics on sights- there is no need to mske changes when a guy with a rifle and bluetooth rangefinder scope combo will be out chasing the ssme game a week later. What about a class action lawsuit to reimburse hunters for weapons and gear purchased while these are legal. Even the muzzleloaders from manufacturers are not set up to equip anything but a scope.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I'll just come out with it, and say this just is not fair. You can not go back after 5-6 years of having a rule implemented and then turn around and take it away from us muzzleloader hunters. 3% is not that big of deal, hunters are taking 1.5 more deer than if they were to use open sight muzzle loaders. If your concerned about the amount the of animals that are being taken then if this passes then the rifle limited entry bull elk hunt needs to to be moved. utah is the only state that allows big bulls to hunted and killed with high powered rifles during the peak rut and the late muzzle loader limited entry hunt in November for deer either needs to be canceled and or the general tag move back to November. Both deer and elk are being hunted during their most vulnerable times. Scopes are not affecting taking deer or elk most muzzle loader hunters are not taking shots more than 200 yards with them. Again this is not fair to black powder hunters. If hunters choose to use open sights then that's fine but for the guys who wish to use scopes let them be. I'd like to hear back on thoughts from the board members.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
October 31, 2023 8:29 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I think taking scopes away is going to cause more animals to have poor shots taken on them and be wounded and then hunters are not going to look for the animal and go shoot another one

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 3:04 am

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed changes to the
taking big game rule?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Years ago (30+) an antler restriction hunt (3 point or better) was placed on a unit (Richfield, Monro areas) that proved to be an absolute failure for the DWR. I personally, watched two deer 2 points get shot and left to lay after the shooters realized they didn't meet the minimum requirements for the unit. Many hunters I spoke with on the mountain, didn't even know there was an antler restriction in place.

The proposed Archery and Muzzy restrictions for the Boulder Unit is nothing but a very comical proposal. If you want to "save the deer" on that unit, just close it down to GS hunting. The current proposal, if approved, this would increase the applicant pool on the remaining units for the GS deer. Thus, creating a point creep of 3 points to draw a GS deer tag in some units.

What happens when a handicap hunter that has to use a crossbow is required to apply for a unit other than than the Boulder? There is a an ADA law, and someone may want to exercise that law in a litigation against the DWR.

I have been hunting Utah since 1977 and at this point, I could care less if I ever hunt deer or elk again. I am embarrassed to say the least the way the wildlife has been managed, and the the management strategies moving forward. I think the DWR is 20 years to late in helping the deer populations. Place a moratorium on building/development in the winter range that were protecting the herds. Although, there isn't much left of that along the Wasatch Front.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 8:33 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Really like to CWMU program overall.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

The "Tradition" of the muzzleloader hunt can still be had by all that choose to continue with open sight, flintlock, inline, or cap and ball guns. Just like archery using a long bow, compound bow or cross bow. When I was starting to hunt big game, you were lucky to have a 3x9 scope and a gun capable of shooting 300 yards. With technology, hunters are lobing shots at deer at over a mile. The traditional 30-30 can still be used for those whom choose to go that route. Per your #'s, deer harvest with scopes on muzzleloaders is only up 2.6%. I can only guess that the wound / loss # is down and would like to know that #. 2.6% higher success rate should be a non-factor when it come to a state wide harvest of under 400 additional deer. If the law is changed, I believe that many muzzlerloader hunters will jump back into the rifle hunt and reduce opportunities in deer hunting for all. There will be more demand for fewer available draw tags in the rifle hunts and those that could have drawn a decent deer unit with 18 points will now have additional years to wait. If you have a goal to create more oppzrtunities in deer hunting, don't mess with something as trivial as scopes on muzzleloaders.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 11:16 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Neither agree nor disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am interested to see the results in a few years from these studies and changes. I have a concern on the point restriction study. If you have all hunters in a unit trying to shoot the biggest and smartest deer (4 point a bigger), It seems like the spikes, 2x3's, 3 points will become the breeding stock with lessor genes to carry into the future. The does produced will also be of the inferior breeding and will produce deer with lower potential. Long term I believe this will hurt the exact thing you are trying to accomplish.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am not in favor of antler restrictions. From the research I have done and the data I have read antler restrictions don't really play much of a factor in the overall size of the herd or the size of bucks.

I believe a better option would be to reduce the overall tag allocations by as much as 30%. Some members of the public are going to be mad and talk about how hunting in Utah just isn't the same as it was when they were kids growing up in the 70s and 80s. Our population in Utah has grown and there simply are not enough resources for the demand. Unfortunately, not everyone is going to be able to hunt every year.

Another option is to break up the deer hunt into 3 or 4 shorter seasons and push them later into the fall similar to Colorado. This would help with crowding and it reduces the amount of people in the field at one time. Also make the season opener dates stick to dates, not days of the week. IE. The deer hunt is always October 21-26 every year. This could result in only 1 weekend, or none at all, to fall during the hunt period.

You could also close down more roads and trails to ATVs and dirt bikes and only allow foot traffic.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I strongly disagree with the proposal to eliminate scopes from muzzleloaders. The data suggests that they only increase hunter success by 3% which is so small that it could likely be related to other factors and not the scopes themselves.

As stated in the presentation most hunters do not feel comfortable taking shots longer than 200 yards with a muzzleloader. My fear is that eliminating scopes will lead to hunters still taking shots within 200 yards that are not as accurate and lead to more wound loss.

I do my best with any weapon to get as close to the animal as possible to ensure a clean and ethical kill. For me, my simple 3-9x40mm scope gives me some confidence that I will hit the animal where I intend and get a quick clean kill.

Most of the new long-range muzzys are bolt action, use magnum rifle primers, and shoot the smaller .45CAL all of which allow for longer shots. In my opinion, a better option would be to only allow muzzleloaders that shoot .50CAL, must use standard 209 primers (or musket cap), and must be limited to 150grains or less of powder.

If the desire is to stop hunters from being able to take long shots limiting the technology that lets the rifle shoot further, not eliminate the thing that gives hunters confidence to make a good shot.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I honestly feel like we are attempting to fix something not broke. I am strongly opposed in taking scopes off muzzleloaders. If you look at all the muzzleloader dates general & limited entry muzzleloader dates optics is your friend in this hunt, but distance or time isn't. Since we always go back & fourth about equipment changes should we not allow scopes on rifles next? Equipment upgrades that are legal does not guarantee a harvest. What it did was allow many new hunters & young hunters to enjoy the great outdoors on hunts they probably wouldn't try if you didn't allow it. Im opposed with allowing something, then slowly but surely everything gets taken back. My success rate stayed the same at 0 with a muzzleloader, but I still try for it is a hard hunt for spike Elk. I think we all jump onto the equipment side of things before season date rotational changes or permit numbers decrease/increase. Thank you for your time UDWR & RAC Members.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 1, 2023 5:02 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

If the success rate is less than 3% and the majority of people do not want the current rule changed then please don't change it! Who cares if us and Arizona are the only states that allow scopes on muzzleloaders. If you take away scopes to keep it a special hunt than move it back into November like it used to be!!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Going to iron sights on muzzleloaders I feel is a mistake. I feel the wounded rate will increase. With people trying to deal with open sights. Please consider limiting the scopes to 1 power which will help keep the wounded rate lower while limiting the range of muzzleloaders. Why do we care what other states are doing? Don't pick and Choose. We're the only state that has rifle elk hunt's during the rut???? There's no need to take muzzle loaders back to open sights. The increase in success rates with scopes is minimal. But I agree something needs to be done with the long range muzzle loaders. So limit scopes to 1 power.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Since 2016 with any scopes on muzzleloaders we have seen an increase in 2.5% success ratio. The comment was made that in the whole state that would equal about 400 more bucks being taken during the muzz hunt. Those 400 bucks would be killed on the early and late rifle hunts anyway so why change the rule for that. I also think that it will discriminate against the older generation of muzz hunters who really appreciate a scope because that groups eye sight is not up to using open sights. If you change anything please make it a fixed 4 power scope to be used
Thank you

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? This is a long overdue change. A+

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I mostly agree with this proposal, but one area I am not in favor of is Antelope Island, I feel they need to get a handle on the very over abundant coyote population before putting more animals out there.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I commend the DWR for this out of the box thinking, and am willing to see how these proposals shake out.

A couple of issues that I am not a fan of, for the restrictive weapons hunts, I feel the archery restrictions are vastly over kill. Archery is already a very low success rate that I feel moving to long bow tech is to far. To me a fair restrictive hunt for archery would be to limit hunters to a 3 or 5 pin NON SLIDING site. to me this would help to reign in the archery equipment and lower success some. As I said its already very low compared to rifle and even muzzleloader.

I also feel that the muzzleloader restriction is to much, I feel that removing scopes as your have with rifles would be a fair take for that weapon type.

To me you went too far with your restrictive weapons definitions, I was ok with-it last year as a proposal, but only because I thought it would be used to add and additional hunt rather than completely replacing a hunt especially something as big as a whole general season unit.

One other issue, the proposed archery season is to start the first weekend in September, I feel you should keep the original start date in August as one of the draws to the archery hunt is hunting velvet bucks, if you move the hunt to September the velvet is not as pristine as it is getting ready to be rubbed off.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

This is a very disingenuous proposal, all of the feedback shows that the majority of hunters, and especially muzzleloader hunters do not support this change.

This is not a biological issue, the success rate did not see a significant jump, I see no reason to change the current rules. Hunting with a muzzleloader even one of the new ones is not even remotely close to the same as hunting with a rifle.

The DWR, or the Tech committee never did give a good valid reason that they feel this rule needs to change. I fully reject this proposal and I hope that you on the WB will as well.

KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLOADERS.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I agree with most of this, the only thing I do not like is them automatically adding a year to the program if the hunter draws a LE tag.

I personally had this happen to me as I drew a LE deer tag on the second year of my Dedicated hunters enrollment last year, this allowed me to be extra selective this year as I was able to hunt for a bigger buck this year knowing that if I did not kill one I could extend my dedicated to next year. But in the chance I did find a buck I wanted this year (which I did) I would still be able to use last year (the year I drew LE) as my no kill year. This allows me to now put in for a general hunt next year and either build a point or draw a tag.

Ultimately if you do this you will essentially be taking away a year of eligibility from the people that draw a LE tag while in the system. We all want as many years as possible to hunt, this rule would take a year away from someone depending on how it is implemented.

Everything else looked good.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

It does not say in this video, but in the new rules that passed last year, the people buying a voucher would have access to the entire LOA per the rule. I am wondering if that rule would still be in effect for Option 2 of the LOA rules?

Something to think about.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

I feel the public hunters do not get enough of the tags, should be 20% go to the public.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 6:42 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Really like the program overall

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Why do you always pick on the archery and muzzleloader hunters. They are not nearly as impactful on deer herds as the any weapon hunters. I'd like to propose an any weapon range restriction; no one needs to shoot a deer at 500 plus yards, work on your hunting skills to get closer. If you wanna shoot outrageous distances, go bang a few gongs! To accomplish this I'd have a limit on bullet grain weight and muzzle velocity, both of which would effectively limit the "doable" range for the firearm. 120 grains or less, and less than 2200FPS, should be a good starting point, maybe a little math to get a more scientifically based restriction.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Agree with mandatory reporting. It's been needed for a long time to gain value data. I don't agree with fining people for not getting it done. Finances are tough as it is now days. Don't add money into this equation.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I agree with shortening season dates. However I would like to see it expanded to state wide for the study period. Only doing it in Southern units where the herds are doing better will not give an accurate idea as to if it works or not.

Antler restrictions should be 3 point or better instead of 4. We don't want lots of mature, genetic 3 pts running around spreading their genes.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I very strongly disagree with this proposal. Leave scopes on muzzleloaders. With the very low success increase it just doesn't make any sense to get rid of them. There seems to be a personal agenda to do away with them because some people just don't like them. There are planets of options for those who don't want to use them to not. Such as the new hunts that have been created and HAMS hunts. Please allow those of us who enjoy and chose to hunt with scopes continue to do so. The technology committee needs to go away. The decisions need to be left to the WLB and RAC's for recommendations upon hearing public comment. There are too many special interest groups getting involved with the politics of hunting. Please get back to the basics of managing wildlife. Scopes on muzzleloaders, trail cams, range finding sights, cameras on scopes, etc are not detrimental to the herd populations. It's terrible management that is causing the decline.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?	Somewhat disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	Somewhat agree
Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?	This has needed to be the case for a long time. Take out the animals that are ruining their lands. Not animals that have never touched their land.
Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?	Time to do away with CWMU and conservation permits. Public animals were never meant to be cash cows for private individuals or special interest groups.
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?	No more CWMU's. Please get rid of them.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 11:48 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I support removing Scopes from muzzleloaders

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I think mandatory reporting is a great idea to gather data. I think having a simple number of points, width of antler spread and height of antlers would be a good idea to see what types of animals are being harvested along with a picture of the animal would be a great idea as well.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? I would like to see a few more sights in the central region as well.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am concerned about the 4 points or restriction, as it could lead to some straight 3 point bucks that cannot be harvested which in my opinion is an inferior genetic. I could be wrong, and it may lead to some management hunts as well. Additionally, I do feel that first time hunters should have the option to harvest any buck.

I have concerns about shortened season dates putting pressure on hunter to shoot whatever is available, I personally hunted every day on this past general rifle hunt and the number of hunters out the second weekend was probably only 10-20 percent of what was there the first weekend.

I do like the other restrictions, I might add a restriction on range finders (making them illegal) would really make a huge difference equally across the board..

Additionally, I do feel that first time hunters should have the option to harvest any buck. I wish you would put a 3 point or better restriction for all hunters who have previously had a tag with the exception for youth and first time hunters that would be an any buck on the Manti unit as an additional study unit. This would not reduce opportunity in any way or restrict tags, it would however make it a little more challenging for most hunters while adding more opportunity to see and possibly harvest a buck for those just getting into hunting. As a dedicated hunter on the Manti, I feel this would be a good option for the unit.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Mostly agree, eliminating rangefinders/rangefinding maps... should be looked at as a way to reduce take with all weapon types.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

There are parts of this I agree with, and parts a strongly disagree with. These tags are way to disproportionate in favor of CWMU and LOA. This is a huge issue for me.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

If you want to help Utah big game, eliminate the taking of CWMU deer during November regardless of tags per acre. If the general public doesn't get to hunt during the rut, private landowners and CWMU's shouldn't either.

While we are talking about taking big game, Northern Utah needs to not hunt in Northern Utah. Box Elder, Cache, Weber, Davis, Morgan, Summit, Rich, & Wasatch counties deer numbers are extremely low. The hunting was dismal at best and the herds will not recover if thousands of hunters are pursuing and harvesting what few animals remain.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

My only concern is that by removing scopes completely, you may eliminate older hunters from the hunt completely, due to not seeing as well. I think a better compromise would be to allow 4x scopes without turrets, which would keep shots around the 200 yard range you mentioned in the video.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Please eliminate the ability to buy the hours.
I am in the dedicated hunter program in Morgan/South Rich/East Canyon/Summit, and I would gladly take a refund on my final year and not hunt due to a complete lack of deer.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

If you want to help Utah big game, eliminate the taking of CWMU deer during November regardless of tags per acre. If the general public doesn't get to hunt during the rut, private landowners and CWMU's shouldn't either.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Utah needs to be proactive in implementing restrictions such as those proposed that allow for maximum hunter participation, but limit harvest/improve animal quality and/or quantity. I think the restrictions to be studied are an excellent idea.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Same as above. Restricting muzzleloader to open sights maximizes hunter participation by requiring more primitive hunting styles and is absolutely necessary to provide more opportunity with point creep.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? For an LOA to get landowner tags, the land should be required to be open to the public. If the tags are ONLY for private land, than I am more accepting that the land doesn't have to have public access.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

In regards to the proposal to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders, one of the reasons for disallowing them is that it only increases success rate by 3%. If this is actually the case, that's a ridiculous reason to disallow scopes. Find a better reason! 3% increase in success rate likely has little impact on the deer herds and scopes, in general, make most hunters more accurate. If you want to disallow scopes, then a better reason could simply be that you want to make the muzzy season more of a traditional "primitive" weapons hunt. I am not opposed to changing the rules, but people aren't stupid and citing a possible "3% increase in the success rate by using a scope" is a dumb reason to make this type of change. A better proposal, in my opinion, would be to make the muzzy hunt "primitive" where more traditional (no scopes, #11 percussion cap ignition, full bore bullets, etc.) muzzy's are required and move the season to the first part of November. Admittedly, I have long range muzzleloaders and I have been involved in legal muzzy hunting where deer have been cleanly killed at up to 700 yards, so I've definitely used and witnessed long range scoped muzzleloaders in action. If a change is to be made, I think the season should be much more primitive as I mentioned, where success is more dependent on hunting/stalking skills rather than being able to dial your scope in for a long range shot.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? They need less laws, way too many restrictions. Can hardly even hunt anymore no trail cams, no baiting, etc.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Why make 4 point or bigger units for deer? Utah already has bad enough with new dumb laws, if we need the deer population up, then start handing out less rifle tags and more archery tags. Also use some of that fee money you guys get and use it for deer farms or something, not on super nice DWR trucks.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 7:34 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 7:38 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

I would HATE to see the muzzeloder rules change. There is no reason to take a scope off the gun. More deer are wounded from having open sites without optics.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 7:47 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? There is no reason to change the muzzleloader rules. I do not want scopes to be removed from muzzleloaders!!!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

It is too late to restrict scopes. If you did not want to allow them then you never should have. I already purchased one, spent a lot of money, spent many hours practicing it and it does not have provisions for open sites. This change would force me to purchase a new rifle and spend many hours practicing and working a new load. I would not be able to sell the one I have for much money because nobody could hunt with it. This is hog wash. If you want to restrict those new muzzleloader rifles that use the casing around the load like the Optima Paramount that is a different conversation but don't allow scopes long enough for everyone to buy one and then say oh sorry. I don't care if other states don't allow them, that should of been considered when you allowed them not now. If you want to keep muzzleloading pure don't allow utv/atv's on hunts. They are taking over the hills. Thank you

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 2, 2023 8:44 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Dear Sirs and Madams,

I am writing in response to the proposed restrictions for optics on muzzleloaders. I did watch the video in its entirety, and I have some thoughts and concerns. I have hunted in Utah for over 40 years. I have used muzzleloader rifles throughout that entire period. I own and have used traditional TC rifles (cap and ball) as well as more modern in-line rifles. According to the data presented in the video, adding scopes to muzzleloaders insignificantly increases the harvest ratio, does not increase the wound ratio, does not increase the distance of the hunter taking a comfortable shot and therefore really has no scientific data to show that removing them entirely would have any significant effect except to appease a small fraction of people who are traditionalists or just don't like them or to match what other states are doing.

I would propose leaving the regulations as they are unless:

- 1) The scientific data shows an overwhelming advantage in harvest numbers.
- 2) The data shows an unacceptable increase in the number of wounded animals.
- 3) Biologists need to slow the buck harvest to increase buck-to-doe ratios or to help a specific area herd to recover. Make it a useful tool, like they are doing in our southern regions, not a blanket regulation.

As far as technology is concerned, I think it would be easy to argue that all methods have significantly increased over time, especially in the last 30 years. For example:

- 1) Compound bows have gone from 50-60% let off to 90% enabling longer hold periods.
- 2) Newer materials have shortened bows with higher speeds and less vibration.
- 3) Optics, specifically range finders, have dramatically improved accuracy and range.
- 4) The increase in the speed of compound bows allows greater arrow choices.
- 5) Rifles have also benefited from optic technology.
- 6) Rifle bullet technology has made effective shooting ranges more than double.

I respect that trying to effectively manage the states game animals is a daunting task and there are a lot of voices to be heard. However, I believe taking scopes away from muzzleloaders is the wrong choice and an ineffective rule with no real benefit for the wildlife at this point in time.

Sincerely,
Robert M

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? you said yourself this has been tried with no improvements. why is this being considered again? you can not manage our wildlife based on who is the squeakiest wheel

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? what is the goal with this proposal?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? this proposal seems to contradict itself through out. these things have been tried before or are just a way to avoid the real solution which may be some closures....
just be real with us.
close areas that need it. reduce tags and raise prices...

antler restrictions.. does not work show us where it has shortened seasons will kill more small deer due to urgency to harvest
weapon technology???
no compound bows...who suggested this? why
scopes on muzzleloaders... 3% wont help anything
no scopes on rifles... good luck this would be the only restriction that would help.
The real issue with technology is the long range shooters, but I have no solution to suggest for this except no scopes...

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

292k people hunting and you got info from 582 people and feel like it represents how the general hunting public feels... silly suggestion. make us all take a survey before we apply or purchase any tag... this will give you a much better idea of what we want... scopes on muzzleloaders is not going to make a difference on the herd numbers... why did you not explain the no compound bow recommendation? who suggested this idea? more importantly why are our wants coming before the needs of the wildlife... drought and snow, drop the tag numbers and raise cost...

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

who cares just keep the program

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

stop catering to land owners... they do not own the wildlife

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?

stop giving more permits to private land owners they do not own the wildlife and should not be allowed to monetize hunting which is federally against the law
why were we not allowed to comment on the CWMU recommendations???

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I don't agree with Antler point restrictions, over time it will take all the good genetics out of the herd. You'll then be left with 2 points and 3 points being the dominant gene on those units. I do agree with shortened season dates and continue to cut tags where it's needed. Could we possibly tier the units to accommodate everyone's hunting needs or desires... make some units where the hunter who just wants to hunt or harvest a deer no matter the size could draw every 2-3 years and the other units trophy units where your hunting every 4-6 years, but have a good chance at harvesting a mature buck.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I disagree with taking scopes off muzzleloaders. Let's take a limited entry tag for example... It can take a sportsman 15-25 years to draw a tag which then turns in to a once in a lifetime hunt. Let's give the hunter every opportunity to harvest an animal once they draw a tag.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I think I missed giving feedback on this one when I submitted my previous feedback.

I commend the DWR are trying new things. The deer herd needs to be scientifically studied as to why they are not thriving.

These ideas will do little to nothing to stabilize the population but I do think they will improve hunter satisfaction. I grew up hunting Fish lake as a 3 pt or better unit. That unit was amazing and it was ruined when they removed the APR. in one season they hammered it and it's never been the same.

I would like to see this tried in more units - say 1 per region.

I really like the primitive weapon option for Dutton. Again I feel like this could be done in at least 1 unit per region.

The shorter seasons I'm not as big a fan if. I think people hunt harder when the season is shorter. Might lead to higher success rates.

Thank you for being willing to try new things.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Finally we will have actual data on the number of animals harvested and wounded per unit and weapon type.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I think this is a great idea. I am glad to see the DWR wanting to try some things sportsmen have been asking them to try for years. I would like to see this study expanded and maybe even include central and northern units to compare to the southern unit studies. I would like to see the season date restriction statewide. We are very good at harvesting animals with the technology we have now days. We don't need to be hunting and pressuring the animals as long as we do now.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I would like to see 1x scopes allowed. There is no magnification over open sights and it is easier for some including youth to use a crosshair in a 1x scope over a peep or iron sights. I think if we do go to open sights or peep only we need to look at restricting the new MOA adjustable peep sights example(Gunwerks Revic EXO). These are new the technology for open sight peeps for shooting muzzleloaders long range without a scope. If we are trying to curve the muzzleloader technology these needs to be included into the restrictions.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 3, 2023 12:20 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I am a muzzleloader hunter and fully support the recommendation to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders during muzzy only seasons.

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

I have been an avid hunter for many years, and love spending time in the wild. Over the years, I have been heartbroken with the population of mule deer in the state. Where one use to be able to go out and see many animals, the chances of an encounter are much less. I agree that the state NEEDS to make some changes, or we are going to see our deer population end up like the pheasant population (which as a youth I never would have thought it would be nearly impossible to hunt wild pheasants on public land). I also like the implementation of the new proposals for the southern unit, but feel these changes are needed statewide, not just in the southern part of the state. Why not try these proposed rule changes to the central and northern units?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

First, I do not support having different rules for different areas. It is already way too confusing and this will make it exponentially worse. Many people are not following the rules now and most of the time it is not intentional, the rules are just too complicated. Also, some of these recommendations are needed on all units and some should not be implemented on any unit. It is not logical to wait until 2029 to implement statewide.

I support 4-point or better on all deer units in Utah with an exception for youth 12-16 years old that should be able to harvest any size buck. This does multiple things including: increases number of mature deer, doesn't deprive youth of being able to have reasonable success and continue hunting in the future, and provides a way to cull out those deer with bad genetics that may never be a 4-point.

I absolutely do not support the shorter season proposals for any unit. Hunting is my passion and I cherish every day spent in the field. Your own data shows that shorter seasons do not significantly impact totals days hunted or harvest. It only increases hunter crowding and takes away from time in the field of those that are passionate. Please do not shorten seasons.

The weapon restriction proposals are ridiculous. We may as well go back to using spears and atlatls. These restrictions will significantly reduce hunter satisfaction, instantly make peoples equipment obsolete and force them to make significant expenditures to purchase new equipment, and result in much less ethical shots being taken and more wounded game. It simply is impossible to hunt more ethically with a long bow, re-curve, or non-inline muzzel loader when compared to modern technology.

Also, please divide the Manti unit into a north and south unit split on the most logical boundary of Highway 31. The unit is simply too big to manage as one unit. Populations and trends are not the same across that large of a unit and there is no way to control hunter crowding. Please consider this comment even though it is mostly unrelated to the current proposal.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I do not support this recommendation at all. I fully believe this will result in less ethical shots being taken and much more wounded and unrecovered game.

People do not shoot more than 200 yards generally with a muzzleloader because of the gun, not because of the optics. Muzzleloaders have no doubt improved, but are still far from being on par with a modern rifle. The fact that they are single shot, the diameter of projectile, worse accuracy, pain to clean and tune, etc. all lead to them being significantly different and less efficient than modern rifles.

Many of us need scopes due to our eyesight. I would hardly call most people with vision problems impaired since it impacts almost every single person as they age. It is very difficult to focus on open sights as you age as well as seeing clearly at all ranges. I don't think the visual impairment is meant to mean just older people. Seems very hard to enforce.

Will the RACS, Wildlife Board, or Division be buying back our now obsolete equipment? I worked very hard to obtain my equipment and will not be able to afford to replace it to meet the new restrictions. My muzzleloader didn't come with open sights or even drilled for open sights. It will place a very unfair burden to retrofit or replace equipment and result in expensive equipment with no reasonable market to get our hard earned money back.

Please do not implement this proposal.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 8:02 am

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 8:25 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Another point to keep 1 power scope instead of open sights is if I want open sights there's already a hunt for that. The hams hunt.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 4, 2023 9:33 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? You already have HAMS weapon limitations. If the goal is going retro then just make more HAMS hunts available. No reason to punish people who have taken advantage of currently legal technology's.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? This is great and long overdue.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I love all of these proposals. Once it is determined which ones are successful (e.g. more mature bucks are on the landscape), I hope we expand the program to other regions in the state. Ideally, I'd love to see every region have units with different rules on them so there are options for all preferences.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The visual impairment CORs for scopes needs to be limited to 1x magnification only.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I'm okay with shorter seasons and antlers if 3 point or better but against weapon restrictions do t make a problem out of nothing. Leave weapons the way they are.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Don't make problems out of nothing. Leave compound bows alone. The archery hunt will never have the the success rates of rifle or muzzleloader. Don't do that let me hunt the way I want to. You should get rid of the technology committee instead. Let us hunt with in-line muzzleloaders and scopes on rifles.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

The reduced hunting season dates and antler restriction will negatively impact hunting for my family. We hunt as a family with most of our focus on helping the youth and younger kids have a fun successful hunt. Limiting the dates of hunts forces us to choose between hunting or sending the kids to school. We currently hunt the weekends and any other days that the kids have off of school such as fall break or during the archery season when school hasn't started yet. Changing to a later archery season and limiting the rifle hunt to one weekend takes this away from the youth. The antler point restriction will also take away many chances that youth in my family have had to harvest as it makes it more difficult to get them into position to harvest a larger more difficult buck. Many times the youth hunters in our group are accompanied by younger siblings that are just getting exposed to hiking, camping, spotting deer, etc and they would be discouraged if they never see a successful harvest or are not invited due to them making too much noise or not being capable of hiking longer distances to get into position to harvest a larger buck. Our favorite part of hunting is spending time with family in the mountains and enjoying camping. These proposals make it feel like only outfitters or professional people will be successful and will cause the simple family to be unsuccessful and stop hunting.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 5, 2023 1:41 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? We want scopes on our muzzleloaders. Hunters have spent thousands of dollars on the available high tech optics and now we can't use them and now you want to take away scopes all together? Madness!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I strongly agree with trying something new.

I have read up on the pros and cons of APR. it just doesn't seem like there's never a balance to make this program work. We do have the tools to balance APR out. Maybe!

My proposal is to let the youth hunters harvest two point or better, we're only talking 20% of the permits that they get anyways.

I feel like this would be more of a balance, and APR would work a lot better by doing it this way.

Thanks for all you do.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I strongly agree with removing scopes off of muzzleloaders.

But in turn, I would like to see the general season muzzleloader elk hunt moved to the general season, muzzleloader deer hunt. I feel like muzzleloader should be before the rifle hunt.

This would be a good compromise for removing scopes off of muzzleloaders, and I feel like that's where the muzzleloader hunt should be.

Then we have the first season rifle hunt for seven days, Then we have the second season GS rifle elk hunt. Then the GS rifle deer hunt.

That means no hunts in November on GS other than the late season Muzzleloader hunt.

Thank you

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? We have needed this for a long time!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? After watching the video and seeing the data, I don't feel that there is any need to remove scopes from Muzzleloaders. The muzzleloader tags come out of the same allotment as the Any Legal Weapon tags, I prefer to hunt the later dates on the Elk, even though the dates are after the majority of the hunts have taken place and the animals have been pressured. I don't feel that the 2.6% increase in harvest warrants removing scopes. I would venture to guess that the 2.6% increase is from less animals wounded and not recovered, so those animals are now recovered animals. I read through the majority of the comments/feedback that has been received that has been posted on the DWR site and it seems to me that the "Majority" strongly or somewhat disagree with the proposal, that should be taken into consideration as well. I still don't know why with the "Technology" that is available you can't send out the survey to all licensed hunters and have all the data compiled rather than just a "Sample" taken. Based on the presentation out of 291,500 tag holders (over the past 7 years, only 2489 people got to participate in the survey, if you are going to do a "Survey" make sure that every stakeholder has the opportunity to respond!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 6, 2023 4:00 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am writing mostly about scopes on muzzleloaders. There is only a 2.6% increase in hunter harvest with using scopes versus not using scopes and I suspect that there is less wounding loss when using scopes. I can't see a biological reason to disallow the use of scopes on muzzleloaders. Voting to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders won't increase our big game herds at all.

I am over 70 years old, and it is almost impossible to focus both the front sight and the rear sight on a muzzleloader for me and most people near my age. A scope really helps me make a better and more ethical shot on an animal, especially in low-light conditions. We hunt spike elk with muzzleloaders and it is hard to keep track of a legal spike and a spike with extra points that isn't legal when both are moving around in a herd and changing places. A scope really helps.

I was at the Wildlife Board meeting clear back when they had the two-board system when they made the 1 power scope rule for muzzleloaders. There was an older gentleman by the name of Jerry Mason on the Board who really liked to hunt with a muzzleloader, but he couldn't see very well so he wanted to be able to use a scope. He didn't think that he had enough support for a law to be able to use scopes so he made a motion to use 1 power scopes and it passed. He didn't realize that a 1 power scope makes things look farther away than they really are, and the crosshairs are so thick that they almost cover up a whole target at a hundred yards and it was really hard to even sight one in. This is why hunters pushed to be able to use regular rifle scopes.

I don't like the idea of people shooting animals with muzzleloaders at the yardage they claim. The trouble is that you can't legislate common sense, morals, or ethics. I never shoot at anything over 200 yards and almost never over a hundred yards. I don't have one of those new long-range muzzleloaders and don't plan on buying one. Basically, most muzzleloader bullets have very poor trajectory so the only way that you can hit anything at the ranges they claim is to have a scope with a lot of magnification that you can dial up for yardage. If you shoot a scope that doesn't have an adjustment for yardage, you are just guessing where you hold your crosshairs when you shoot. At the ranges, some of them claim to shoot a muzzleloader that would drop between 10 and 15 feet. That would be really hard to guess the holdover with a fixed low-power scope.

I would hate to see you vote to disallow scopes on muzzleloaders but if you think that you want to make a change, I suggest that you change the rule to say "Only fixed 4 power scopes or less are allowed on muzzleloaders". That would really cut out all this really long-range shooting but would still allow a decent short-range rifle that more follows the spirit of muzzleloader hunting. Scopes have been used on muzzleloaders clear back in the Flintlock days. People of my age have plenty of issues with hunting as they get older but please don't make it harder than it already is for us.

I was the southern region RAC chairman for several years before I was appointed to the Utah Wildlife Board. I have been active in all kinds of wildlife conservation groups for over 50 years. Every year sportsmen were complaining about low buck numbers. Throughout all these years I have been around when the legislature passed buck-only hunting when we have gone through antler point restrictions, shortened seasons, cutting permit numbers and all kinds of measuring ideas like bucks per 100 does and age classes and the list goes on. All the while our deer herds just keep dwindling and as part of it we just keep seeing fewer bucks and for sure older bucks.

Basically, for the last 50 years we have had our focus in the wrong place, we have been worrying about bucks because we like to hunt them. The real thing that we should have been focusing on is fawn rates instead of bucks. For a deer herd just to maintain we need about 65 per hundred does postseason. In the past some deer units would have over 100 fawns per hundred does postseason. Now we have units with less than 40 fawns per hundred does postseason. If we want bucks they have to be born and allowed to survive to maturity and be able and reproduce. Large mature bucks are always a small portion of a deer herd so when you have low herd numbers you can't expect to have many large bucks whether we hunt them or not.

Now we are under 90,000 deer hunters hunting buck only and the deer are declining. In the banner years in the 60's and 70's, we had almost 3 times that many hunters and we were hunting either sex, and we still had a lot of deer. I don't agree with all this modern technology and don't want to make light of it, but the answer to having more and larger bucks to hunt is fawn survival. All these hunt-change strategies that have been tried over the years to create better buck hunting have failed. Sportsmen have been complaining and bickering forth with each other and the DWR for years and have accomplished really very little. We are so far below any reasonable threshold on some of our deer units that it would take almost some major intervention to ever bring them back. If we do ever get the deer herd back to some reasonable level there will be enough good bucks for all of us to share without all these changes.

I have been where you are sitting now, and I really appreciate all the time and commitment that you have for Utah's wildlife.

Paul Niemeyer

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? What yhe DNR should do is close the hunting seasons on all big game for 4 years and still implement the points system and alots of the other things except for the changes to the weapons

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? What yhe DNR should do is close the hunting seasons on all big game for 4 years and still implement the points system and alots of the other things except for the changes to the weapons

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? What yhe DNR should do is close the hunting seasons on all big game for 4 years and still implement the points system and alots of the other things except for the changes to the weapons

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? If one of these experiments were conducted on my preferred hunting unit I would be on fire about this. As is this will likely push folks from the experimental units into my preferred hunting unit. Why are we trying to get so cute with social experiments in our wildlife management. Does this really solve anything? Do we expect this to help our deer herd? That is not the way I understood the presentation. Are you just crossing your fingers hoping that public opinion will be bright and shiny after this experiment?

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I don't have any concern about pushing toward a more primitive model with the muzzleloader, however there are many models sold today that do not have open sights installed or an easy way to install open sights. Allowing a 1x scope would help limit effectiveness while not requiring those that have purchased this equipment to have to make a full equipment change. I would ask that you move back to the previous rule rather than eliminating scopes altogether.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 7, 2023 4:01 pm

Which best describes your position Somewhat disagree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

To the Utah Wildlife Board,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many area's and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.

They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen
967 West Fremont Ave
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104
ID # 6489548

**Which best describes your position
regarding the technology
recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

To the Utah Wildlife Board,

My name is Scott B. Christensen. I have hunted in Utah all but one year of my eligible life. I started hunting at 14 and I'm 60 now. I just learned of several changes that will be discussed in your next RAC meeting. Many of which I disagree with.

First I would like to say I recognize there are problems with our Deer population. This year has been miserable for the rifle deer hunt. Two days of hunting and I saw three deer. A doe and her 2 yearlings. I hunted many areas and covered many miles. I also sat down with DWR officers that were stationed near Scipio. At the time I sat down with them they hadn't had anyone stop in and only one person call them. Last winter was terrible and the area must have had severe winter kill. Lets just say I won't be applying for a tag in that area for some time.

I'm also worried about CWD and welcome testing so long as it leads to ways of controlling it or eliminating it. Testing to just track it or to just say we know it's there is worthless and a waste of the money I contribute to DWR. I further recommend more information to the public about eating animals that test positive for it. IE: Its safety and possible harms it may pose. I think it needs to be shared on more media than your website.

Now to the proposed changes.

Muzzleloader - Only open sites.

Scopes help hunters make better and more humane shots/kills. With open sites you'll have more people making poor shots that could lead to more wounded animals and less ethical hunting. Scopes also help hunters make better identification of species and sex. Scopes do not change the effectiveness of the muzzleloader itself, it's killing capabilities, or it's range.

Sometimes when I hunt CWMU's I like to use a muzzleloader for the challenge and skill it provides. After all I get only one shot 99% of the time before it scampers off.

Muzzleloader - Inline Muzzleloader (Using 209 primers) restriction from Muzzleloader season

I'm stymied about the need to break this grouping up. A muzzleloader is a muzzleloader. Inline with a 209 primer doesn't increase the distance my muzzleloader shots. I still must load it from the muzzle. I still usually only get one shot per animal. Having a primer cap where someone can see it doesn't help, improve, or change the effectiveness of a muzzleloader. Both shoot primer sparks into the powder charge forcing one round ball, maxi ball or sabot out the end of the barrel. Forcing all inline or 209 primer muzzleloader people into the regular rifle hunt puts them at a disadvantage to modern-day rifle hunters. They aren't even the same class of hunting styles.

Concerning both of these above issues I'm asking you to oppose them.

They are counter productive and appear to be more to hassle certain hunters rather than keep things fair among hunters.

Concerning the memorandum about 2024 CWMU and LOA permit recommendations. There is a chart showing the number of private and public tags. Above it, the paragraph above says it shows the recommended tag numbers of, "...bucks, bulls and turkeys." However the chart doesn't show turkey tag numbers. I don't know if this is an oversight error or purposeful omission. I would like to have known the numbers.

I should also note that my wife, daughter and son all have licenses and agree with my thoughts on this matter. We love hunting in Utah and want changes to make sense and not be used to discriminate or as a political tool, such as the muzzleloader changes appear to be.

Happy hunting

Scott Christensen
967 West Fremont Ave
Salt Lake City, Utah 84104
ID # 6489548

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Love it

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Up for anything to help the herds grow and recover

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Great idea in my opinion, I have been waiting for this

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I love the idea of traditional weapons. I have hunted with a long bow, traditional muzzleloader and a 44 mag for the last few years and have been begging for something like this, thank you thank you!
I also love pulling scopes off muzzleloaders for the general muzzleloader hunt. I have always loved the muzzleloader hunt for elk and deer, but was definatly ruined with scopes and technoligy. I think it would be a great idea to limit rifles as well. limit scopes to 9 power and dont allow any tyme of bolt on or squeeze attachment for a rest.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

CWMUs are great for wealthy hunters and large land owners, I think the idea of a CWMU is awesome, however the millions of tax dollars spent on managing wildlife seems wrong to allow large land owners profit off an animal owned, managed, and founded by the state. the trade off for the amount of tags for the public needs to be much higher. Also would be nice to not allow special long seasons for CWMUs, if the hunts overlapped with the general season hunts it would help disperse the hunting pressure

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? It's long over due. Every hunt should be reported on so that there's accurate data. There should be an app that gathers all the data upon harvest. Kind of like an electronic tag but you use the app at the kill site. It would have location, date, size, etc.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I've wanted a 3 point restriction for adults for years and an any deer for youth. I think that would help a ton.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? If there's only a 3% difference, than why does it matter? Let's keep scopes that allow for more ethical kills. There may only be a 3% difference in harvest rates but I bet the wounding rate is much higher with open sights, people probably don't report it. I don't think utah needs to match other states.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

Good work trying some new tactics and listening to the hunter is appreciated, even though its hard to make everyone happy. There will always be that misguided group that will shoot anything with an antler. I personally like to chase mature bucks. If antler point restriction is implemented it seems like a good move to go with 3 point or better. 4 point or better would leave more 3 points in the gene pool to pass on that gene. When I hunt deer, if I cant find the size of buck I'm looking for, ill switch over to management the last several days like spike x2, 2x3 (that looks to be older than 2yrs) or 3x3.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

So if you don't start the general archery deer hunt until September on the Beaver wont that put a lot of hunters in the field during the limited entry elk hunt. Hunters wait along time for that hunt it would be a shame to add that many more people in the field at the same time unless you finely do what all other western states do and move the archery elk to latter in September. Oh and change the limited entry to a 80 / 20 split so the point creep will go down faster. Its not fair to hunters that have put in for so long really its almost twenty years to draw a archery elk tag in a good unit.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 1:32 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I'm in favor of the strategies proposed. I grew up in St George and have hunted the Pine Valley unit my whole life. I like the idea of antler point restrictions for the unit, but I do have a concern. Pine valley already has a large portion of the tags going to hunters with "lifetime licenses." I worry that more and more lifetime license holders will want to hunt the unit in the future if the antler restrictions work. So I think it only fair that there be a five year average CAP ON THE NUMBER OF TAGS THAT CAN BE ALLOTTED TO LIFETIME LICENSE HOLDERS FOR THE PINE VALLY UNIT! Otherwise I worry that there will be little to no chance for regular hunters to get a Pine Valley tag. Thank you, -Roy Staheli

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? What do deer hunters want? I doubt that very many want the division to limit rifles to no scopes. I'm a Utah hunter ed instructor. I get to be able to spend time with new/young hunters as they learn hunter safety. As I watch them do their live fire exercises, those who use scopes are typically much more accurate on their target (shooting .22 @ 50' or closer). Those using iron sights most often struggle to hit the target. If the division is moving toward restricting scopes in general deer units, I think this will have a negative effect on the young and beginner hunters that we are trying to retain.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

My 17-year-old daughter has only harvested 3 buck deer. They have all been with a muzzleloader. It does have a scope. All of her harvests have been shot at less than 150 yds. The outlawing of scopes on muzzle loaders WILL affect the young/new hunters more than anyone else. I'm a Utah Hunter Ed Instructor. I get to be able to spend time with new/young hunters as they learn hunter safety. As I watch them do their live fire exercises; those who use scopes are typically much more accurate on their target (shooting .22 @ 50' or closer). Those using iron sights most often struggle to even hit the target. I have hunted with muzzle loader since 1990. The use of scopes has made me a more ethical hunter. I have much better shot placement. Though my muzzle loader is probably capable of shooting accurately more than 200 yds. All the deer I have shot with a muzzle loader have been less than 200 yds. I would not be comfortable mentoring my buck tag to a youth if they were required to shoot without the aid of a scope.

Per the divisions harvest survey:

- Muzzle loader success rates have only gone up 2.6%
- Only non-muzzle loader hunters support open sights for muzzleloaders.
- Both ML+ (60% vs 28%) and ML (56% vs 29%) hunters OPPOSE open sights on ML.
- Most Muzzle loader hunters are only comfortable shooting less than 200 yds with a scope.

This recommendation does not Preserve hunting traditions into the future - It will push many young hunters away from muzzle loader hunting. I do not believe it helps managers meet the objectives outlined in the species management plans. And it does very little to increase opportunities for hunters.

Please don't pass a recommendation that is opposed by most hunters, makes it even tougher for the youth, and that doesn't even satisfy the committee's 3 purposes.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Scopes and optics greater than 1x have only been allowed for a handful of years, it has only been the last couple years that the success has changed due to increased hunters and smokeless powder muzzleloaders with long distance capabilities. This should be the conversation not the optics, in most cases the optics allow for a cleaner more accurate shot. A peep sight or pin covers an entire clean kill zone on a deer past about 70-80 yds, how do you make a clear/clean shot at that point? It is the same with archery equipment, optics and technology are not the problem. It is education and creating a defined rule in the proclamation that states clear definitions of what a muzzleloader is ... twist rates, bullet weights, smokeless or black powder substitutes, loaded from muzzle and not cartridge style, etc. Going to an inline muzzle loader changed my odds with a scope or with open sights, they are more effective and accurate period, my old Hawken was good to about 50 yards. Is this what we are trying to create, a traditional hunt? My last biggest complaint is... why is the DWR having RAC meetings and asking for public input on a subject when all the ML elk hunters are still in the field? This is completely illogical, if they truly want the ML guys input this will be a long drawn out conversation, not a bang it out in a couple months process. This kind of major change needs to be hashed from all sides across multiple meetings. I live in Tooele and the nearest RAC to me is Springville, 200-300 mile round trip to attend an hour after I get off work? Why don't the RAC meetings move around? Seems to me you all are getting the same input every month from the same crowd, Is this the "general public" or is this "isolated general public" that you would like to hear from? Is a 3% success rate change worth the amount of non-recovered animals that may lay again, because that's probably why the success jumped, they tagged them instead of lost them.

I live and have hunted in Utah my whole life, I recently purchased a new CVA that does not even have open sight options, it is a smooth bore muzzle loader. I am quarter sized accurate at 100 yds, with my 240 gr sabot, my Hawken is torso sized accurate at 50 yds with 280 gr buffalo slug. The education is when to take the shot and when not to take the shot, knowing your weapon, and most of all the ethics of the shot. Removing optics does not fix any of the these problems/issues.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 8, 2023 8:48 pm

Which best describes your position Neither agree nor disagree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

In 2002 we sold 72,900 permits, in 2022 we sold 73,075 permits. We are NOT selling less permits.
The four point or better would work great for the first few years, but then it worries me severely. The Book Cliffs and the Monroe had a three point or better restriction for years. Now out of our LE units they have the worst genetics in the state (willow horn, crab claw and deer that never get more than 2 points) maybe four point or bigger would help with that but I'm not so sure.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

In this economy I'd really rather not be forced to buy another muzzleloader just because what was once legal, now is not. I've always disliked in-line muzzleloaders. But after becoming a dedicated hunter, I bought one. But now you're potentially forcing me to buy another one due to the fact my current one can't except open sights. Why not outlaw inlines altogether? That is something I know alot of people would get behind.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

This is a great idea. No more wasting more expensive gas, driving 2 hours just hand over a piece of paper.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I like some of the proposed points. I think limiting the scopes power in a muzzleloader would old be beneficial. I don't not think we should remove them all together as I feel that will only result in more wounded animals. I also think when it comes to archery they should allow compound bows on all archery hunts. I also would vote in favor of keeping a muzzleloader only hunt. If the deer population still struggles I would like to look at going back to 1 rifle hunt, or limit the number of tags we issue. I know we all want to hunt but it more important to keep a healthy heard size then to hunt every year or two.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I think it would be a good idea to limit the scopes on MUZZLELOADERS. I don't feel like removing them all together is a good idea. As I fear that will result in more wounded animals

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I would propose a compromise on the muzzleloader sights. The board approved the change to magnification for the 2016 hunting seasons. How much money has the public spent to change or upgrade their equipment since then? Now, everyone who upgraded (the majority) will have to change their equipment back. This will cost people more money they don't have in an already strained economy. Some of the new muzzleloaders purchased in the last 7 years are not equipped for open sights, requiring gunsmith work. This is all for a marginal increase of success. I do agree the technology growth boom in hunting has to stop, however it would be wise not swing the pendulum to far the other way.

Suggested compromises:

- 1. Allow 3x9 scopes. Most muzzleloader scopes are 3x9 and this would likely have the least impact on the majority of the hunters. This also would still limit range and technology increase. I don't think the small increase in success rates on bucks and bulls will impact overall numbers.
- 2. Allow 4X power scopes.
- 3. Go back to the original 1x scope rule.

Thank you.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 9, 2023 9:36 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am 72 and my eyes will no longer accomodate to allow effective use of open or peep sights. If this rule is put into effect it will certainly end my muzzle loader hunting. I don't view as primitive ultra inline weapons which can be quickly reloaded and are capable of taking animals at 800 yards using 50 moa ballistic turret scopes and streamlined 300 gr bullets at 2300 feet per second and higher muzzle velocities. Maybe a good compromise would be to allow maximum 6 or 8 power scopes without ballistic turrets in the muzzle loader hunts so folks like me can continue to muzzleload and to restrict the mega loaders with super scopes to the any weapons hunts where they belong.

David Collins, Monroe, Utah

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I QUIT the muzzleloader deer hunt last night after 30 years, and all other general big game seasons, (Plus I'm taking my son with me.) I brought to the meeting 30 years of muzzleloader hunting experience and gave my personal insight on my personal use of iron sights, red dots, 1x scopes and explained that sight picture on the those devices left much to be desired by being so coarse in the sight picture as to obscure most of the animal and how that lead to less than clean one shot kills on the deer when I was forced to use them, and how the variable power scope has lead to clean, ethical kills. The RAC members agreed and Ryan, a RAC member, would make the "heart" sign with his hands and nod in approval to my comments and other comments about the virtues of the use of scopes. Comments were made by the Blair Stringham that scopes didn't really affect the deer biologically and this was a "social Issue", I'm not willing to hunt by an unscientific, arbitrary rules enacted by narcissists feeding their ego. In the end, Ryan sold us out and he seconded the motion to do away with scopes along an 8-3 vote. This marks a disturbing trend of the DWR not following the science, but governing by what's popular on the Monster Muley forum board. Deer don't care how they were killed, they don't care if they were killed in an approved manner that someone thought was more virtuous than another. The biology of the heard just has to cope with one less deer, no matter the cause of death. I guess if you're comfortable with hunters shooting multiple deer that run off and they can't find, go ahead and make iron sights the only option. Talk was also put forward about "wonder weapons", muzzle loaders that shoot out to 700 yards, these are expensive (\$5,000) and require special bullets machined to the gun (\$20 /ea). They are not in common use and out of the financial reach of most hunters. The DWR should not ruin the hunt with "common" muzzloaders for trying to deal with the "few". Years ago, it was explained to me by the DWR when I asked about the reason the muzzleloader season and archery season existed, I was told that those seasons, "Are there to take the pressure off of the general deer hunt." The Muzzleloader season simply isn't for Live Action Role Play (LARPer) who want to run around the woods thinking they are Daniel Boone, or those who want a primitive season in every sense of the word. In closing If the measure is approved, I QUIT. I would hope that science and rationality will prevail over ego and narcissism . I am able to hunt wherever I want and I will go where I'm treated best. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I love that the division is willing to try this out. I think we will regret it if we don't accept this study and take this chance to get the hard data of how these restrictions affect wildlife and hunters. If we don't like the affects then we can not use them, if we do then great. Again I strongly support this.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I strongly support this. The lines between the muzzleloader hunt and the rifle hunts are blurred because muzzleloaders have advanced so far. They will only continue to advance and I think we need to draw the line in the sand.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I strongly support this proposal. I am grateful that the division is willing to test these restrictions to see what affect they have. If after the four years we dont like the results then we can discontinue them. I think will we regret it if we don't take this chance to gather hard data from this study.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I strongly support this. As a young hunter I think this will return the muzzleloader hunt to what it is intended to be. The lines between the muzzleloader and rifle hunts have been blurred and will only worsen as muzzleloaders continue to advance.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I wholeheartedly endorse this plan. It's commendable that the division is open to testing these restrictions. The four-year trial period allows for a thoughtful evaluation, and if the outcomes aren't favorable, we can reconsider. This opportunity to collect valuable data shouldn't be missed.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I wholeheartedly endorse this move. Removing scopes from muzzleloaders in Utah aligns with the true essence of muzzleloader hunting. The distinction between muzzleloader and rifle hunts has become blurred, and this action is essential to preserve the authenticity of muzzleloader hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Count me in for supporting this proposal. It's reassuring that the division is exploring these restrictions, and the option to reassess after four years adds a layer of flexibility. Seizing this chance to gather concrete data from the study is crucial, and we might regret not taking this step.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I offer my strong support for this proposal. Eliminating scopes from muzzleloaders in Utah reverts to the authentic essence of muzzleloader hunting. The current blurring of lines between muzzleloader and rifle hunts necessitates this action to uphold the intended experience of muzzleloader hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I express my strong support for this proposal. It's commendable that the division is willing to test these restrictions, and the four-year timeframe for evaluation is a sensible approach. The ability to reevaluate and discontinue if results are unsatisfactory shows a thoughtful consideration. Taking advantage of this opportunity to gather solid data is crucial.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I'm fully behind the decision to remove scopes from muzzleloaders. This step is essential to bring the muzzleloader hunt back to its intended form. As muzzleloader technology advances, the distinction between muzzleloader and rifle hunts has become muddled, and this change is vital for preserving the unique character of muzzleloader hunting.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 2:20 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I strongly agree this. I especially like the restricted weapons restrictions. I think there should be more general season opportunities for guys that are willing to pick up primitive weapons for the chance to hunt more often or for more mature animals.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I strongly agree. The muzzleloader hunt had just become the early rifle hunt. There needs to be more of a distinction between the two. Even if success rates are not higher now they eventually will be as more people buy long range muzzleloaders

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I strongly support this proposal! We need better data on the who, what, when, and where of general season hunting. I would just say that this survey needs to get specific. Don't just ask what type of weapon they used, get into whether a compound or traditional bow was used, for example. Ask if the hunter wounded an animal and couldn't recover it. Ask how many days the hunter was out hunting. Getting good detail like that will help you make better decisions in the future!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I'm glad the state is experimenting a bit to gather more data into the most effective hunting strategies, so I'm in favor of the experiment. We just need to remember that all of this could go up in smoke if water sources run dry. Please continue using money to restore habitat and water sources!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I get that the dwr is trying to implement ways to bring the buck to does ratio up. The real solution would be to just cut tags numbers in these units. I believe they should look into cutting tags for the whole state. I get the dwr needs there revenue but cut tags and charge more money for the tags. That would be the real solution! Its time to start looking at the real solutions here and not just try to make people happy. Myself as a hunter would rather not draw a tag every year but in 2 or 3 years and have a chance at better bucks. There are all kinds of factors in these seem to be hurting deer populations. continuous drought years, highway collusions, tough winters, developments in winter range habitat, etc. We can stop some of these things from happening but we can cut tag numbers for you know say 4 years and then look into these units and see if buck numbers have increased. This is a more simple solution than anything the dwr is proposing. The weapons restrictions proposal to me is not a good thing. Your going to have more wounded deer out there than not. I get where does the line get drawn but you cannot stop technology from happening. The more simple fix for everyone would to just be cut tags!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I would like to see questions asked in the mandatory required survey to include questions that the answers to could help the division manage future decisions. Such as: If you knew ahead of time that drawing an archery tag in this unit (i.e. Box Elder) you would NOT be allowed to hunt the Extended Wasatch archery hunt?

Why am I suggesting this? Some people enjoy hunting specific units and others are applying just because their odds are better to draw so they can just hunt the Wasatch Extended. Their applications are keeping those who really desire to hunt these "under subscribed units" from drawing and enjoying their hunt. I feel there needs to either be designated units that if drawn in the archery draw are exempt from hunting the Wasatch Extended OR Make the Wasatch Extended hunt it's own draw OR Make the Wasatch Extended an over the counter hunt purchase regardless if you drew an archery tag or not. The OTC Wasatch tag would only be purchasable by unsuccessful Archery draw people.

Other questions should be asked specific to what the division might be considering for future changes. As a sportsman I would not be annoyed and would be honest in my answers if I knew the division was going to use my answers to better the enjoyment of my hunting experience. As of right now, I'm very guarded with my answers to some of the questions in order not to negatively effect my chances at drawing a tag in the future. (i.e., did you wound an animal during your archery hunt?)...even If I did, I'm not going to disclose that for fear that my chances of even having an archery hunt in the future might be cancelled.

I also think any future surveys should be directed to 100% of those people who received a big game permit and not just a random sample. We have the means today to be able to do that, let's utilize the technology.

As for the 30 day mandatory reporting date....I don't totally agree with that time line. I'd like to see that reporting date begin during the season being reported, (If I shoot an animal on the first day of the season, I should be able to report that immediately), and extend my reporting time even up to and including the end of January, when most all the big game hunts have ended.

Thank you guys for allowing me to input my dumb ideas and give comments.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?

After hearing all the negative things about re-locating deer, it would have been nice to hear why relocating antelope is so successful. What's the difference in the two animals that allows one species to survive and another not to?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

While I support the need for changes and I hate that we have to wait to make some of them, this is not the time to be playing around with these ideas. The Mule deer committee is about to meet...let them entertain these ideas. I do appreciate the division for discussing it and coming up with this idea.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I'm an older guy (74) and hunted with my muzz during the general rifle season before Utah even had a muzz season. I had no problem back then filling my tag with open sights, real loose black powder and a number 11 cap stuck on my side lock rifle. All the while watching some 200,000 hunters scattered across every ridge in the state. My shots were taken down in the bottom of the draws all those hunters were watching from 300 yards above. I hunted with my muzz during every trial the state put us through, specific units to hunt were a real pain as I didn't know the areas and had no real way of studying them at the time. Finally the state made a state wide hunt using the muzz. Life was good in my opinion. I watched as some of my friends started to change their guns to accept 209 primers to up their odds of the powder charge igniting. I watched them switch to synthetic powders with varying results, I watched them attach red dot scopes and one power optics to their guns, again with varying results. Still I stuck with my open sights and enjoyed the primitive nature of the hunt. Getting to within a hundred yards of an unsuspecting animal was and still is easy. You just have to have the mind set to get that done. And then in about 2015 the discussion about optics on muzz rifles changed it all. When it was allowed to have variable power scopes on muzz guns I through my hands in the air and said "THIS IS BULL CRAP"! I put my cap gun away and grabbed a recurve bow and took up archery. I went back to a primitive hunt and since have killed two bucks using that bow. It's a little harder to get to 20 yards but it's still possible. I'm up to the challenge.

As for this proposal, I have to say the definition of a muzzleloader is a gun that is loaded from the muzzle, powder first. It doesn't matter if it was designed in 1800 or 2023, if it loads that way, it's a "muzzle loader". As for the definition of a muzzleloader hunt...now this is different. In my humble opinion, Utah needs two separate and distinct hunts. Ones in which every participant is carrying weapons that they are comfortable hunting with. Those with optics and those without. Those with exposed ignition systems and those without. Those with loose powder and those without. Those with 209 primers or electronic ignition systems and those with #10 or #11 caps or better yet, flints, fuses or any other wild and crazy ways to get the powder to ignite inside the barrel. I would love to be out hunting and know that everyone else I see hunting are using the same style of rifle I am. Ethics? give me a break! There isn't a hunter I know that won't take that long shot and I loved when I read that it's mandatory you go check for blood after you have shot. But I have yet to watch that guy leave his rock on the side of the hill and walk down the hill, across the bottom and up the other side where the animal was standing before it ran off, and I have yet to see that same guy be ticketed for not doing it. Yes, give us old timers who like to give the animals a sporting chance our own special season.

Back in the day, we hunted during the rut, but the way things are set up now with the different units that would not work for a special Primitive weapon hunt. Only those units where the deer are migrating through to winter range or where the winter range is actually located would work for

those type of hunts. Think about that when you are setting up our primitive weapons late season dates and areas.

Thanks for trying to get scopes off of muzzleloaders, but it's too late when you have more than 50% of the hunters with muzz guns already invested in high dollar guns and optics. All you can do now is create hunts that utilize those types of weapons. If I was a conservation officer, I'd opt to patrol the guys with no magnification guns than I would the ridge runners with the \$5,000 guns. These are two different types of mentalities on the mountain.

Thanks for entertaining my thoughts and best of luck making the right decisions for us Utah Sportsmen. Wynn Zundel, 801 599 7147

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 9:55 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I would be all for removing scopes from muzzleloaders if you buy back at cost the scope I currently have. I don't have a ton of extra money to remove a scope from a hunting weapon and set it on a shelf to never be used again. I bought my muzzleloader and scope as a unit to hunt with. If you are concerned about harvest numbers, reduce the amount of tags issued despite that meaning less revenue for the organization.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 10:27 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? this is the best private land program for hunting and public in the entire country.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 10:28 am

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 10:32 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? I think the Double cone CWMU seems to have a great track record with the program and they should not be a split recommendation. seems like some info on land size was not right. not their fault.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 10:34 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? We got to hunt on a CWMU this year and loved it. my dad is 81 and this was his funnest hunt we have had. Thanks to private land owners.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 10:37 am

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Sound like Double Cone are good CWMU. Sounds like there was error that created issues.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 11:05 am

Which best describes your position Somewhat disagree
regarding the proposed changes to the
taking big game rule?

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

9 November 2023

November 2023 RAC Proposals
C/O Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Main Office
Box 146301
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301

Re: November 2023 RAC Proposals

Dear Wildlife Board Members and Director Shirley:

On behalf of Safari Club International, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the November 2023 RAC Proposals. SCI would like to provide opposition comments on 3 items, specifically items 1, 3 and 4.

Item 1 deals with mandatory reporting requirements and late fees for general elk and deer permit holders. While SCI understands the desire for reporting requirements for scientific wildlife management, prohibiting the non-reporting party from participating in the following season's hunt seems penalty enough without the \$50 late fee, particularly when the fee is equivalent or more than the cost of the original permit at the resident prices.

Item 3 contains information on a buck deer hunting proposed research study. In particular, SCI has concerns with the hunt restrictions related to four-point or more on one side antler restrictions. Antler point restrictions unnecessarily restrict hunters from self-selecting the animal that best suits their individual needs and may result in taking the first four-point animal encountered, which may be a younger animal, rather than waiting for a "trophy" animal and possibly ending up taking nothing. As you know, the key to increasing the age class of deer is to reduce opportunity when the deer are most vulnerable, i.e. the rut.

Item 4 contains technology and hunting recommendations, in particular muzzleloading equipment. The proposal would remove the use of optical scopes on muzzleloaders except in any legal weapon seasons. It does not appear that the removal of scopes has any biological basis on a landscape scale. As such, SCI opposes the removal of the scopes from muzzleloading equipment.

Allowing individual choice for all constituents who want to use muzzleloading equipment should override the concerns of a vocal minority aimed at individual competition, and allowing scopes on muzzleloaders does not force any individual to use a scope.

SCI believes that sound science-based conservation involving hunting as the primary management tool, while maximizing opportunities for all huntable species, is necessary to the long-term health of wildlife.

Hunters have long paid the way for conservation, both game and non-game wildlife, and maximizing opportunity for hunting is also key to long-term funding for all conservation. Hunting benefits wildlife conservation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the 2023 November RAC Recommendations. SCI is dedicated to protecting the freedom to hunt and we appreciate the continued partnership with the Division and the Wildlife Board. SCI is always first for hunters.

Sincerely,
W. Laird Hamberlin
Chief Executive Officer
Safari Club International

Which best describes your position Somewhat disagree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

9 November 2023

November 2023 RAC Proposals
C/O Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Main Office
Box 146301
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301

Re: November 2023 RAC Proposals

Dear Wildlife Board Members and Director Shirley:

On behalf of Safari Club International, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the November 2023 RAC Proposals. SCI would like to provide opposition comments on 3 items, specifically items 1, 3 and 4.

Item 1 deals with mandatory reporting requirements and late fees for general elk and deer permit holders. While SCI understands the desire for reporting requirements for scientific wildlife management, prohibiting the non-reporting party from participating in the following season's hunt seems penalty enough without the \$50 late fee, particularly when the fee is equivalent or more than the cost of the original permit at the resident prices.

Item 3 contains information on a buck deer hunting proposed research study. In particular, SCI has concerns with the hunt restrictions related to four-point or more on one side antler restrictions. Antler point restrictions unnecessarily restrict hunters from self-selecting the animal that best suits their individual needs and may result in taking the first four-point animal encountered, which may be a younger animal, rather than waiting for a "trophy" animal and possibly ending up taking nothing. As you know, the key to increasing the age class of deer is to reduce opportunity when the deer are most vulnerable, i.e. the rut.

Item 4 contains technology and hunting recommendations, in particular muzzleloading equipment. The proposal would remove the use of optical scopes on muzzleloaders except in any legal weapon seasons. It does not appear that the removal of scopes has any biological basis on a landscape scale. As such, SCI opposes the removal of the scopes from muzzleloading equipment.

Allowing individual choice for all constituents who want to use muzzleloading equipment should override the concerns of a vocal minority aimed at individual competition, and allowing scopes on muzzleloaders does not force any individual to use a scope.

SCI believes that sound science-based conservation involving hunting as the primary management tool, while maximizing opportunities for all huntable species, is necessary to the long-term health of wildlife.

Hunters have long paid the way for conservation, both game and non-game wildlife, and maximizing opportunity for hunting is also key to long-term funding for all conservation. Hunting benefits wildlife conservation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the 2023 November RAC Recommendations. SCI is dedicated to protecting the freedom to hunt and we appreciate the continued partnership with the Division and the Wildlife Board. SCI is always first for hunters.

Sincerely,
W. Laird Hamberlin
Chief Executive Officer
Safari Club International

**Which best describes your position
regarding the technology
recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

9 November 2023

November 2023 RAC Proposals
C/O Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Main Office
Box 146301
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301

Re: November 2023 RAC Proposals

Dear Wildlife Board Members and Director Shirley:

On behalf of Safari Club International, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the November 2023 RAC Proposals. SCI would like to provide opposition comments on 3 items, specifically items 1, 3 and 4.

Item 1 deals with mandatory reporting requirements and late fees for general elk and deer permit holders. While SCI understands the desire for reporting requirements for scientific wildlife management, prohibiting the non-reporting party from participating in the following season's hunt seems penalty enough without the \$50 late fee, particularly when the fee is equivalent or more than the cost of the original permit at the resident prices.

Item 3 contains information on a buck deer hunting proposed research study. In particular, SCI has concerns with the hunt restrictions related to four-point or more on one side antler restrictions. Antler point restrictions unnecessarily restrict hunters from self-selecting the animal that best suits their individual needs and may result in taking the first four-point animal encountered, which may be a younger animal, rather than waiting for a "trophy" animal and possibly ending up taking nothing. As you know, the key to increasing the age class of deer is to reduce opportunity when the deer are most vulnerable, i.e. the rut.

Item 4 contains technology and hunting recommendations, in particular muzzleloading equipment. The proposal would remove the use of optical scopes on muzzleloaders except in any legal weapon seasons. It does not appear that the removal of scopes has any biological basis on a landscape scale. As such, SCI opposes the removal of the scopes from muzzleloading equipment.

Allowing individual choice for all constituents who want to use muzzleloading equipment should override the concerns of a vocal minority aimed at individual competition, and allowing scopes on muzzleloaders does not force any individual to use a scope.

SCI believes that sound science-based conservation involving hunting as the primary management tool, while maximizing opportunities for all huntable species, is necessary to the long-term health of wildlife.

Hunters have long paid the way for conservation, both game and non-game wildlife, and maximizing opportunity for hunting is also key to long-term funding for all conservation. Hunting benefits wildlife conservation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the 2023 November RAC Recommendations. SCI is dedicated to protecting the freedom to hunt and we appreciate the continued partnership with the Division and the Wildlife Board. SCI is always first for hunters.

Sincerely,
W. Laird Hamberlin
Chief Executive Officer
Safari Club International

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

So this is where my stance is. APR doesn't work why try it.

Say we give every resident a permit. I don't know how many that is , So I will do simple math.

Say there is 100,000 permits issued. In 2024 say 40,000 deer get harvested with this program then those 40,000 hunters get put on a 3 year waiting period.

So now that leaves you with 60,000 hunter left(this number is already lower than the tags we issued this year) lets say 30,000 hunters fill there tags in 2025. That puts them on a 3 year waiting period.

So now that leaves us with 30,000 permits left over going into 2026 hunting season.(I think it's safe to say at this point this is probably hunter that are more selective on what they want to shoot) say they harvest 30,000 deer. now that puts them on a 3 year waiting period.
So the total deer harvested is only 100,000 deer in 3 years.

Versus you issue 65,000 deer permits each year and we roughly harvest 40,000 bucks each year. the grand total will be 120,000 deer in 3 years.

This way you are saving buck and also giving everyone a tag each year unless they fill there tag, it will balance out over crowding and each year. Then the people that hasn't filled will have the option to apply in different regions or hunt units.

No points system needed just a thought. I feel like the only thing that would stop this from working is you will take a big hit on money. Thanks for all that you do I'm just trying to help.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? There have been numerous studies performed on antler point restrictions that shows they are not effective in producing more high quality bucks over time. Within the presentation it was even noted that it has not shown it be an effective method to improve the deer herd and provide a better hunt experience. I do not believe it will be productive to test the theory again and could potentially be damaging to the herds. I believe limiting weapons so severely will push hunters into other units and diminish hunt experience for those people not able or willing to adopt the weapon styles required to hunt in the units it is enforced in. I believe that shortened seasons will only hurt those folks that are unable to spend time in these hunt areas outside of the hunting season like most non-resident hunters. I am willing to agree to implement it to study the impacts as I do not see monumental shifts in deer numbers or quality being experienced.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? For the past 30 years, we have been told to trust the science on the 3point restrictions. they don't work. now we are told they do work. despite decades of study proving it doesn't work.

we have a Deer management plan. we need to follow it. and when it is due to renew. drastic changes like this can be addressed. not before. not mid plan.

We do need a 100% hunter harvest report on all big game. without that, we cannot make informed decisions.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I could not be more against this proposal. this is driven by a very small group of powerful people. this is not what 99% of the Utah hunters want.

1. the 2.6% harvest increase is a guess at best, a lie at worst. there is no harvest report data before scopes, or after.
2. the survey..... for a survey to work, the questions need to be clear, and not leading. a survey can be written to get the answers the writer wants. it is simple. I can write a survey to get Trump supporter to favor Biden. it is all about creative writing.

I have talked to, in person over 250 Utah hunters, not a single one took this survey. the sample size was very small, and the return rate was dismal. and everyone. 100% was against any change to scopes.

3. in 2015/16 we talked about harvest increase concerns in RACS, the board, everywhere. for years. the result of that was a 10-15% increase was expected. if it went higher. it would be looked at. 2.6% increase from a poor survey is well under that concern line.
4. until we have data. there should be NO CHANGE.
5. any survey has a 3-5% margin of error.
6. if there were a real increase of 2.6% is that deer that were hit and found due to a well placed shot with a scope? i say yes.
7. an increase of 2.6% could be due to a better deer crop. again, there is NO DATA to support the claims made in this recommendation.

Point creep. by banning optics, you will see a HUGE increase of hunters going back to rifle tags.

This passed the 1st RAC and got voted against in the central RAC only because we showed up. they listened to the people.

the technology committee is being fed bad information. the 800-yard muzzleloaders are already illegal. let's deal with that. there is a VERY small percentage of people in this class. but the guns shooting over 650 with any energy or accuracy are shooting custom guns, shooting smokeless powder. 4198, or H355. AR-15 powder. they are also shooting a bullet deemed illegal. they are shooting 45 cal guns, with a 38 caliber 130-170 grain bullet in a sabot . this is illegal per page 47 of the handbook.

Even with the biggest scope you can bolt to a muzzle loader it is still a 250/300 yard gun. and plenty of people shoot a 1x or dot at that distance. and hope they wound one enough to get a closer shot. with an scope, it is a kill. not a wounded animal.

We cannot legislate ethics. some people will do what they do.

removing scopes will do nothing to help the deer population.

in short, less than 1% of utah hunters support this. Do the right thing and vote to keep scopes on Muzzle loaders.

it keeps the old guys with bad eyes hunting. and gets the new hunters exited.

Several guns have been called out by name.

the leader of the scary one seems to be the CVA Paramount and Accura LR.

I own them both.

I have 4-16's on both

I have done more load data, load testing and performance tests than probably any hunter in Utah.

here is the RAW data (both guns performed similar enough not to separate. despite one having 1-22 test on a 26 barrel and the other a 1-24 twist on a 28 barrel.

at 500 yards there is 174 inches of drop.

MV averages are 2200 FPS

at 800 yards that is 856 inches of drop. NO SCOPE can caculate that with a turret. NONE.

Energy at that distance is 460 fps and flight time is 2.68 seconds!!!

think about that data. look it up.

i can hit accurately a steel plate at 800 yards. but there is no energy left. the bullets are still intact.

do not let the 3 kings of the south decide what is best for Utah hunters.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 3:17 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? more deer are shot and not recovered with open sights

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 3:20 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? As a youth its hard to learn how to open sights work.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 3:27 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

If you want to ban scopes on muzzleloaders you should also "be like other states" and make rifle straight wall cartridge only. why just single out the muzzleloader. If you ban scopes move elk season like the "other" states have it.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I am split on this one. I strongly support the implementation of the restricted weapons and see immense benefits from this. However I do not see value in the antler point restrictions or shortened season dates. I feel like there is enough data that we already know the real value for increasing opportunity and quality simultaneously is with the restricted weapons opportunity. I feel like we have been missing a major opportunity with Traditional Archery for too long. There are multiple ways that Traditional Archery could be broadly implemented into our game management WITHOUT changing or diminishing any other hunting opportunities. This is a low hanging fruit and could allow doors to be opened to the hunting community that have been closed for a long time. The fact that there are still hunters using traditional archery equipment despite the fact that there is currently zero incentive from game management indicates that there is real value there. Once real incentives have been put in place I believe there will be a significant percentage of hunters that gravitate to it.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

It has been interesting seeing the muzzleloader community come out and defend scopes saying that they don't have a big impact on long range accuracy... I have a long range muzzleloader and can confidently say that most people can shoot that rifle accurately out to 400 yards with little to no practice. With a little practice 800 yard shots are possible. The fact is that we never should have put ourselves in this position to begin with. The muzzleloader season was originally justified due to the short range accuracy and difficulty of the weapon type. Modern muzzleloaders are a BRAND NEW technology that has only been legal for a short time and we (the hunting community) are pretending like we are having our rights taken away, as if we have been hunting with long range muzzleloaders for generations. I get it. It is extremely difficult to let go of technology once we have got our hands on it and the easy thing to do is just leave it the way it is. The right thing to do is to keep muzzleloader season legitimate and remove scopes and long range technology. If I want to keep using my long range muzzleloader I can keep using it during the any weapon season, or I could sell it and buy several traditional weapons, which are typically cheaper anyways.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 10, 2023 4:01 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I don't believe the 4 point or better requirement has worked or will work. How would you address any of the bucks with inferior genetics that will be passed on. This has been tried previously and in many other states. I believe this needs to be looked at again. I am in favor of trying the other suggestions for the four year period. Thank you for trying to address the deer situation.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? This should be a primitive hunt, not a single shot rifle hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

it is very obvious that these changes are a done deal. he states clearly that scopes have made no real change in success results. yet the change to no scopes is still going forward. in the past i have used open sights, 1 power scopes when they could be used. and was thrilled when that went away, and scopes of various power could be used. I love being able to make an accurite shot, and not wound an animal because the sights essentially cover the animal up. The fact is that open sights are at best , a guess. It is ridiculous to think that going to open sights only is going to increase wounding loss. It will in simple fact do the opposite. Utah and Arizona being the only two states to allow scopes is a good thing. hunters from other states that wont allow it, will flick to Utah to enjoy the hunting found here. The money spent here to there hunts helps us all. Frankly this proposal seems to just be hatred of scopes, by a few people in power over us. I hate this proposal, and the two dozen hunters Ive spoken with feel the sane as I. Just leave it alone. by your own statistics it is not a problem. As a past staunch supporter of the DWR, it seems youve found a way to make a needless change and lose my support. I know you could care less what many of us like in a scope on our muzzleloaders, and I cannot understand any factual reason to change what we currently can use. It is a short range range weapon wether it has open sights, high power scope,?or a [REDACTED] laser on it.

Rick Pewtress
801-755-9798
huntinfool@me.com

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 11, 2023 6:51 am

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? By taking away scopes on muzzleloaders you are taking away opportunities from hunters and forcing them to go back to other weapon types

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I completely support all of the recommendations, with the hope of better quality deer hunting in Utah in the future. Deer are just hunted too many days. If you take a unit like Fish Lake with all the different seasons, including the five day hunt in the middle of the elk hunt and the late season muzzleloader hunt, there are 60 DAYS of deer hunting. That is just too many days for a buck to dodge arrows and bullets! I encourage you to discontinue the deer hunts held during the elk hunt. While the idea may be to reduce hunter crowding, that's five more days that deer are being hunted. I support shorter season dates for all seasons. Thank You, for your consideration.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Muzzleloaders should not be allowed to have scopes, after all this is supposed to be a primitive weapons hunt.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 12, 2023 8:30 am

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

It would be nice to divide the "hunting days" into scouting/effort days and actual hunt days. I think that would give more value and accuracy to what it takes to harvest each animal on a specific hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? No fines. Rather than 30 days make it 60 to get the survey completed.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Terrible ideas all the way around. Why would you do these studies in units that are already doing well? And had very low winter loss. It makes no sense. I would like to see a 5 day hunt throughout the state for a period of 5 years. I don't not agree with the restricted weapons option. Too many holes and issues with it. Antler restrictions do not work. Study after study has shown this.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Whole heartedly disagree with this. Please leave scopes on muzzleloaders. There is absolutely no reason to remove them. There are already hunts for those who don't like them and can hunt the way they choose. They can also hunt without scopes during general hunts or i.e. hunts so they choose. Please don't take away options for others.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Make landowner tags hunt the property for which the tag was issued.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

It is time for CWMU's to end. I don't feel it's right to sell our public wildlife to the highest bidder and for the operations make copious amounts of money off of them.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Please don't cave in to the public pressure to leave it how it is. We need to make it a get closer to the animals hunt, please don't believe it causes more wounded deer. This is a bad argument, shooting 500 yards with a muzzleloader will cause just as many, I would like a 1x scope but if needed I'll go open sights. Also Don't cave into the argument that I just spent all this money, once again if they can spend thousands, they can buy a conservation tag at a banquet. Thanks

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? The number of tags should be greatly reduced again to help the deer populations. I also think ALL general and limited entry units should require a 2x3 and larger so our young bucks actually have a chance. I see more 2 points killed then anything.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Regarding this I feel the same as above.
" The number of tags should be greatly reduced again to help the deer populations. I also think ALL general and limited entry units should require a 2x3 and larger so our young bucks actually have a chance."

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I do not agree with the muzzloader scope removal during hunts. They are still labeled a rifle so using this technology should be allowed.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? I do not think the dedicated hunter program should be changed in anyway then what it currently is. It's current rules work and some people still have a hard time meeting the volunteer hour requirements and it's very expensive to pay for hours. I think it should remain as is.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

Everything about this frustrates me.

It's apparent that people in power with personal agendas are strong-arming the Division into making this proposal. The Division knows that antler point restrictions and shorter seasons don't work - they've been saying so for years, and they have good data to back them up. Thus, the only reason for the change in approach now has to be external pressure.

The timing is suspect as well. The deer committee is convening soon. Isn't it better to let the committee spend some good time hashing out all the details, instead of rushing something through at the last minute?

Please, please, please don't employ bad strategies that have already been proven to fail. I want a DWR that puts facts and data above political pressure.

I'm not necessarily opposed to some restricted weapons hunts during general seasons, but I would rather see the committee work on that as well.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

At some point, we will need to draw a line in the sand and decide what we want our muzzleloader hunts to look like. Otherwise, give it a few more years, and people will be shooting at even crazier ranges as technology improves their capabilities even more.

It is a social decision and there's obviously not one right answer, but my view is that there really is no point in even having a muzzleloader hunt unless it is significantly different from the rifle hunt. And with some of the long range muzzleloaders that are out there, the two hunts seem less and less different all the time.

I understand the frustration of those who have invested money in muzzleloader scopes. It's hard to take that away. But, it will be even harder 5 or 10 years from now. If that's the direction we will ultimately go, best not to wait any longer.

At a minimum, for the sake of those of us who have trouble focusing our vision with open sights, can we please allow 1x scopes? Doing so would give those of us with bad eyesight a fighting chance, without significantly increasing the effective range of the weapon.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Scopes would be considered a reasonable accommodation for individuals who have a disability or an individual who has aged and has issues associated with eyesight. The old rule about a one power scope would at least provide an accommodation for individuals who don't have 20/20 eyesight. It would be unfair to kick them out of the muzzleloader season and make them hunt with the any legal weapon hunters. They should be given the same opportunity as the other muzzleloader hunters during the same season. It would seem that this new rule change would fall in the category of age discrimination.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I fell that these changes especially the weapon restrictions are to extreme. If you were to have a primitive season like the hams hunt and had different dates to create more opportunity would be fine. Please do not change the regular general season hunts. This gives people a choice and does not force us to buy/use certain weapons. I don't think that the shorter season dates help any. You tried that a few years ago in southern units. I have hunted the boulder unit for 18 years so this affects me personally. I would have to go buy new guns and bows to hunt my unit especially now my kids are hunting with me.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I agree to taking scopes off of muzzleloaders. This is designed to be a lesser weapon hunt and it has turned into a single shot rifle hunt.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 13, 2023 1:49 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the proposed changes to the
taking big game rule?

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the proposed research study?
Do you agree with the
recommendations?

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 13, 2023 2:06 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I agree that there should be a mandatory reporting to big game take.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? rarely hunt antelope in Utah and have not kept up on them

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

Muzzleloader hunters are the main target here and very little to nothing with rifle and archery. I disagreed with the board when they stated we don't care what power scope hunters put on muzzleloaders. Should have been a 4X or less at that time. I have taken animals with my red dot much farther then my 3X9 since the change. Still try to get as close as possible. I agree with getting rid of the high power scopes which some hunters pay for and the weapon to take 500-1000 yard shots with.

Your data shows only a 3% success increase but going to open sights is extreme. There is already been a late muzzleloader hunt that is for that classification. I am in my 60's and the eyes do not focus as they once did and cannot focus on 3 things at once. A scope or red dot allows for focusing on 2 things and works for older or bad eyes. Even a 4X does not allow long range shooting. There will be those that will still try to shoot farther then should, because they know they did it with high magnification scopes. I believe a red dot or scope allows for a better sight picture for better bullet placement, not for long range shooting if 4X or less. I'm all for getting the high dollar weapons and scopes out of the muzzleloader hunt that jumped in to get first crack at the deer before the rifle hunters with their technology weapons that shoot like a single shot rifle.

The early rifle season is just days after the muzzleloader hunt ends and the rifle hunters are allowed out with the rifle of their liking. Lets not restrict the muzzleloader so extreme to just have the same deer hunter days later with rifles.

Also the muzzleloader elk hunt lost most all the cow tags about four years ago. We didn't complain much because we could purchase a rifle or archery cow tag and use it during the season of our valid bull muzzleloader tag. However, this year it was change to using the cow tag during the dates on tag only. However, there is only a few units that even have muzzleloader cow tags issued and none was issued in units with this change. Like Vernal Bonanza, iyt always had muzzleloader cow tags before, but now only had 100 rifle and 100 archery cow tags issued. I believe this should be addressed. Rifle hunters have high success and archery hunters can already shoot a cow on their archery tag if they wish. I believe the muzzleloader hunters have a low success and should be issued cow tags equal or greater then the other two hunts. The muzzy elk hunt is a very tough hunt and with magnification scopes possibly going away will be very, very tough.

Thanks for your hard work and the chance to voice my opinion.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Muzzleloader hunters are the main target here and very little to nothing with rifle and archery. I disagreed with the board when they stated we don't care what power scope hunters put on muzzleloaders. Should have been a 4X or less at that time. I have taken animals with my red dot much farther then my 3X9 since the change. Still try to get as close as possible. I agree with getting rid of the high power scopes which some hunters pay for and the weapon to take 500-1000 yard shots with.

Your data shows only a 3% success increase but going to open sights is extreme. There is already been a late muzzleloader hunt that is for that classification. I am in my 60's and the eyes do not focus as they once did and cannot focus on 3 things at once. A scope or red dot allows for focusing on 2 things and works for older or bad eyes. Even a 4X does not allow long range shooting. There will be those that will still try to shoot farther then should, because they know they did it with high magnification scopes. I believe a red dot or scope allows for a better sight picture for better bullet placement, not for long range shooting if 4X or less. I'm all for getting the high dollar weapons and scopes out of the muzzleloader hunt that jumped in to get first crack at the deer before the rifle hunters with their technology weapons that shoot like a single shot rifle.

The early rifle season is just days after the muzzleloader hunt ends and the rifle hunters are allowed out with the rifle of their liking. Lets not restrict the muzzleloader so extreme to just have the same deer hunter days later with rifles.

Also the muzzleloader elk hunt lost most all the cow tags about four years ago. We didn't complain much because we could purchase a rifle or archery cow tag and use it during the season of our valid bull muzzleloader tag. However, this year it was change to using the cow tag during the dates on tag only. However, there is only a few units that even have muzzleloader cow tags issued and none was issued in units with this change. Like Vernal Bonanza, iyt always had muzzleloader cow tags before, but now only had 100 rifle and 100 archery cow tags issued. I believe this should be addressed. Rifle hunters have high success and archery hunters can already shoot a cow on their archery tag if they wish. I believe the muzzleloader hunters have a low success and should be issued cow tags equal or greater then the other two hunts. The muzzy elk hunt is a very tough hunt and with magnification scopes possibly going away will be very, very tough.

Thanks for your hard work and the chance to voice my opinion.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I like this proposal. It was sometimes a little tuff to get that first year hours in when you didn't find out you were drawn until so close to the hunts. This works great and is still the same hours needed. Great job/proposal here.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Thank you for your hard work and looking outside of the box and listening to the hunters.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 13, 2023 4:43 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Why take scopes off muzzleloaders it helps make ethical shots and less wounding if you worried about anything it should be the rifles that shot 2000 yards you have more animals wounded with these kind of shots but on another hand you guys don't listen to the public you do what you want just like the trail cameras

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Harvest surveys are way overdue, otherwise how do you have any real data???? Please pass the mandatory reporting on ALL hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? This topic and vast changes should be left to the mule deer committee who are meeting in just a few short weeks. This sweeping changes are going against decades of PROVEN failures time & time again. Vote to reject and allow the full committee to decide.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Life long muzzle loader hunter of over 30 years and don't currently use scopes, however I will defend the right to choose! Especially when you have no real data to prove the negative impact on the yearly take. My kids & grandkids depend on having a scope to enjoy muzzleloader season and in a day when we're loading the next generation we don't need any more restrictions. After a few years of harvest surveys if the real data warrant an revisit I can support that. Please listen to the MAJORITY and actual muzzleloader hunters and not some fringe minority trying to drive more wedges in the hunting community!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 13, 2023 8:50 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Although the success rate of muzzleloader hunts has only increased by 4.9% over the past 7 years, the cost of long range muzzleloaders is decreasing. These long range muzzleloaders are quickly making the muzzleloader hunt another rifle hunt. Over the past two decades we have doubled the range of lethality in all of our hunts. 100+ yard archery shots. 200+ yard muzzleloader shots. 800+ yard rifle shots. At some point we have to take the side of the animals. We can decrease the number of tags or limit ourselves. I like the technology limits for muzzleloaders and believe that this is a good first step.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? There should be more across the state.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? There should be more regulations on archery season and rifle also. We are talking about a resource that is on a steady decline, we should make some regulations that help the deer in all seasons. If a guy with a bow can now shoot past a hundred yards, and then the next hunt we regulate muzzleloaders, and then the next day a guy with a rifle can shoot a thousand yards. Its tough, if changes are not made it hurts everyone.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? The state is going to loose its future generations because the state is working so hard to please Landowners.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am in strong disagreement of the proposed muzzleloader/scope recommendations. While I do agree that the ranges are starting to become a little excessive, I am not in favor of removing the scopes from muzzleloaders. One comment "other states do not allow them, so why do we?" If we are going that route, then why do we have to stop our archery elk hunts on the 15th of September? All of the other states allow archers to hunt until 30 Sept.

Back to the subject. If you really want people to stop taking long shots then we need to push educating hunters about why long shots are risky. Educate them on ballistics so they understand that hitting a target at 600yards is different than trying to harvest an animal at 600 yards. Technology is not going away, like it or not, and I think picking and choosing which areas to allow technology is not good. In one sentence you say hunters should use technology for knowing where you are in regards to private property, using technology for hunter surveys, but then you say we cannot use technology for hunting success.

If you want to keep a traditional muzzleloader season why not give the traditional guys 3 days to hunt before the modern muzzleloader hunts open? I believe Colorado does something similar, and it has been successful.

Seems kind of unfair that if a hunter has bad eyes they will be allowed to hunt with a scope on their rifle, but others who have good eyes have to stay open sight. I know that in my hunting group 4 of the 5 of use have to wear corrective lenses. So one guy in our group will get the shaft while the others can keep their scopes..... Doesn't make much sense.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I really appreciate that the DWR is taking some action and is willing to listen and maybe make some changes to make hunting a more enjoyable experience for the public. I agree with most things listed here, but if there is one thing that I strongly disagree with is that antler point restrictions do not work and I truly believe that the DWR knows this. Genetics doesn't give every deer the opportunity to be a four point. This has been proven too many times in history not only in Utah, but other states as well. What will happen is we will end up shooting 2 year old 4 points and 8 year old 2 and 3 point genetics will dominate and that's all we will begin seeing on the landscape. We need to manage for age class, (not easily done) rather than points on a head. I also feel that these management strategies aren't managing the deer population rather than trying to have bigger bucks on the landscape, which is great and fun to see, but at the end of the day, the deer population as a whole is what I personally would rather see. Shorter dates, some weapon restrictions, those kinds of things won't throw most, unless they have dumped a bunch of money into something, but point restrictions sounds like the easy way to manage, but it will only work for a year or two. If we want more deer/bucks on the landscape, we need fewer tags, or area closures and mother nature to work with us. Thank you.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I somewhat agree on this proposal. We've taken muzzleloaders a "primitive" weapon and allowed them to become a single shot rifle. I think most hunters that are true muzzleloader hunters know their weapon and practice with them and know their effective range. Allowing high powered scopes on them has allowed the weapon to become more popular and made it possible to take less effective shots, even if it was an ethical clean shot or not. The data doesn't necessarily show that it has made it easier on people to kill an animal, but I feel it does give us an advantage. I like to remind people though that there is a reason it is called "hunting" and not "killing". I would really like to see muzzleloaders stay a primitive weapon. Now, that being said, I want to be careful as well because I do think some technologies help us become more ethical hunters. Me as a hunter never wants to injure an animal, so if there is something out there that helps me make a cleaner more ethical kill, I want to know about it, and again I know that begins with hunters practicing and getting to know their weapon of choice. But I think there can also be some room to understand that I still have to get within a certain yardage with a compound bow, but at least I know I can make an ethical shot with it rather than using a long bow and guessing where I'm aiming (even with practice). This will always be a long debate, but I think we have to understand what weapon we are using. Bows we are trying to get within 60-70 yards, preferably less, muzzleloaders 150-200 yards at most, and if you want to shoot further than that, look at a rifle hunt. Thanks.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Love the mandatory reporting!

A few suggested edits:
-Give a hunter 90 days post hunt to complete. 30 seems short. OR pick a set date. 1/31?
-Don't make 2024 a trial year. You already know how to do this. Rip the band-aid off!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Love seeing this...just don't strip too many antelope away, too quickly, from the Parker.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

This is the biggest crock of crap. 2 Southern Utah politicians are pushing this agenda to hopefully grow bigger bucks and more of them.

We already have LE units! We already have HAMS hunts! AND antler point restrictions have never worked in any state during any long term test. We are talking about general season units! I want my kids to get tags more often vs not. This hurts opportunity for the average joe to get tags each year.

The DWR themselves have said that antler point restrictions and 5 days hunts don't work.

Please squash this set of politically driven recommendations.

Lastly, the mule deer committee is meeting next year. Why in the world is this not being put on their shoulders? Again, just another sign there's an agenda here.

How about we put some effort into fencing, water installations, predation control, habitat restoration, winter feeding, etc. Those are the only things that will make a difference in the long term.

Please vote this think down.

Give me a ring if you want to talk.

Jon 801-602-2418

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Going back to iron sights is too extreme.

The changes to muzzy scopes aren't supported by any science (harvest rate increase of 2.5% from random sampling is not significant) AND is not supported by the majority of hunter feedback. Seems like this group recommended their personal agendas vs what the data and MOST people said. The "spin" the DWR and tech committee took on the survey for this topic was also done poorly. Definitely skewed to an agenda.

If you need to make changes, don't swing the pendulum so far. Keep some optic (1-4x and/or red dot on top). I had to get glasses for the first time this year...having some optic is a big help for old eyes. Requiring all muzzy hunters to add on iron sites is a joke.

The Wildlife Board member who pushed for this is now gone...sounds like this was due to shadiness on his CWMU. Sad if true.

More things to consider:

- Utah hunters have payed a lot of money for scopes. Could be painful for lots of folks to take those off.
- Don't make your suggestions based on what other states are doing. Dumb.
- I'm actually good with making it tougher to harvest. Just make it really clear what the rule is, easily enforceable and easy to implement for hunters.
- Based on deer #'s I've seen this year, it's highly unlikely we will soon have too many deer on the landscape in a 4 year period. We are nowhere near carrying capacity. Please don't up the buck harvest based on buck to doe ratio changes. We need way more deer...period.

How about we put some effort into fencing, water installations, predation control, habitat restoration, winter feeding, etc. Those are the only things that will make a difference in the long term.

Give me a ring if you want to talk.

Jon 801-602-2418

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I do like the idea of electronic reporting. That said, it seems like having e-tags should be in place in order to keep the honest guys honest.

And glad to see the orientation course go away just to apply for the DH program.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

This program is already liberal enough. Quit making it easier to get tags for them.

I hate taking any permits out of general season or LE tag #'s strongly opposed!

I hate taking away any public access!

And I think it's a bad idea to be able to resell permits intended for family use only.

Lastly, how can you ensure these tags stay on private lands when the public is land-locked? You know folks would cross this line...

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

Seems like the Kimberly Beaver Mountain unit should be considered for elk.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Absolutely ridiculous to punish hunters for your mismanagement

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Strongly agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I highly applaud the Utah DWR for it's willingness to undertake large scale studies to study the real world effects of potential future management changes, and to advance our knowledge of modern deer management. One of the compelling elements of this potential study is the fact that general deer hunters in southern Utah will have options available to fit their hunting styles and preferences. I understand that this will be a small burden for those who may have to travel further to hunt a unit that fits their wants and needs, but I believe this short term sacrifice will be worth it for the knowledge and opportunities that will be gained from this study. Personally, I am excited for the opportunity to tackle the challenge of restricted weapons, and the potential to see more older age class bucks without reducing tag numbers is an exciting idea. I urge the public to keep an open mind to this proposal, let's find out what works and what doesn't in the modern age.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have pushed for, and agree with the ban of magnified scopes. However, I was under the assumption that the rules would go back to the previous way six years ago, before scopes were allowed. At that time, 1x magnification and red dots were allowed. I have recently realized that the new proposal would be open sights and peep sights only. I ask for consideration of the 1x scope and red dots for hunters like me who are getting older and don't have the same eyesight we used to. Looking through iron sights is difficult with far sightedness. I used a red dot scope before scopes were allowed, and I never changed. Even when magnified scopes were allowed, I continued to use the 1x red dot. It is much easier see the sights on target with a red dot. Max shooting distance is still roughly 100 yards, because you just can't see much further than that without magnification.

My eyes aren't bad enough nor would I want to apply for a special exemption to use a scope. I just want to be able to see the target more clearly.

Thanks for all you do.

Travis Fitch

801-657-5679

tbfitch@live.com

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Utah has tried antler point restrictions before and we gave it up. Every western state has tried it and the overwhelming studies show they don't work. I understand you're proposing this because to the uneducated public, it sounds like it would accomplish the goal, but it doesn't can we just squash this and recognize that it has not worked in any state and that it won't work now. As for the other proposals in the study, the only thing that has shown to work in helping deer is shortened seasons/less tags and mother nature's cooperation. My hope is that should Mother Nature be kind to the deer herds during this study we should recognize that an outside influence had more to do with deer population growing than these proposed restrictions.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I think staying ahead of a technology curve is a good thought, however, the committee doesn't seem to use data when trying to make suggestions. Last year it was digital archery sights, which showed no increase in harvest from before they were available. Trail cams also. Montana did away with trail cams during the season for a number of years and then started allowing them during season again because as the data shows, they don't significantly increase harvest. These are emotional decisions being made without consulting data. I know your job is hard because hunters are often emotional, but can we please start stressing the data. I appreciate that you have data for scoped muzzleloaders. 3% is a decent increase. I'm in favor of removing scopes, but please allow 1x and red dots like it was in the past.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? So we are going to totally disregard the science to do what we want to do. Antler point restrictions based on the science will only increase the wounding and wasting of animals. How is this going to help the deer populations. Oh and we are going to change the optics rules so hunters will not be able to take accurate humane shots so the take waste and wounding loose will increase. This is a bad idea and will hurt the deer in my area.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I have hunted muzzle loader throughout my life in Utah. I hunted with flint locks to inline. The idea that a scope on a muzzle loader is killing to many animals is not accurate. I spend a lot of time in the field and the scopes on my muzzle loaders have made my shots more ethical and safer. When we had only iron sights and red dots, I had multiple incidents of wounding loss and lose hits due to poor aiming. Scopes on muzzle loaders help make hunters safer and more ethical. When we changed to magnified scopes we were told it would destroy the deer population due to take. Based on the data it only increased take buy 5%. How is this killing to many deer? A scope on a muzzleloader has helped make my boys like to hunt muzzleloaders. The fact that they could make a ethical and safe shot. Based on the data the division has provided muzzleloader hunters like me do not want to take the scope off the firearms.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Why are we as a State so focused on restricting the ability to hunt? Nothing in Blair's presentation is a reason to remove scopes other than "getting the hunt back to what it used to be". Is that really a reason to remove scopes from muzzleloaders, or is this just a wish from some who have their own agenda or "ethics" at play here? We do not live in the past and technology is here to stay. If we advocate for removing scopes to make this a "primitive hunt", then why not outlaw inlines period? They didn't exist 100 or 200 years ago. Why should we allow modern clothing with all its advantages? That didn't exist in the past. Why should we allow optics other than what were used during back in the day? Are modern trucks, ATVs and side by sides really consistent with a primitive hunt? I will not go on because I want to be respectful of your time, but you should clearly understand what I am saying.

We need to be inclusive, as much as possible, in the hunting world or we risk losing the very people who will advocate for it in the future. Removing scopes does nothing to benefit those that want a primitive experience...other than excluding those that cannot participate otherwise. You've heard all the arguments, but that is really what it comes down to. If a person wants have a a primitive experience, let them do so but don't restrict others that opt to use technology as part of their experience.

As a final point, if an individual wants a more primitive experience, they can hunt the HAMS hunts where scopes are not legal. Does this not, in and of itself, solve the problem here?

While the Technology Committee may have had good intentions, it got it wrong here. Removing scopes from muzzleloaders during the general muzzleloader hunt is "a solution looking for a problem". The supposed benefit does not in any way, shape or form outweigh the negative impacts associated with it. We live in 2023 not 1870. I strongly urge the Wildlife Board to reject this proposal.

Thank you for your time

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? I'd be happy to comply with mandatory reporting if it was implemented.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I think the proposed studies in the various units would be worth effort and better guide Utah into the future, compared to doing nothing. Go for it!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I fully support limiting technology starting with the requirement of open-sighted or peep-sighted muzzleloaders.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Bout time

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The majority don't want this to change doesn't seem like this is affecting success so why change it. Feels like a witch hunt. Pretty disgusting to see the majority of the public's opinion just to get tossed away even tho this is supposedly just a social decision. And one thing I want to know is what is the wounding loss before and after allowing scopes. I want to know the actual numbers besides just bout the same and how much do we actually believe these numbers. Leave the scopes alone and leave the muzzle loader as a unique hunt opportunity.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 15, 2023 2:14 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat agree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? I dont agree with the weapon restrictions it will result in to many wounded animals, but I am Happy someone got the DWR to try different ideas on Deer management. That guy should be the new director

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? CWMUs should have the same season dates as the rest of the state, what makes them better than us?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 15, 2023 4:51 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I strongly oppose any antler point restrictions on deer. Because some bucks never grow 4 points and you will get mature 3 and 2 point deer that wont be shot and will carry on those genetics. Then your hunter involvement will decrease as the chance to harvest a buck and the frustration of seeing large 2 and 3 point bucks increases

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Somewhat disagree
Do you agree with the recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? We have studies already with point restrictions why are we doing it and wanting a different result. Shorter season dates I don't like because if bad weather comes in it could run half the hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? My biggest concern is muzzleloader scope restrictions. I have hunted limited entry and general hunts with muzzleloaders. I put lots of time and money into my muzzleloaders and you want to change them. I am comfortable shooting 200+ with open sights. But my younger sister, my nephews and my older dad this would make a big impact on their hunting. The muzzleloader has worse dates than the rifle hunts. Less weekends or less days. Since adding scopes I have had more clean kills with the family members I have helped hunt.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 15, 2023 7:28 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The only people this helps is the rifle hunters. You want to fix it divide units into smaller units

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Please don't go all the way back to open sights. I know something needs to be done with the long range muzzleloaders. Going back to a 1x scope would solve this. If I want to go open sights isn't that the point of the ham hunts? Or the new proposed limited weapons hunts? At least for deer. I've hunted Utah for 42 years and these old eyes at least need the crosshairs to help me with my muzzleloader. Thank you for your service and time

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Somewhat agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 15, 2023 9:00 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

What are we doing here? There is no evidence we are surpassing the kill rate percent that we set 7 years ago. We know y'all are going to change it anyway. Don't take things that we've worked for away. You're going to hurt the elderly with this recommendation and the youth. I'll be fine but your hurting many more that won't hunt anymore because of this.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? This proposal should go through the Mule Deer committee first.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The muzzleloader hunt was originally conceived as a primitive weapons hunt. It's time to get back to that.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? I am against limiting or removing public access. I am against extra tags or availability for large landowners.

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Have a plan in place to deal with the amount of lifetime license holders that can take tags from any one unit if it becomes an issue.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Allow fixed 1 power scopes and red dots along with peep sites.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? All of the proposed changes are sorely needed as written. Especially the one that helps landowners in limited entry units without LOA's.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

It was this very board that allowed scopes, and now this very board wants to go back on this? That's really jerking the public around and not needed. The data cited says that 75% of people are in favor or neutral of leaving it alone. So listen to the public and leave it alone. No change. A major impact will be making increasingly harder to obtain ALW general and LE hunts even harder to obtain as people shift away from muzzleloader. This proposed change only decreases opportunity. DO NOT CHANGE.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

Thank you. I really like how far the division has come over the last 10 years, That said APR is has more Cons then Pros. Because of one thing(Balance) is a key thing in this.
We have Management hunts on our premium deer hunts! So why do we have this pretty simple to balance out the herd.

We all know the deer committee needs good solid Data. I just don't think running APR for one year will give us that Data they will need.
A mature mule deer is roughly 4 to 7 years. So in my mind we need to at least run this for 3 years.

So my proposal would be. Run the APR for at least 3 years but with a balance. I say we allow the youth to shoot 2 point or better.(we only give 20% of the tags to youth) I feel like this would give it the balance.

Thanks for all that you do.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I have watched this weapon exploded over the years. When the multi season elk tags came out, this was an eye opener I just couldn't believe how early they where shooting and how late they where shooting and I just couldn't believe the distances they where shooting.

I know people will say success ONLY went up 2.6% increase. It went up but we don't know how much it truly went up. By having Mandatory harvest survey, I will guarantee the success is a lot higher. I think we need to be proactive on this

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

I've hunter in Utah my entire life. I feel these comments are completely a waste of time and probably will not even be read. Everyone I know and talk to is opposed to these changes and has no faith in your leadership or management of wildlife. I have lived in Utah my entire life. I purchased a Knight Peregrine for this season. The gun is only equipped for a scope. So after one season your decision and games you play with the power you hold has rendered a \$2300 investment completely worthless. I am buying land in Alaska and not looking back. I hope people start to wake up and realize this is just the top of the iceberg. Hunting is a way of life and a spiritual practice for me. You have taken that away. Non-resident tags, declining habitat, and mismanagement have left me with no other option but to leave this great state I have lived my entire life. This goes much deeper than scopes. It's about money and power and you're going to all get what you deserve!

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I've hunted in Utah my entire life. I feel these comments are completely a waste of time and probably will not even be read. I'm fully aware, you've already made your decision and this is all just bread and circus. Everyone I know and talk to is opposed to these changes and has no faith in your leadership or management of wildlife. Because of your poor management, prioritizing rich folks, having opportunities to hunt instead of regular blue-collar, Utah residents. I have lived in Utah my entire life. I purchased a Knight Peregrine for this season. It took me six months to save up for this gun. The gun is only equipped for a scope. So after one season your decision and games you play with the power you hold has rendered a \$2300 investment completely worthless. I am buying land in Alaska and not looking back. I hope people start to wake up and realize this is just the tip of the iceberg. Hunting is a way of life and a spiritual practice for me. You have taken that away. Non-resident tags, declining habitat, and mismanagement have left me with no other option but to leave this great state I have lived my entire life. This goes much deeper than scopes. When you make decisions based on feelings or fear, influence of power and not FACTS! You are participating in the great decline of our country. It's about money and power and you're going to all get what you deserve! I'm not talking to the people who work hard and truly care about conservation and equal opportunity. I'm speaking to the board members and those in power. May [REDACTED] have mercy on your souls!

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? This all sounds fine.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:11 am

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 12:34 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 12:59 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Due to high cost to hunters to retro fit sights on rifles that dont have open sights Recomend allowing lower power scopes lowest power scope that I can find is 4x they dont make open 1x scopes anymore only 1x reddot dont really work for hunting situations over 70 yards also old people have a hard time seeing through reddots but don't have bad enough vision for the scope exception

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? While this study proposal may have some merit, I object to the way it is being implemented. First, I strongly oppose the permit base, using the average permit numbers of the past 4 yrs to lock in the permits issued for the next 4 yrs. This will cut Hunting opportunity because we have endured heavy cuts due to drought and THE BOARD's decision to not increase 2023 permits, after we finally had a good year. the biologists tell me the herd looks great going into this winter. and we really need to get back some of our hunting opportunity. Since the Deer Plan sets permit numbers in April after deer counts and winter losses have been evaluated, AND, the DEER COMMITTEE will be meeting, lets give this proposal more time, if it is going to be implemented,

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Hunters starting the DH program can purchase ALL THEIR SERVICE HOURS, at the beginning or as they go along. If a dedicated hunter writes a check buying his opportunity to hunt 9 seasons over the next 3 yrs as opposed to maybe drawing a permit to hunt one season in 3 yrs, How is this NOT purchasing privilege?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Neither agree nor disagree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 4:08 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? I have lost faith in this system and will never hunt Utah again you have failed us we no longer have a voice

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Dear Board members,

I am an avid hunter who has participated in Utah hunts for over 30 years. I still look forward to hunting season much like a kid looks forward to Christmas. I appreciate what the division and board members do to help preserve the hunting privileges we enjoy. Over the last 10 years, I have especially enjoyed introducing my kids to hunting. Specifically deer hunting when they are lucky enough to draw a tag. We have had some great times hunting in the muzzleloader season where scopes have been allowed up to this point. My kids have had opportunities and been successful tagging out.

I can almost guarantee that wouldn't have been the case had only steel sights been allowed. Unfortunately, long range muzzleloader options are becoming more wide spread and I see how the division feels a change needs to be made to cull long shots on what was designed as a primitive hunting experience.

I would like to advocate for the youth and also for older hunters like my self that may struggle with steel sights. If the board feels a change needs to take place, I would plead that the option of a 1 or 2 power scope would be allowed rather than banning optics all together. Those that wear bifocal glasses or otherwise have poor eyesight along with kids that aren't proficient at shooting with open sights would still be able to participate in this hunt. Overall, the objective of 200 yard max shots would be achieved and this group of hunters can still participate in a hunt that we have all grown to love.

The concern about enforcement was brought up in the video. I would suggest that ALL muzzleloader hunters be required to take a short online ethics course (similar to the dedicated hunter course) regarding hunting requirements and expectations and there highlight scope restrictions. Just being around other hunters will help with this initiative. Ethical hunters don't want to be viewed as CHEATERS.

Thanks for your consideration. Dave B.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 5:07 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly disagree
regarding the technology
recommendations?

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I'm against the proposed changes to muzzleloader scopes. Primary concern is what are we supposed to do with the of contemporary muzzleloader rifles that have been purchased to fill the demand created by this board by allowing variable power scopes in the first place? Thousands of muzzleloaders sold in Utah the last decade or so have no provisions for iron sights to be mounted. This began even before the advent of the variable power scope hunts with the allowance to have single power/red dot optics. Utah created the demand for these types of rifles. Thousands purchased them and they aren't all necessarily the long range models that we keep hearing about. The proposal as written will leave most contemporary muzzleloader useless for hunting unless nearly the cost of a new muzzleloader is spent on gunsmithing to drill and tap and install an aftermarket sight system (if such a system exists for your particular rifle). Yes, we can choose to use our now banned muzzleloader on the ALW hunt, but we all know that nobody is going to do that given the increased capability of a centerfire rifle (contrary to the rhetoric being floated around, there is a significant difference between even a single shot rifle and even the best "long range" muzzleloaders; it has to do with the time to load and make a follow up shot and the inferior ballistics of the muzzleloader projectile).

Can we at least consider reverting back to the 1X/red dot rules or maybe just a limitation on max power so that the majority of existing rifles can be fitted with a "legal" optic without modification?

The more I wade through comments, forums, listen to RAC proceedings, and converse with fellow sportsmen, I see the support behind this proposal as being selfish. Last year we heard some in the muzzleloading community throw their support behind eliminating the 3 season bull tags with the justification that it will reduce the more than 4500 muzzleloader hunters on the any bull unit back down to the numbers that were there before the three season hunt came into play (around 800 as I recall). This is a selfish yet appealing motivation to have the mountain to themselves. We are seeing the same thing happening now. If we dial back the optics on our muzzleloaders fewer people will want to participate. Tags get easier to draw. I've been in this camp. When the muzzleloader scope restriction idea first came up I thought that it was great, I can go back to hunting the muzzy without seeing so many people on the mountain. It was completely selfish.

The end result of this selfishness, perpetuated by people who insist their way is better than somebody else's in order to ensure they will always be in a minority of people that still want to try the muzzleloader hunt, will likely be:

-More pressure put on the ALW hunts, both general and LE, with people jumping back into the points pool in those hunts rather than trying for the muzzy.

-Lost interest in the muzzleloader in general...maybe in the future this leads enough lost support that it goes away altogether. If the "Mountain Men" get

their way we'll all be using smooth bore guns and then we'll have the Utah Legislature passing laws to ban the hunt altogether after social pressures show how inhumane or unethical such an archaic hunt method is (based on anecdotes and emotion, not fact)...it's death by a thousand cuts and muzzleloaders will be first in line because there will only be a handful of people actually participating in the hunt and nobody will back them up when the antis come their way (but hey, they'll get their tag every year until they can't).

Another misconception is that there is evenly split or majority support for banning the scopes. Not even close to the case. Discount the neutral votes and see where people stand:

-60% oppose this proposal, only 28% support = 32% more oppose than support the proposal.

-In the muzzy only community it is similar, 56% oppose and 29% support = 27% more oppose than support the proposal.

Somehow this is a only "a little over half the people"; if this were a presidential election, it would be a landslide. We are skewing actual data with opinion to fit an agenda.

More data for the 1X scope question: This one is a little closer but still opposed. In the context of the questions asked, this is only more palatable because people would rather see this than iron sights. I think people are opposed to this, but less opposed than the iron sights, because it is viewed as a compromise. Let's not confuse this for actual support or non-support of the 1x scopes, it's just an indicator framed by the previous question of no scopes as an option.

-53% opposed to 37% supportive or 50% opposed to 41% supportive (muzzleloader only hunters) are still not even close to an even split as advertised.

When the real question is asked about keeping the status quo it isn't even close amongst muzzleloader hunters:

57% support keeping things the way they are vs 26% that want something to change = more than twice the support for just leaving things the way they are.

Similarly for muzzleloader only hunters, it was 53 % to 28% = 25% more people support keeping it the same.

The issues that we are attempting to address here are purely social and they are derisive to the sportsman community. The masses are not asking for this. Having hunted with a muzzleloader long enough that I've used all sight options I can tell you that my success doesn't change based on the sights. What does change is my selectivity in what I choose to shoot and my confidence in making a clean kill. It's the difference between a heart shot and a spine or gut shot. For selfish reasons, it's not going to hurt me that much to see scopes go away when it takes hunters out of the pool that I hunt in. I'll figure out a new system to hunt with because I'm in a position to make it happen. Many people will just walk away from it and concentrate

on the overcrowded ALW hunts. Utah created what was a unique and fun hunt under the current rules (or even under the old 1X rules). This weapon configurations we have been allowing has made muzzleloading approachable to many as evidenced by the popularity it has gained and the pressure it has taken off of some of the ALW hunts. But hey, a small minority of hunters will draw our tags more frequently so why not?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? This is a start to helping our deer herd out, I have hunted the Beaver for 60 plus years, also the Dutton, my family ran cattle on both, I would like to see the Beaver and the Dutton go to a five day hunt and four point or better, if the Board doesn't go with with this, let's close these two units down, their just no deer on them, the Beaver is the worst, thank you,
Ron Perkins 801-541-2710, Tom Hatch of Panguitch will agree with me.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Make it a muzzleloader hunt, no scopes, try to help the hunters out with real bad eyes

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? This spring we tried out e-tags. It seemed to work great. This would satisfy survey requirements. Why are we not rolling this out instead?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Too much risk of mistakes happening. Low likelihood of any significant improvement.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? Why is everything from the technology committee always all or nothing? Why not have a compromise with a fixed power scope of 1X-4X? The current COR for vision impairment is inadequate. This proposal favors a minority of traditional hunters, who are really not affected, as no one is or ever would stop them from hunting that way. Ethically, it's a wash. How is shooting an animal at distance any different than shooting at one with a smooth bore rifle with inconsistent powder, ignition and bullet weight/consistency that creates a higher risk of wound loss.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Somewhat agree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Need more "off the shelf" projects- especially in northeastern region for those who can only do projects during the week.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations? Why are all the units in the south? Why isn't there any in the north? Why is the Boulder unit getting hit with all three? This is the only unit I hunt, for the last 35 years. I struggle with even harvesting a deer as it is and now you're making it impossible to even get a deer. This is a limited entry elk unit so I can't get an elk tag. I just purchased a brand new compound bow this year and purchased a muzzleloader couple years ago and now I won't even be able to use them. You're making it so I have to go somewhere else to even stand a chance to get a deer so I might as well go out of state where my chances are better. Archery is not killing you deer or even the muzzleloader or rifle, it is the scopes. You want to raise the deer population, outlaw scopes on everything. My suggestion is keep the bow the way it is, take scopes off of muzzleloaders, get rid of the rifle hunt altogether and give more tags out to the archery and muzzleloader or Make more hunts for the archery and the muzzleloader. Make it a three-pointer better for two years and then a four pointer better for two years.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I don't agree with the antler point restrictions. We have seen this type of regulation used in many different states throughout the years and the data has shown this is not a favorable way to regulate hunting to improve populations. It would be foolish to think that we are going to see a different result now. It makes me a little nervous that this will change the genetic structure of a unit as well. The deer that are never going to be a 4 point will now be the dominant breeding bucks and I think that will be an unexpected consequence to this regulation.

I feel there are too many uncontrollable environmental variables that impact mule deer for us to know for sure that it is the changes we have made that affected deer population in the way the data will show no matter if it is for the better or for the worse.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Somewhat disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Somewhat disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

I strongly disagree with the 4-point antler restriction. Research in western states including an article published by WAFWA in Utah about antler restrictions proved that they did not result in an overall population increase in deer over a long term. It also doesn't allow for an older age class of bucks to survive resulting in bucks with bad genetics to live (bucks that may never become a 4-point regardless of age). I think this may result in less hunter participation in 4-point restriction units. I believe that the only way to increase population increase would be to reduce tags or at least those that allow the take of does and predator management. I agree that reduced season dates would help with population growth. However If the goal is to produce more quality bucks in units it may be best to allow general tag holders to take bucks with 2 points or less and allow limited tag holders to take any buck to promote more bucks with good genetics to pass on those genes.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I disagree with the proposed muzzleloader and archery restrictions. I find that more restrictions on muzzleloaders and archery gear could result in more wounded animals that may not be able to be recovered.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:21 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?

After looking over the proposal, I would vote to let double con. Have what they asked for originally. Adding 30% more of their private ground to the cooperative unit seems like a huge adjustment from what was presented a few months ago. They should be looked at, and I would hope maybe a change made for them to move forward.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:23 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Thank you for letting us hunt on private land. Thank you very much.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:24 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:29 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? Great program

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:32 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 9:48 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 10:13 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations? Strongly agree

Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations? I like the idea of trade lands if the ground is equal for opportunity for me. I'm glad that it seems the unit biologist now is required to go to the land and confirm it is good quality.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 10:50 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 10:59 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations? Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

As a tradition muzzleloader hunter I am very torn about this. I am 36 years old and have hunted with a traditional muzzleloader since I was old enough to hunt and as a dedicated hunter I have carried one in the field during the rifle hunts most of my hunting life as well. The last few years I have hunted along side a few friends that are long range rifle hunters that have transitioned into long rage muzzleloader hunters. We hunt with completely different weapons but we have been able to exist on the same hunt. We have figured out how to make it work and we have had some great experiences. I have watched them take deer and elk at 400+ yards and they have seen me take them within 100 with a patched round ball. We have all come to understand that my muzzleloader's capabilities are much less than theirs are but that has never been an issue between us. As I have listened to all the RAC meetings I have witnessed allot of passion and strong opinions on both sides of the scope argument. It saddens me to see us as hunters so divided and I wish both sides were willing to find some common ground before we destroy ourselves and the hunt we all love so much. My buddies know how passionate I am about hunting with my traditional rifles that require me to get close and give me a sense of nostalgia and connection to the men that introduced me into hunting at a young age. At the same time I can see their passion and understand that long range shooting is what draws them into the field and I understand that scopes are a big part of hunting for them. I am sad that we as traditional muzzleloader hunters have become a dying breed and I wish more people could understand why we want to hunt the way we do but unfortunately I think the boat has sailed. Long gone is the hunt I fell in love with while following my dad around in November those many years ago. I wish we could bring those days back but for now I choose to coexist with my hunting brothers and make the best of what we have, and we have allot. I won't be one of the people that say that I won't ever hunt again if I don't get my way, there would be too much for me to lose if I did that. It doesn't matter what the decision is, I will never give up on my traditional muzzleloaders, I have too many memories tied up in them and there are too many more memories to be made.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Somewhat agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?

5 day hunt isn't going to give more opportunity or decrease harvest. More people will shoot the first buck they see with a shorter hunt. These proposals won't help youth have more opportunity to hunt because they won't be able to shoot smaller bucks. The biologists have lots of data around the survival rates of younger bucks and hunting isn't the biggest issue in their survival rates. Automobiles, habitat, predators, and weather play a larger role. All of these limitations will limit hunters but not make a difference in increased deer or larger bucks.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

Years ago When the division proposed allowing scopes, the data said the majority of hunters wanted scopes. Several years later the the division is proposing to remove scopes and the data still shows the majority of hunters want scopes. The majority of hunters are regular guys shooting regular muzzleloaders and they want scopes. Their are some "long range" muzzleloader hunters. This recommendation to limit the long range guys will also limit all the regular guys including youth and older hunters that will struggle without the aid of scopes.

I have three sons I hunt with. All three of them love the muzzleloader hunt as it is currently set up. If scopes are removed they have all said they will stop hunting or rifle hunt because the open sights are too difficult. They are into sports and video games and hunting with open sights will push them off this hunt.

I know this is a hot topic and I can see both sides of this issue. It seems reasonable to compromise and go to a fixed 4X or a red dot/1X to help cater to youth and individuals with poor eyesight while also limiting long range shots on a more primitive weapon hunt. I asked the division why they don't like this idea and the reason was it was dangerous and difficult for the officers to check scopes. This seems silly as it is more difficult to enforce and check a lot of the rules and regulations that are in place.

In 2016 the majority of hunters wanted scopes and they were added. Today the majority still want scopes. They should be allowed to have scopes. If a concession is to be made it should be something that keeps scopes on the guns but limits the 600-700 yard shots.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I didn't hunt much in high school because of football. I went on the rifle hunt a few times but there were a lot of people. I went on the muzzleloader hunt this year with my Dad, brothers and Uncles and had a blast. We saw lots of deer and I was able to harvest a nice buck at 120 yards. Both my brothers and my cousin came along. The scopes made it so we could all enjoy the hunt and have a chance to hit something with a muzzleloader. it was nice to have a family hunt. If the muzzleloaders are removed my Dad will still hunt because he is really in to hunting. My brothers and cousins won't because they are fair weather middle of the road hunters.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:21 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? The data doesn't support the recommendation!
The majority of hunters don't support the recommendation!
At least find a compromise and allow 1-4 power scopes.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:24 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I am 17. This is my first year using a muzzleloader. I liked the scope. I don't like the rifle hunt because there are too many people but no scope will make it too hard for me to shoot a muzzleloader. if the scopes are taken away I don't think i will go hunting anymore.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:28 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

I shot my first deer with a muzzleloader this year. It has a scope on it. I couldn't have done it without a scope. I'm 13 years old. If you take away scopes it will make it too hard for me and my brother to hunt with muzzleloaders. Is that what you are trying to do? Keep us from hunting with muzzleloaders?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:30 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the CWMU
recommendations?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:36 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

My Dad let me use his muzzleloader with a scope this year. Please don't get rid of scopes. I think I could do pretty good with a 4 power scope. But it would be too hard for me without a scope so I wouldn't want to go hunting anymore.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

What are we supposed to do with the muzzleloaders Utah created the market for but we can't use any more? Don't say that we can choose to use them on the ALW hunts because so can the guys that want the mountain to themselves with their flintlocks. Nobody is asking for the muzzleloader score restriction. The data doesn't suggest it's needed. It's purely social and it is divisive. It's drawing a wedge in the sportsman community for no reason. Tell me what your favorite hunt method is and I'll tell you what I don't like about it. The difference is that I won't try and stop you from doing it.

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?

As I stated in my comments for my regions RAC Meeting, I strongly oppose changing the rule on scopes from how it currently stands. I can't understand how it is being recomend to change to only open sights, when the data clearly indicates that the majority of hunters surveyed wish to keep magnified optics. Changing to open sights is even more restrictive than the rules used to be. If the concern is people taking too long of shots, unethical hunters will take too long of shots regardless of aiming devices. Many of us have recently invested a considerable amount of money into modern muzzle loading equipment only to have it potentially outlawed. That's not right!

I urge the board to listen to the majority of hunters and keep the rule as it currently stands. And under no circumstances move all the way to only Iron sights.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?

I'm 17 and hunt with my dad and our favorite hunt is the muzzleloader. All the hunters in my family are against any change to the scope rule. I watched the video and don't know why the change is still being even talked about. There are way more people who don't want a change. Putting the I don't cares with the change people is just trying to make that side look better. They could be put with the don't change side and make it uneven, so why include them at all? Messing with the numbers to work for one side is tacky and sketch. PLEASE DON'T RUIN MY FAVORITE HUNT!

Form Name:
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback
November 16, 2023 11:55 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations? Strongly disagree

Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations? 1-4 power scopes are a better compromise since the data and hunters don't agree with entirely eliminating scopes.
