

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 8, 2024 2:19 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** great program  
**recommended changes?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 8, 2024 3:15 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

Glad to see the CWMU rule being addressed but I do have some comments.

Cons:

1. While I do like the majority of the plan to help CWMU's reach their cow harvest. I don't believe in any circumstance that the CWMU's should be given private antlerless elk permits even if they are just giving them away. The majority benefit to the public of the CWMU program is that they get 100% of the antlerless tags if a CWMU chooses the 90/10 bucks/bulls split. If a CWMU needs to be given cow permits because they aren't meeting their quota then I suggest they be moved down to a different tag split which will then give the private land owners more control over the cow tags without sacrificing the public's share of the deal (the 50% partner in the CWMU program). Whenever tag splits are brought up the CWMU's tout that the public get all the antlerless tags and therefore there is no reason to change the splits. I would hate to see the public's benefit be given away without splits being adjusted accordingly.

2. Along those same lines, I'm saddened to not see anything addressing CWMU's that don't have any antlerless permits to give to the public. There are 56 CWMU's that are receiving buck/bull permits in 2024 that offer no antlerless tags to the public. Only 2 of these have elk permits. The rest are deer only or deer/pronghorn units. These CWMU's don't offer antlerless tags for good reason because they don't have elk, and our deer management plan tries to steer away from hunting doe deer too much. Nevertheless, these CWMU's are taking advantage of a 90/10 split which maximizes their benefit and minimizes the public benefit simply because of where their units are located. I would recommend that all of the CWMU's that don't have antlerless permits to offer are required to either do an 80/20 split or give 1 additional antlered tag per year to the public, whichever is greater.

3. I would like to see something recommended to the wildlife board to require the DWR to keep the hunt planner updated. I attempted to contact all 125 registered CWMU's this spring in preparation for the application period. There were several instances where the contact information provided on the hunt planner was incorrect (both emails and phone numbers). Also the information about the CWMU's (rules, number of guests, etc) was incorrect in almost every instance. The general public has a lot of issues with the CWMU program but I truly believe that at least half of that is because of misinformation or a lack of information, and having the hunt planner incorrect or providing bad contact info doesn't help. I would like to see the DWR directed to review/update the hunt planner every time a COR is renewed. If they are already supposed to be doing that I can tell you it isn't happening.

4. I think the public should be given 5 minutes to comment on this item since there is so much being crammed into one presentation.

Pros:

1. Super happy to see the guest policy being addressed. I think that has been a long time coming and is a reasonable compromise. Public hunters can either be guided and bring one guest, or they can have up to a car full of people that has to stay with them. Makes much more sense than what has been done in the past.
2. I support the changes with trade lands and contiguous acres and think they will be good things for both the public and private.
3. As mentioned a bit above, while I don't agree with everything being proposed for the antlerless elk harvests I am happy to see some of the other tools being proposed to help with antlerless harvest to help get some of these elk herds under control.
4. Glad to see the CWMU advisory committee helped out by giving them a little more direction. They do a great work.

Please take a real look at each of these issues and don't just pass everything through like is usually done with CWMU proposals. These are important issues to everyone. If you don't feel like you understand the program, please educate yourself on both sides so you can make informed decisions.

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the proposed changes to  
Administrative Rule R657-41?**

---

Strongly agree

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 8, 2024 6:33 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** Nice to be able to take my dad hunting.  
**recommended changes?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 12:39 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I represent nonprofit Chairbound Sportsman and have a general comment in support of the CWMU offerings for nonprofit hunts of big game species. Over the years many of our members with disabilities have had successful hunts and this has been a great benefit for their self confidence and rewarding outdoor experiences. Please keep these ongoing and consider adding cow elk hunts as well. Regards Kenneth Vaughn Board member 801-499-9770

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 3:01 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---



**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I think there were some great things that came out of the CWMU rule committee but because the committee was stacked with individuals who were a voice in favor of the CWMU association instead of a balanced group, the committee recommendations fell short in a few areas. Here are my thoughts.

1. While I do like the majority of the plan to help CWMU's reach their cow harvest. I don't believe in any circumstance that the CWMU's should be given private cow permits even if they are just giving them away. The majority benefit to the public of the CWMU program is that they get 100% of the antlerless tags if a CWMU chooses the 90/10 bucks/bulls split. If a CWMU needs to be given cow permits because they aren't meeting their quota then I suggest they be moved down to a different tag split which will then give the private land owners more control over the cow tags without sacrificing the benefit to the public (the 50% partner in the CWMU program). Whenever tag splits are brought up the CWMU's tout that the public get all the antlerless tags and therefore there is no reason to change the splits. I would hate to see the public's benefit be given away without splits being adjusted accordingly.

2. Along those same lines, I'm saddened to not see anything addressing CWMU's that don't have any antlerless permits to give to the public. There are 56 CWMU's that are receiving buck/bull permits in 2024 that offer no antlerless tags to the public. Only 2 of the 56 have elk permits. The rest are deer only or deer/pronghorn units. These CWMU's don't offer antlerless tags for good reason because they are not elk CWMU's, and our deer management plan tries to steer away from hunting doe deer too much. Nevertheless, these CWMU's are taking advantage of a 90/10 split which maximizes their benefit and minimizes the public benefit simply because of where their units are located. I would recommend that all of the CWMU's that don't have antlerless permits to offer are required to either do an 80/20 split or give 1 additional antlered tag to the public each year, whichever is greater.

3. I would like to see something recommended to the wildlife board to require the DWR to keep the hunt planner updated. I attempted to contact all 125 registered CWMU's this spring in preparation for the application period. There were several instances where the contact information provided on the hunt planner was incorrect (both emails and phone numbers). Also the information about the CWMU's (rules, number of guests, etc) was incorrect in almost every instance. The general public has a lot of issues with the CWMU program, but I truly believe that at least half of that is because of misinformation or a lack of information, and having the hunt planner incorrect or providing bad contact info doesn't help. I would like to see the DWR directed to review/update the hunt planner every time a COR is renewed. If this is supposed to be happening already I can

promise you its not taking place.

I do have some things I'm very much in support of in the new rule changes and wanted to put a few of them below.

1. Super happy to see the guest policy being addressed. I think that has been a long time coming and is a reasonable compromise. Public hunters can either be guided and bring one guest, or they can have up to a car full of people that has to stay with them. Makes much more sense than what has been done in the past and brings a family hunting element to CWMU's that wasn't always there previously.

2. I support the changes with trade lands and contiguous acres and think they will be good things for both the public and private.

3. As mentioned a bit above, while I don't agree with everything being proposed for the antlerless elk harvests I am happy to see some of the other tools being proposed to help with antlerless harvest to help get some of these elk herds under control.

4. I think its great that they're giving the CWMU advisory committee some help by offering better guidance and direction. That committee does great work.

Please take a real look at each of these issues and don't just pass everything through like is usually done with CWMU proposals. These are important issues to everyone. If you don't feel like you understand the program, please educate yourself on both sides so you can make informed decisions.

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the proposed changes to  
Administrative Rule R657-41?**

---

Strongly agree

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 5:49 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I've been a public hunter on a cwmu unit and killed the biggest deer of my  
**recommended changes?** life and had the best hunt to date.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

Been involved as a landowner and an outfitter in the CWM you program for over 25 years I guide in multiple western states. This is the best program by far in the west couldn't be more supportive help south struggling land owners to keep their property so they don't have to sell. It gives access to public Hunters without having to pay to get on the property that is typically managed to a much higher standard couldn't be more supportive of it. It's a win-win thank you.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 6:14 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these**  
**recommended changes?**

I look forward to hunting one of the CWMU that border the town I live in. They have much better animals on them than the general managed unit that I normally hunt. I think it's a fantastic program. Thank you

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 6:19 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I'm a public hunter and haven't drawn. I have been an observer with  
**recommended changes?** someone who has drawn though and had an amazing time.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the latest cougar harvest and management information?** Too many predators mountain lions and coyotes need to be reduced. Everyone would rather see elk deer than cougars and coyotes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?** One of the reasons I like to hunt the Cwmu It's more exclusive and it's a good hunt with lots of animals. I'm hoping that they don't double all of the cow tags and wipe out all the elk and make these hunts. Hard. I like restricting the hunting of getting your cow not selling more tags. Have been hunting the booby hole for multiple years and always liked the way it was set up and I always saw elk. Hopefully they don't double the tags make the hunting harder.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

CWMU are supposed to be more exclusive and harder to draw. Gives everyone a better chance to actually harvest an animal. Selling more tags is going to hurt the population of the CWMU. I've hunted CWMU for a couple years and it is an amazing experience, they are already ran great by awesome people. You don't need to turn their private land into hunts where you see more people than animals. Leave it how it is and do more predator control.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 9:43 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 10, 2024 2:21 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 10, 2024 8:05 am

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these**      I submitted this earlier and upon further study and rewatching this I strongly  
**recommended changes?**      support the elk population tools.  
I do not support the atv horse usage portion, i feel it is too much overreach  
on how a private land owner can provide stewardship for their own  
property.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the latest cougar harvest and management information?** I am in support of continued trapping of Cougars.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?** I am against any kind of trade lands. These trades never favor the public hunter. It is confusing trying to find the trades on the DWR website and they are not shown on Onx. With the many mapping systems available, OnX ,Gohunt ect, there is no need to trade lands for a recognizable boundary. People can accurately navigate the boundaries. A lot of these CWMU operators want trades because the deer and elk move off of the CWMU onto public lands adjacent to the private. By trading lands, we are taking opportunity from the public hunter. I would like to see Zero land trades. If a CWMU can't make it with 100% private land, then they shouldn't get an approval to operate.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?**

One of the purposes of the conservation tags is to make money for wildlife. Covy said in his presentation that some of the recommended changes are to "Maximize conservation permit revenue". I find this disingenuous with the way things are currently. The UDWR is leaving money on the table. One sure way to Maximize revenue is to eliminate the In-person Validation of applications at the Western Hunting Expo. Currently an applicant must physically travel to Salt Lake City to be allowed to apply for the 200 permits taken from the public drawing. How is that fair to the people that live in Blanding (308 miles) or Vernal (175 miles) or St. George (305 miles) let alone Nonresidents. If we are truly trying to Maximize revenue, then we need to get rid of the In-person Validation and go to online applications. There is even data that supports this. In 2021, because of the pandemic, people were allowed to apply for the 200 tags online. That year there was 21,680 applicants. That's over 2000 more applicants than the next highest year which was 2023 and had 19,565 applicants. In addition, the number of Nonresident applications in 2021 was 161,187. The next highest year was 2023 at 97,853 applications. that's a difference of 63,000 applications which equates to \$315,000 we are not getting just from Nonresidents because of in-person validation. (These numbers come from the 2023 DWR audit. The most recent I could find)

These are public permits, and they should be made available to ALL that want to apply, not just those that have the time and means to travel many hundreds of miles and take a day off from work. I would highly recommend that the RAC and Board make a motion to eliminate In-person Validation for the 200 public permits at the Expo. This would be a sure way to increase Revenue on these public permits.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

The DWR has already made changes that were not consistent with State Code by allowing CWMU's with less than required acreage to participate. The DWR has also closed public lands to the public to the benefit of CWMU's. The primary purpose of the DWR is not to cater to CWMU's but to the general population. The majority of funds for DWR come from licenses and these are purchased by the vast majority that are not represented in this proposal. A firm NO to this proposal.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 14, 2024 10:57 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---



**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I am disappointed in the Advisory Board and the recommendations that they made or failed to make. Here are a few questions or comments I would like suggest.

First I want to say there are many people over the 20+ years of the program who have benefited. There have been many stories of positive experiences. At the same time, the public gave up too much to the landowners.

1. The tag split needs to change. 90/10 is hugely disproportionate to the value each brings to the table. The landowners bring the land. Without the animals, the land has no value in harvesting wildlife. The Public brings the animals. Without the land, there would be no place to harvest the animals. Each is dependent upon the other. The split should be created by the saying 'if you split it, the other gets to chose'. There is a COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT UNIT. We need to create a better split. If the landowners come up with the split, 90/10 for example, the public get to choose which number they want, 90 or 10. If the public chooses the split, then the landowners get to choose the number.
2. The public gets too little for the amount the landowners get. The landowners get 12 weeks to harvest their tags. The public gets 5 days? The landowner gets guaranteed tags, the public gets in a lottery? The landowners get to hunt with a rifle for 12 weeks, the public gets 5 days?
3. Changing the split will have an impact on point creep due to more bucks and bull tags going into the public draw.
4. Why is it when the landowner gives up 10% of the bucks and bull tags and goes to 80/20, they increase the antler less tags by 40-50%? Why would they not just get 10%?
5. Change the season dates of the CWMU to coincide with the general and LE hunts. This would help all the general public land by dispersing the animals thru the entire landscape rather than them congregating on private land.
6. Allow public hunters 2 weeks to hunt the private land.
7. Why would you give the extra antler less tags back to the landowner when they chose the 90/10 split?
8. Create a roster of people who can respond at a moments notice to harvest antler less animals. This creates more opportunity.
9. Why the disparity of what the private landowner gets and the general public?
10. If the landowners want to exit the program, then they can sell all their tags and hold their hunts in the same time frame as the rest of the state. This potentially could lead to a decrease in the cost of the tags due to everyone having to hunt at the same time.
11. Change the split. If the landowners want to charge more for their tags to make up for the difference, they can. If they chose to not participate any longer, then they can hunt with the rest of the public.
12. Make it so every tag sold thru the CWMU process eliminates the persons points. This should also include the sportsmans and other conservation tags. This helps with point creep

We can and should do better.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 15, 2024 11:34 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?** I understood the DWRs rule was 100 percent of cow tags went to the public if a CWMU does a 90/10 split. This change would break their own rule and give CWMUs operators the ability to sell cow tags. Either more bull tags should go to the public, or 100 percent of cow tags needs to stay in the public draw according the the rule. I think the CWMU program could be great if they could provide more public opportunity and allow public hunters to bring a few guests on when they do draw tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 17, 2024 1:39 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the latest cougar harvest and management information?**

I believe that having the ability to trap cougar's is a great tool. Trappers have been able to target them in places it would be extremely difficult to chase with hounds or spot and stock them. You are not near as dependent on having to have snow to track them. I also would like to see being able to sell the green pelts.

---

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these**  
**recommended changes?**

I am grateful there is an increased effort to make hunting fair for public hunters on cwmu draws. I still feel the most fair way to treat the cwmu, would be to follow the surrounding seasons/weapons. We all know that during the hunting seasons, a large amount of game, especially elk, head to private property. Mostly, because there is much less hunting pressure. It seems a little unfair, to then hunt on these CWMU's on different dates/weapons than the surrounding public land. I would think it makes sense, that during archery season, the cwmu also must use archery only. During muzzleloader seasons, they must use muzzleloaders etc. I also think they should follow the same hunt dates. If there are no hunts on public land at the time, there should not be hunts going on private land.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 22, 2024 6:32 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** Seems like a fair option to hunt on those private lands.  
**recommended changes?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 22, 2024 7:22 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these**  
**recommended changes?**

I listened to the presentations and thought the members of the committees that were on the rule change did a good job talking about things they got or things they didn't get. Seems like a real fair outcome. I've always had good experiences on cooperative wildlife units and appreciate being able to hunt on private land once every few years.

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 23, 2024 6:50 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I really like the new guest policy. I really like hunting the private lands. Keep  
**recommended changes?** up the good work.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 23, 2024 8:46 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I got to take my dad on a hunt on a cooperative unit where he drew a tag. We have so much fun. I was glad to be able to go with him and be a part of that experience. I'm glad that has the opportunity for me to hunt on their private land. Please keep the program going.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 23, 2024 11:41 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?**

Strongly agree with the money raised for the conservation fund. There is opportunity though to change this program to provide greater opportunity for the general public. Please consider moving some (at least 50%) of these tags from an auction to some sort of public draw. I agree with many of the comments made by Ritchie in the Northeastern RAC.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 25, 2024 10:38 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?** Had a great experience on a CWMU in northern Utah. I really like the program. Keep up the good work. Glad i got to hunt on private land.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 25, 2024 8:13 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?** I support the secondary motion presented from the NE RAC. It is time to give the average public a chance at these tags.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?**

I am supportive of any and all efforts to reduce the ridiculous number of auction tags (Conservation tags) Utah has currently.

I support the secondary motion presented from the NE RAC on this topic and like the approach to take a percentage of the current auction tags and make them available to everyone through a raffle or something similar. My strong preference would be to take 75% (225 tags) of the approximately 300 current auction tags and make them available to all and keep 25% (75 tags) for auction to the highest bidder.

Actually if I had it my way, I would only have 1-2 auction tags per species and call it good.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 26, 2024 3:59 pm

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 28, 2024 1:30 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?** I agree with these changes, as well as the the secondary motion proposed by the NE RAC.

---