

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

June 13, 2024, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtube.com/live/sMQihQZGxKc>

AGENDA

Thursday, June 13, 2024, 9:00 A.M.

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Randy Dearth, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Randy Dearth, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Gary Nielson, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– J. Shirley, DWR Director | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. Legislative Statute Updates
– Kyle Maynard, Assistant Attorney General | INFORMATIONAL |
| Rules to be impacted by Legislative Actions | |
| R657-5 – Taking Big Game | |
| R657-13 – Taking Fish and Crawfish | |
| R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Program | |
| R657-42 – Fees, Exchange, Surrenders, Refunds | |
| R657-44 – Big Game Depredation | |
| 6. Cougar Update
– Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator | INFORMATIONAL |
| 7. CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37
– Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 9. Conservation Permit List
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 10. Other Business
– Randy Dearth, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Wildlife Board Action Log

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

Fall 2023 – Target Date – Special Use Permits on WMA’s – Guides and Outfitters – Non-consumptive user fee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into Guides and Outfitters obtaining special use permits on WMA’s and to look at implementing a fee for non-consumptive users. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Chelsea Duke
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: August 25, 2022

Fall 2024 – Target Date – Increase Trapping Fee for Non-residents

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into a trap fee increase for non-residents for 2024. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 3, 2023

Fall 2024 – Target Date – CWMU Recommendations Committee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to form a CWMU Recommendations Committee to review the rule and bring recommendations back to the board in June 2024. The committee should consider if the rule is equitable for both the public and the private parties. It needs to be an incentive based program to encourage CWMU’s to fulfill antlerless harvest. Tools need to be in place to encourage CWMU operators and the division to obtain necessary harvest for unit objectives. The rule needs to address non-contiguous lands and set requirements for trade lands – land traded needs to be comparable to be fair to both the public and the operator. Trade lands need to be posted with a common sign such that the public can easily recognize it as such. If public tags increase or decrease then CWMU tags should do the same. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Chad Wilson
Action: To be presented during the May RAC Meetings and June Wildlife Board Meeting 2024
Placed on Action Log: May 4, 2023

Winter 2024 – Target Date – Use of Barrels for Bear Baiting Stations

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to work with the federal land agencies to address any concerns that they may have with the use of barrels on the landscape. This is to be placed on the Action Log and addressed during the January 2025 board meeting.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2024

Winter 2024 – Target Date – Shed Antler Gathering Season Date Recommendations

MOTION: I move that we ask the Shed Antler Gathering Committee to reconvene and to recommend shed antler gathering season dates for residents that matches the non-resident dates. The division should report back with a new recommendation from the committee during the December 2024 RAC meetings/January 2025 Wildlife Board meeting. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: May 2, 2024

Fall 2025 – Target Date – “Destination Water bodies” List

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to create a list of “Destination water bodies” throughout the state. This list will determine which fishery management plans are presented statewide and which may be presented to only the local RAC. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Randy Oplinger
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: September 21, 2023

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

May 2, 2024 Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtube.com/live/QvH1qoTk1Qk>

AGENDA

Thursday, May 2, 2024, 9:00 A.M.

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
 - Randy Dearth, Chairman
2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
 - Randy Dearth, Chairman
3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
 - Gary Nielson, Vice-Chairman
4. DWR Update **INFORMATIONAL**
 - J. Shirley, DWR Director
5. Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2024 **ACTION**
 - Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
6. Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2024 **ACTION**
 - Rusty Robinson, OIAL Species Coordinator
7. Bull Elk Permit Recommendations for 2024 **ACTION**
 - Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
8. Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2024 **ACTION**
 - Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
9. Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2024 **ACTION**
 - Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
10. Shed Antler Gathering and Big Game Rule Amendments **ACTION**
 - Rusty Robinson, OIAL Species Coordinator
11. 2024 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations **ACTION**
 - Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
12. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
 - Randy Dearth, Chairman

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2024 –Target Date –Special Use Permits on WMAs–Guides and Outfitters – Non-consumptive user fee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into Guides and Outfitters obtaining special use permits on WMA’s and to look at implementing a fee for non-consumptive users. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Blair Stringham
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: August 25, 2022

Fall 2024 – Target Date – Increase Trapping Fee for Nonresidents

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into a trap fee increase for nonresidents for 2024. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 3, 2023

Fall 2024 – Target Date – Mandatory Tooth Reporting

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into mandatory tooth reporting. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Dax Mangus
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: May 4, 2023

Fall 2024 – Target Date – CWMU Recommendations Committee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to form a CWMU Recommendations Committee to review the rule and bring recommendations back to the board in June 2024. The committee should consider if the rule is equitable for both the public and the private parties. It needs to be an incentive based program to encourage CWMU’s to fulfill antlerless harvest. Tools need to be in place to encourage CWMU operators and the division to obtain necessary harvest for unit objectives. The rule needs to address non-contiguous lands and set requirements for trade lands – land traded needs to be comparable to be fair to both the public and the operator. Trade lands need to be posted with a common sign such that the public can easily recognize it as such. If public tags increase or decrease then CWMU tags should do the same. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
May 2, 2024

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Chad Wilson
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: May 4, 2023

Fall 2025 – Target Date – “Destination Water bodies” List

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to create a list of “Destination water bodies” throughout the state. This list will determine which fishery management plans are presented statewide and which may be presented to only the local RAC. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Randy Oplinger
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: September 21, 2023

Winter 2024/25 – Target Date – Shed Antler Gathering Season Dates

MOTION: I move that we ask the Shed Antler Gathering Committee to reconvene and to recommend shed antler gathering season dates for residents that match the non-resident dates. The Division should report back with a new recommendation from the committee during the December 2024 RAC meetings/January 2025 Wildlife Board meeting. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Randy Dearth
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: May 2, 2024

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
May 2, 2024 Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson seconded by Kent Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 4, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting and the April 9, 2024 Wildlife Board Work Session as submitted.

3) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 2024 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed -2, with Bryce Thurgood and Kent Johnson opposed.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Buck Deer permit number recommendations as presented by the Division.

AMENDED MOTION by Bryce Thurgood: I would ask that we amend the motion to meet in the middle of the permit recommendations with an increase in Southern Region permits

AMENDED MOTION died for lack of a second.

4) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2024 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the OIAL permit number recommendations as presented by the Division, including increasing the moose permits from 22 to 25.

AMENDED MOTION by Kent Johnson: I would ask that we amend the motion to also increase the bison permit numbers on hunt 6535 from 3 to 5 permits.

AMENDED MOTION accepted by Bryce Thurgood, and seconded by Gary Nielson.

2nd AMENDED MOTION by Bret Selman: I would ask that we also reduce the Mineral Mountain ram permits by 1.

2nd AMENDED MOTION was not accepted by Bryce Thurgood. 2nd AMENDED MOTION died.

5) Bull Elk Permit Recommendations for 2024 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bull Elk permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

6) Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2024 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Buck Pronghorn permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

7) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2024 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Kent Johnson and

MOTION: I move that we approve the Antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the Division, and add language in the guidebooks about not taking a cow with a calf.

8) Shed Antler Gathering and Big Game Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Kent Johnson and fails, with Gary Nielson, Paula Richmond and Bret Selman opposed, and Bryce Thurgood and Kent Johnson in favor.

MOTION: I move that we keep the requirement to plug sheep until the new system is in place requiring photo evidence.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, and died for a lack of second.

MOTION: I move that we ban the possession of thermal imaging for the take of big game year-round.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the Shed Antler Gathering Committee to reconvene and to recommend shed antler gathering season dates for residents that matches the non-resident dates. The Division should report back with a new recommendation from the committee during the December 2024 RAC meetings/January 2025 Wildlife Board meeting. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Gary Nielson and failed, with Bryce Thurgood, Paula Richmond and Kent Johnson opposed, and Bret Selman and Gary Nielson in favor.

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

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Bret Selman and passed

unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the proposal as presented, excluding the season closure for non-residents on shed antler gathering.

9) 2024 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor, with Bret Selman recusing himself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations for the 2024 CWMU Antlerless Permits as presented.

10) Other Business (**Contingent**)

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
May 2, 2024 Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Randy Dearth – Chair	Paula Richmond
Gary Nielson– Vice-Chair	Bryce Thurgood
J. Shirley – Exec Secretary	Kent Johnson
	Bret Selman

RAC Chairs

Central – Mike Christensen
Southern – Austin Atkinson
Southeastern – Dana Truman
Northeastern – Grizz Oleen
Northern – Brad Buchanan

Division Personnel

Mike Canning	Dallon Christensen	Covy Jones	Paul Gedge
Justin Shannon	Mike Christensen	Rusty Robinson	Dustin Mitchell
Miles Hanberg	Staci Coons	Chad Wilson	
Chris Wood	Paige Wiren	Brandon Baron	
Kevin Bunnell	Teresa Griffin	Mark Martinez	
Blair Stringham	Dax Mangus	Wyatt Bubak	
Jason Vernon	Riley Peck	Dallon Christensen	
Kyle Maynard	Jim Christensen	Sydney Lamb	
Kent Hersey	Lindy Varney	Kenny Johnson	

Public Present

Troy Justensen	Wade Garrett
Angie Wonnacott	Braden Richmond
Kevin Norman	
Brandon Zundel	

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
May 2, 2024 Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
<https://youtube.com/live/QvH1qoTk1Qk>

- 00:00:00** Chairman Dearth called the meeting to order and read a formal written meeting introduction.
- 00:02:08** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:02:48** Chairman Dearth asked the Board and RAC members to introduce themselves. Dana Truman was representing the Southeastern Region, and attended the meeting virtually.
- 00:04:04** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the January 4, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting and the April 9, 2024 Wildlife Board Work Session as submitted.
- 00:04:48** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
Vice Chairman Nielson gave updates on three different action log items: the item pertaining to guides and outfitters; the item pertaining to trap fee increase; and the item pertaining to the CWMU Recommendations Committee. Vice Chairman Nielson noted that the Division is still working on the item pertaining to the use of barrels on bear bait stations.
- 00:06:40** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**
Director J. Shirley gave updates on how the severe winter impacted statewide staffing workload and efforts, as well as gave Aquatic, Administrative Services, Habitat, Law Enforcement Outreach and Wildlife section updates.
The Board asked about stocking sterile fish.
- 00:22:52** **5) Buck Deer Permit Recommendations for 203 (Action)**
Big Game Coordinator Dax Mangus noted two corrections of numbers that were published in the previously distributed RAC packets. He also shared updates on collar data that was gathered as deer were coming out of the 2023-24 winter season.
- 00:24:38** **Board/RAC Questions**
The Board asked about recommended permit numbers on the Beaver and Zion units, and the buck to doe ratio on the Zion unit; and also asked about hunter satisfaction feedback on different Zion unit hunts.
The Board commented on how much the public can learn by spending time in the

field with Division biologists.

The Board also voiced support for the management approach that the Division is currently taking versus different management approaches from past years.

Dax alerted the Board to overlapping multi-year season dates that were published in the hunt planner, and that the overlaps have been brought to the Division's attention by some members of the public. He suggested addressing changing the overlapping hunt dates as an item on the June 13, 2024 Wildlife Board meeting agenda.

The Board asked about the average days of harvest.

The Board discussed whether or not at the June 13 meeting they wanted to modify the overlapping hunt season dates.

Wildlife Board Liaison Staci Coons shared with the Board what their options are should they want to modify season dates.

The Board decided that they did not want to address the overlapping season dates as a future agenda item.

00:55:32 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

00:57:40 RAC Recommendation

All RACs passed the permit recommendations, with varying stipulations regarding the Southern Region permit recommendations.

01:01:05 Public Comments/Division Clarification

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

01:06:51 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

01:07:53 Board Discussion

The Board commented on the small number of public comments received on this agenda item versus the large number of applicants applying for permits, and voiced support for creating more hunting opportunity.

The Board voiced appreciation for the Division's management approach as well as the Division's acknowledgement of public input, and asked which level of hunter success the Division used to determine recommended permit numbers.

The Board commented on Utah's general season deer hunt, and voiced additional support for creating more opportunity as is allowed by the Mule Deer Statewide Management Plan.

The Board suggested that the Mule Deer Committee look at which units could be managed for quality versus opportunity hunts.

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed 3-2, with Bryce Thurgood and Kent Johnson opposed.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Buck Deer permit number recommendations as presented by the Division.

AMENDED MOTION by Bryce Thurgood: I would ask that we amend the motion to meet in the middle of the permit recommendations, with an increase in Southern Region permits.

AMENDED MOTION dies for lack of a second.

01:19:35 6) Once-in-a-Lifetime Permit Recommendations for 2024 (Action)

OIL Coordinator Rusty Robinson thanked conservation partners, shared the reasoning behind specific permit number changes, and reviewed highlights from having taken this agenda item through the RAC public process

01:21:36 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked about increased permit numbers on bison hunts, and how resident versus non-resident bison permits numbers are calculated.

They asked about moose permit numbers, and if moose are suffering from tick infestations this year.

01:29:10 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

Chairman Dearth shared a personal bison hunting anecdote.

01:31:23 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the recommendations with varying stipulations.

01:33:58 Public Comments/Division Clarification

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

01:36:57 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

01:37:35 Board Discussion/Questions

The Board asked if the Division would be comfortable with issuing the higher number of moose permits that was recommended by one of the RACs.

The Board commented on the potential of Utah getting additional bighorn sheep rams from Nevada.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the OIAL permit recommendations with two exceptions

AMENDED MOTION by Kent Johnson: I would ask that we amend the motion to also increase the bison permit numbers on hunt 6535 from 3 to 5 permits.

AMENDED MOTION accepted by Bryce Thurgood, and seconded by Gary Nielson.

2nd AMENDED MOTION by Bret Selman: I would ask that we reduce the Mineral Mountain ram permits by 1.

2nd AMENDED MOTION not accepted by Bryce Thurgood. 2nd AMENDED MOTION dies.

01:50:53 7) Bull Elk Permit Recommendations for 2024 (Action)

Big Game Coordinator Dax Magnus voiced appreciation for Staci Coons' public meetings expertise.

Dax gave an overview of this agenda item.

01:52:24 Board/RAC Questions

There were no questions from the Board or RACs.

01:52:42 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

01:54:32 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the permit recommendations with one stipulation.

01:56:38 Public Comments/Division Clarification

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

01:59:19 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

Dax Mangus gave feedback on the Northern RAC's recommendation.

02:01:18 Board Discussion/Questions

The Board asked the Division about permit numbers on the San Juan unit.

The Board voiced appreciation for Staci Coons' professional support of the board.

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bill Elk permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

02:05:53 8) Buck Pronghorn Permit Recommendations for 2024 (Action)

Big Game Coordinator Dax Mangus gave an overview of this agenda item.

02:07:07 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked about fawn production on the San Rafael North unit and about permit recommendations on the Parker Mountain unit.

02:10:05 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

02:10:47 RAC Recommendations

All RACs accepted the Division's permit recommendations as presented

02:12:05 Public Comments/Division Clarification

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

02:12:47 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

02:13:06 Board Questions/Discussion

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Buck Pronghorn permit recommendations as presented by the Division.

02:14:00 9) Antlerless Permit Recommendations for 2024 (Action)

Big Game Coordinator Dax Mangus gave an overview of the Division's recommendations.

02:15:17 Board Questions

The Board asked about the permit number increase on the Wasatch unit, and asked about antlerless harvest of deer and depredation permit numbers.

The Board asked about changes to antlerless hunts on the La Sal Mountains.

02:22:52 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

02:24:55 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed motions to accept the Division's recommendations as presented with the Central Rack adding one stipulation.

02:28:53 Public Comments/Division Clarification

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

02:32:40 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

02:33:13 Board Discussion

The Board asked about cow moose with a calf harvest numbers.

The Board discussed whether or not the Board needed to direct the Division to take any action with regard to prohibiting the take of a cow moose with a calf, and commented on the member of the public who brought this issue up at the Central RAC meeting.

The Board recognized the value of harvesting antlerless animals to alleviate wildlife-human conflict.

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Antlerless permit recommendations as presented by the Division, and add language in the guidebooks about not taking a cow with a calf.

02:41:57 Lunch Break

03:30:39 10) Shed Antler Gathering and Big Game Rule Amendments

Once-in-a-lifetime Species Coordinator Rusty Robinson opened the floor for questions.

03:32:24 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked about the number of non-residents who took the Division's online shed antler ethics course, and how many of those non-residents also had a Utah hunting license.

The RAC asked what the legal definition differences are among the words "collect," "gather" and "take," and if searching for a shed antler falls within the legal definition of "take."

The Board asked about a technology that the Division anticipates using that allows a user to take photos.

The Board also asked how many states have shed gathering seasons, and of those, which ones have different season dates for resident and non-residents.

The Board then asked a hypothetical question about illegal harvest during management cactus buck hunts.

03:41:10 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

03:42:58 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the permit recommendations with varying stipulations and opposition.

03:47:58 Public Comments/Division Clarification

There were no public comments on this agenda item.

03:48:10 RAC Summaries

Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.

03:50:19 Board Discussion

The Board asked about the Division's sheep plugging recommendation, and asked if the requirement to plug a ram's horn is a potential deterrent against poaching. The Board suggested requiring a photo to accompany the mandatory bighorn sheep harvest data report. The Board then suggested leaving the sheep plugging rule as is.

The Board asked if, in the future, photos are going to be a mandatory reporting requirement.

The following motion was made by, Bryce Thurgood seconded by Kent Johnson and failed 3-2, with Gary Nielson, Paula Richmond and Bret Selman opposed, and Bryce Thurgood and Kent Johnson in favor.

MOTION: I move that we keep the requirement to plug sheep until the new system is in place requiring photo evidence.

The Board asked if reward permits can be issued for reported violations that occur during one of these management buck or cactus buck premium unit hunts.

The Board asked what the number of permits is for management cactus bucks, and commented that, because the number is low, it would reason that the probability of unlawful take during one of these hunts would also be low.

The Board asked if mandatory cactus and management buck check-ins is a staffing burden, and if the Division has seen any violations at the time of check-ins.

No motion was made regarding management buck and cactus buck hunts.

Night vision issue and thermal imaging?

The Board voiced support for a year-round ban of thermal imaging technology for taking or locating big game, and then discussed how such a ban could be enforced in the spring and summer, especially if a hunter were using the technology for hunting bears or cougars.

The Board voiced support for the recommended language rule change, as well as voice opposition to a year-round ban of thermal imaging technology.

Chairman Dearth stated his support for the rule language change from "unlawful to use" versus "unlawful to possess."

The Board voiced an opinion for less, not more, regulation.

The Board again asked how a year-round ban might impact Division law enforcement as well as how a year-round ban might affect people hunting bear or cougar. The Board also commented that a year-round ban seems unnecessary.

The Board discussed how using thermal imaging technology could be used to aid in the take of big game in the spring and summer months.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, and failed for lack of second.

MOTION: I move that we ban the possession of thermal imaging for the

take of big game year round.

The Board discussed non-resident hunting license holders who also took the Division's online shed antler gathering course.

The Board discussed having both a resident and non-resident shed gathering seasons, and noted that all the RACs passed the Division's proposal.

The Board discussed the impact that neighboring states' shed gathering season dates have on Utah's shed antler gathering season.

The Board voiced support for having a season that applies to both residents and non-residents.

The Board asked if there is data that shows the effects of shed antler hunting on deer populations.

The Board asked if the proposed rule and/or code changes would apply to private land holders.

The Board noted from memory that there was an approximate 70% of online public comment that supported creating a shed gathering season.

The Board advocated for obtaining more public input on a shed antler gathering season, and also suggested passing the Division's recommendation and then observe over time the outcome of the decision.

The Board discussed what the target date of the Action Log item should be.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the Shed Antler Gathering Committee to reconvene and to recommend shed antler gathering season dates for residents that match the non-resident dates. The Division should report back with a new recommendation from the committee during the December 2024 RAC meetings/January 2025 Wildlife Board meeting. This is to be place on the Action Log.

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Gary Nielson and failed, with Bryce Thurgood, Paula Richmond and Kent Johnson opposed, and Bret Selman and Gary Nielson in favor.

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

Wildlife Board Liaison Staci Coons provided procedural guidance to the Board.

Chairman Dearth reiterated that all the RACs voted to approve the Division's recommendation.

The RACs noted that at the time of their meetings, they did not have the additional information that has come up in this meeting.

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the proposal as presented excluding the season closure for non-residents on shed antler gathering.

- 05:15:16** **11) 2024 CWMU Antlerless Permit Recommendations (Action)**
Private Lands and Public Coordinator Chad Wilson opened the floor for questions.
- 05:15:33** **Board/RAC Questions**
The Board asked which species this recommendation affects.
- 05:17:44** **Public Comments**
Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.
- 05:18:41** **RAC Recommendations**
All RACs passed motions to accept the Division's recommendations as presented.
- 05:20:45** **Public Comments/Division Clarification**
There were no public comments on this agenda item. No clarification was needed at this time.
- 05:20:52** **RAC Summaries**
Chairman Dearth summarized the RAC recommendations.
- 05:21:14** **Board Questions/Discussion**
The Board asked how much the next board meeting's CWMU agenda item recommendations would affect harvest opportunity on CWMUs.
The Board noted that CWMU operator and/or landowners and the biologists are working well together.
The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor, with Bret Selman recusing himself from the vote.
MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations for the 2024 CWMU Antlerless Permits recommendations as presented.
- 05:29:17** **12) Other Business (Contingent)**
There was no other business to discuss.
- 05:29:53** Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

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

NR SER, NER:

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

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

CR:

MOTION: Accept the CWMU rules except for the cow elk management strategies when a unit is over objective.

VOTE: Passed 6-1

MOTION: For the DWR to explore the option to give first access for antlerless permits to the public hunters and then look for other strategies as needed.

VOTE: Passed 8-1

SR: **MOTION:** Move that we accept the Division's CWMU Rule Amendments as presented, but remove the 90 percent acreage requirement in order to request a variance.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

2) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments –R657-41 (**Action**)

NR CR SER:

MOTION: I move that we accept Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments - R657-41 as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SR: **MOTION:** Move that we accept the Division's Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 as presented but make December 31st the end date for all sheep unit hunts if it is approved for the conservation permit holder on that unit.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

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

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

MOTION: To have the Wildlife Board look at different ways to generate revenue from current Conservation permits to open more affordable avenues for the general public.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

RAC AGENDA

May 2024

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes **ACTION**
- RAC Chair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- RAC Chair
4. Regional Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. Cougar Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator
6. CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
7. Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 **ACTION**
- Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief

Regional Presentations Only

- Juab County WMA's Habitat Plan – CR Only **INFORMATIONAL**
- Mark Farmer, Habitat Program Manager

Central Region RAC Meeting
Summary of Motions
May 14th, 2024
Springville, Utah

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passes unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.

2) Approval of April 11th, 2024 RAC Meeting Minutes

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passes unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the April 11th, 2024 Central Region RAC meeting as transcribed.

3) CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen. Seconded by John Ziegler and passed 6 in favor and 1 opposed (Braden Sheppard).

MOTION: Accept the CWMU rules except for the cow elk management strategies when a unit is over objective.

The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed 8 in favor and 1 opposed (Joshua Lenart).

MOTION: For the DWR to explore the option to give first access for antlerless permits to the public hunters and then look for other strategies as needed.

4) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41

The following motion was made by John Ziegler and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the rule amendments as written

Central Region RAC Meeting

Attendance
May 14th, 2024
Springville, Utah

RAC Members

Attending

Brock McMillan
Joshua Lenart – online
Mike Christensen
John Ziegler
Bryce Castagnetto
Jim Shuler - online
Brooke Shakespeare - online
Braden Sheppard - online
Kellen Hyer - online (joined 7:20pm)
AMos Murphy - online (joined 7:34pm)

Absent

Steve Lund
Eric Redi - excused
Scott Jensen
Josh Greenhalgh - excused

Wildlife Board

Paula Richmond - online
Gary Nielson
Randy Dearth - online

DWR Personnel

Jason Vernon
Mark Farmer
Sean Spencer
Chad Wilson
Scott Root
Mike Christensen
Covy Jones
Darren Deboois - online
Bailee Prestwich

Total members of the public in attendance: 9

Central Region RAC Meeting

May 14, 2024

Springville, Utah

<https://youtube.com/live/HlroRCqox4g>

06:01:42	RAC Chair Brock McMillan called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present on the broadcast. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations and public comments will be taken during the meeting.
06:05:42	1) Approval of Agenda (Action) The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passes unanimously MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.
06:06:02	2) Approval of Minutes (Action) The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passes unanimously MOTION: To approve the April 11th, 2024 Central Region RAC minutes as transcribed.
06:06:18	3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational) RAC chair Brock McMillan updated the RAC about the last wildlife board meeting held May 2, 2024.
06:09:47	4) DWR Regional Update (Informational) Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities. Wildlife <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 1st Elk that was captured in Winter, gave birth.- North American Moose Conference is taking place.- Brynlee Jones was hired as a depredation technician. Aquatics <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Monitoring Surveys are happening. i.e. - Maple Lake, Yuba, Stansbury Lake, Yearns Reservoir, & other community fisheries.- Netting will begin after the discovery of Walleye in Strawberry Reservoir.- June Sucker spawning is ongoing in Provo River & Hobble Creek.- 3-4 month Carp Netting for removal in Utah Lake.- Salem Fishing Day, Utah Lake 4th Grade Trips, Catfish Seminar. Habitat <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Opening WMA's from the winter closures.- Turning on Guzzlers in the West Desert. Outreach <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Women's shotgun shooting seminar.- Salem Ponds Fishing Day for Children with disabilities.- Many new DH's after the draw. Digital DH timesheets have replaced paper timesheets.

<p>06:19:21</p>	<p>5) Cougar Update - Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator</p>
<p>06:20:29</p>	<p>RAC Questions RAC members discussed ways the RAC or Wildlife Board members can suggest to the legislature why the use of trap/neck snares should be removed as a method of taking cougars. There were also additional discussions surrounding the average age of cougars harvested compared to last year, as well as the sex of harvest.</p>
<p>06:33:14</p>	<p>Public Questions None Public Comments Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>
<p>06:34:08</p>	<p>RAC Discussion The RAC discussed the opportunities members may have on changing language in the guidebooks on the methods of taking cougars in the state. Specifically removing neck snares as a method of take.</p>
<p>06:35:26</p>	<p>6) CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 - Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator</p>
<p>06:36:34</p>	<p>RAC Questions The RAC asked questions regarding how changes are implemented on CWMU operators that do not meet their harvest objectives. There were also additional questions on who represents the CWMU committee as well as how the committee operates the voting process. The new antlerless elk management system was also discussed at length. Questions arose around management strategies that encourage CWMU's to meet their harvest objectives. The RAC also proposed the CWMU's to encourage the taking of more antlerless elk. Questions regarding the Division's willingness to change permit splits between CWMU tags and private tags were asked.</p>
<p>06:50:50</p>	<p>Public Questions - Garrett Slatkoff (BHA) - Can you explain what criteria CWMU's will be asked to show as proof they are trying to meet their public harvest objectives?</p>
<p>06:52:28</p>	<p>Public Comments Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p>

	<p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cody Rhees (Youth Hunters Voice) - Feels the CWMU committee members give many opportunities for youth and thanks all committee members for the support. - Dave Freiss (CWMU Association) - Comments that it should go without saying that there are some challenging issues the CWMU faces. If we do not hit the right line with private and public, he feels we will see issues. The cow elk being the biggest. We need less cow elk, with the way the splits work now, the problem that will arise on where the DWR is encouraging the take of cow elk. If you have CWMU's out of the program, we will not have the same control we have now over the take of cow elk. Overall we do support the changes the Division provides.
<p>07:00:31</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed the representation of CWMU operators vs non CWMU operators at the last meeting. Antlerless elk harvest is a continued need throughout the state. The RAC discussed what problems may arise for habitats should antlerless elk continue to not get harvested. Discussions surrounding how the voting at the CWMU committee was done and why certain individuals made the votes they did.</p>
<p>07:10:47</p>	<p>CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 Recommendations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Mike Christensen and seconded by John Ziegler. This was passed with a vote of 6 in favor and 1 opposed (Braden Sheppard).</p> <p>MOTION: Accept the CWMU rule amendments except for the cow elk management strategies when a unit is over objective.</p>
<p>07:36:28</p>	<p>CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 Recommendations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto. This motion was passed 8 in favor and 1 opposed (Joshua Lenart)</p> <p>MOTION: For the DWR to explore the option to first give access for antlerless permits to the public hunters and then look for other strategies as needed.</p>
<p>07:41:09</p>	<p>7) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief
<p>07:45:58</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>The RAC asked if we send out tooth packets at this time to conservation permit holders.</p> <p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None

07:46:12	Public Comments Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation. Public Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Garrett Slatcoff (BHA) - Stated he along with the BHA support this initiative proposal as they believe it will ultimately improve our habitat for wildlife.
07:49:40	RAC Discussion The RAC discussed their appreciation for Covy as they do feel it gives more opportunities. The RAC also discussed the requirements for conservation permits to be offered (i.e in areas where they are biologically needed).
07:50:39	Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 Recommendations MOTIONS The following motion was made by John Ziegler, seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed unanimously. MOTION: To accept the rule amendment as written.
07:51:40	8) Regional Presentations Only Juab County WMA's Habitat Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Mark Farmer, Habitat Program Manager
07:53:08	RAC Questions The RAC asked if Mark felt he had enough support to manage mountain bike/electric bike trails. There were concerns brought up around the Timpanogos WMA becoming more of a recreational property as well. Public Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none">- None
07:55:09	Public Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">- None
07:55:32	RAC Discussion The RAC discussed how they have observed a lot of open space development in Summit County and the impact on wildlife that aggressive mountain bike trails have created. It has forced some wildlife to be pushed out of the areas and because of this they ask him to consider these observations when moving forward with his plan.
07:56:00	Meeting adjourned.

Regional Advisory Council Meeting

May 15, 2024

The meeting will stream live at https://youtube.com/live/JSH9N5v_Fk4

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes **ACTION**
- RAC Chair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- RAC Chair
4. Regional Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. Cougar Update **INFORMATIONAL**
-Darren Debloois, Mammals Coordinator
6. CWMU Rule Amendments- R657-37 **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
7. Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments-R657-41 **ACTION**
- Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief

Regional Presentations Only

Juab Habitat WMA Plan- CR Only **INFORMATIONAL**
– Mark Farmer, Habitat Program Manager

CR RAC – May 14th, 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Room
1115 N. Main Street Springville
<https://youtube.com/live/HlroRCqox4g>

SER RAC – May 22nd, 6:00 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River
<https://youtube.com/live/RC3VR0uljhE>

NR RAC – May 15th, 6:00 PM
Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden
https://youtube.com/live/JSH9M5v_Fk4

NER RAC – May 23rd, 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources NER Office
318 North Vernal Ave., Vernal
<https://youtube.com/live/fycrLwzrSxq>

SR RAC – May 21st, 6:00 PM
DNR Richfield Industrial Complex
2031 Industrial Park Rd, Richfield

Meeting – June 13th, 9:00 AM
Eccles Wildlife Education Center, Farmington Bay
<https://youtube.com/live/sMQihQZGxKc>

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

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

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by David Earl and passed unanimously.

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

****Jessica Wade and Nikki Wayment were not present for the vote. Joined the meeting online at 6:11 p.m.**

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

The following motion was made by Steve Sorensen, seconded by James Carlson and passed unanimously.

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

3) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments –R657-41 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Junior Goring and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments –R657-41 as presented.

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

May 15, 2024

Attendance

Brad Buchanan – Chair
Blair Stringham- Exec. Sec

RAC Members

Mitchell Alford
James Carlson
Robert Dale
David Earl
Junior Goring
Randy Hutchison

Darren Parry
Steve Sorensen
Jessica Wade
Nikki Wayment
Ross Worthington

Board Member

Kent Johnson
Bryce Thurgood
Bret Selman
Paula Richmand

RAC Excused

Ryan Brown
Jaimi Butler
Casey Snider

Division Personnel

Jodie Anderson
Darren Debloois
Chad Wilson
Covy Jones
Jim Christensen
Devin Christensen

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

May 15, 2024

Minutes

- 00:04:59** 1) Chairman Brad Buchanan called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience and reviewed the meeting procedures.
- 00:09:34** 2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by David Earl and passed unanimous.
- MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.**
- **Jessica Wade and Nikki Wayment were not present for the vote.**
- 00:10:08** 3) **Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Brad Buchanan, RAC Chair**
Links on website to view.
- 00:14:38** 4) **Regional Update – Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**
Blair Stringham updated the RAC on regional activities.
- ** 6:11 p.m. Jessica Wade and Nikki Wayment joined the meeting online. ****
- 00:22:12** 5) **Cougar Update (Informational)**
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- Darren Debloois summarized the presentation for the RAC.
- 00:22:56** **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Get feedback from houndsmen about where lions are being taken. Sale of green pelts. Risks to recreational dogs and the dangers of traps set for cougars. Types of lethal traps. Time frame trappers have to check their traps.

Public Questions

No questions from the public.

00:31:44 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

Blair Stringham summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Cody Bassett- Utah Trappers Association-We don't want to see someone's dog caught in a trap. We're trying to educate the public about trapping.

Walter Szarek-Pain trying to let a lion go that was caught in a trap. Had to call and wait for law enforcement. It is nice to be able to harvest them now. You can only tan so many lion hides and then it gets expensive.

00:36:05 6) CWMU Rule Amendments - R657-37 (Action)

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

Chad Wilson summarized the presentation.

00:36:36 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Tag allocation numbers. Acreage and contiguous lands. CWMU Committee. Extra cow elk tags on over objective units. Public transparency. CWMU Review Board and the public being able to attend the meetings. Depredation situations. Mandatory harvest reporting.

Public Questions

No questions from the public.

00:52:56 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

Blair Stringham summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

Tom Land-Deseret Land and Livestock CWMU- Part of the rules committee. There was a lot of give and take on both sides. Support the Division's recommendations with the exception of the guest policy. State law allows hunters one guest. Commented on the number of guests one hunter brings and the impact it has on other hunters hunts. People don't need to bring a truck load of people on their hunt.

Justin Oliver- Part of the rules committee. In support of the recommendation. There was a lot of discussion on both sides. The rule is good, and it favors the resource. We need to get back to objective. Going to be a lot of good change that is going to benefit the public and the resource.

Cody Rhees- Youth Hunter's Voice- CWMU's are the biggest supporters for youth in the state. Great advocates. Don't want to lose this program. It is important for the state to have it.

Gary Webb- CWMU Association- Participated on the rules committee. There was give and take on both sides. Everybody came together. Changes were proposed that cost the CWMU's, and we didn't get everything we wanted, but the association was happy with how everything turned out.

01:08:22 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Complaints about a CWMU over the past three years. Number of quests allowed on a hunt. Committee given specific agenda topics to address. Record of who purchases vouchers. Specificity of under acreage. Importance of the CWMU program. Public land being taken away and not being able to hunt deer and elk on it. Enforced reviews. Public feedback sometimes slants towards the negative. Public resource on private lands and private property rights. Splits with tags. Over-objective cow elk units and how to address it. Guests allowed on a hunt. General public does not know what is going on, this causes contention. Need for more transparency. Posting of trade lands and color of signage. Enforceable rules. Grandfathering CWMU's that are under acreage.

The following motion was made by Steve Sorensen, seconded by James Carlson and passed unanimous.

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

01:47:10 7) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments - R657-41 (Action)
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

Covy Jones summarized the presentation.

01:50:26 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Amount of money that goes into habitat work annually.

Public Questions

No questions from the public.

01:52:11 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

Blair Stringham summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

No comments from the public.

01:52:51 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

No RAC comments.

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Junior Goring and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments - R657-41 as presented.

01:53:44 Meeting Adjourned. Marshall Alford

DRAFT

DRAFT

Southern Regional RAC Meeting
May 21, 2024 6:00 PM
DNR Richfield City Complex
2031 Industrial Park Rd, Richfield, UT

RAC Members

Attending

Austin Atkinson
Rachel Bolus
Chuck Chamberlain
Russell Gardner
Mike Grant
Tammy Pearson
Brooklyn Cox – online
Verland King
Bryant Johnson

Absent

Travis Duran
Bart Battista
Chad Utley
Riley Roberts

Wildlife Board

Gary Nielson (Online)

Paula Richmond

Kent Johnson (Online)

DWR Personnel

Kevin Bunnell
Phil Tuttle
Chad Wilson
Teresa Griffin
Paul Washburn

Adam Kavalunas
Darren DeBloois
Covy Jones
Stetson West
Corbin Oberg

Public invited to join online: <https://youtube.com/live/iBN9Z908Hq8>

Southern Region RAC Meeting

May 21, 2024

Richfield, Utah

<https://youtube.com/live/iBN9Z908Hq8>

06:00:05	1) RAC Chair Austin Atkinson called the meeting to order. Called the roll of RAC members. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explained the RAC process and noted there will be no live presentations during the meeting• Encouraged those who want to express their opinions at tonight's meeting to submit a comment card.• Reminded everyone to be respectful of others, especially of those who have ideas and opinions that may differ from their own.• Recognized Wildlife Board members in attendance and online.• Welcomed public in attendance and those watching and listening online.
06:04:30	2) Approval Of Agenda and Minutes (Action) RAC Chair Austin Atkinson The following motion was made by Mike Grant, seconded by Tammy Pearson. MOTION: I move that we approved the Agenda and Minutes as presented. Passed unanimously.
06:05:29	3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational) RAC Chair Austin Atkinson <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reviewed the motions from the Wildlife Board Meeting held on May 02, 2024 in Farmington, Utah.• Buck Deer permit recommendations passed as presented by the Division.• OIAL recommendations amended motion passed to increase Moose permits from 22 to 25 on the North Slope/Summit, increase the Bison permit numbers on Hunt BI6535 from three (3) permits to five (5) permits, all other OIAL permit proposals passes as presented.• Recommendations for Bull Elk permits passed as presented.• Buck Pronghorn permit recommendations passed as presented.• Draw results released based on these recommendations.• Antlerless permit recommendations were passed as presented, with the language added that not taking Cow Moose accompanied by a Calf Moose.• Shed Antler Gathering and Big Game Rule Amendments ultimately passed to ask Shed Antler Gathering Committee to reconvene and recommend Shed Antler Gathering season dates for Residents to match Non-resident dates. The remainder of the recommendations

	<p>passed as presented. The Director still has the ability to issue an emergency closure, statewide based on conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CWMU Antlerless recommendations passed unanimously as presented.
<p>06:10:21</p>	<p>4) DWR Update (Informational) - Kevin Bunnell, DWR Regional Supervisor updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p> <p>Wildlife Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bighorn Lamb Surveys on the Mineral Mountains. Production looks good. They will start looking at the Oak Creek soon. • Segment of Zion Bighorn Sheep are coughing, one collared dead Ewe – tested positive for pneumonia. Pneumonia can be devastating to population. Teresa Griffin added that the photo shown in the presentation is from the Mineral Mountains. • Prairie Dog population is up. Working with Fish and Wildlife Services to try and moving towards delisting them. Increases conflict with private property and croplands. Tools to address conflict. If anyone is having issues, please contact our office and we will do our best to address conflicts. • Hummingbird banding at Lytle ranch. • Lead two (2) raptor field trips for the Red Cliffs Bird Festival • Found multiple Great Horned Owl checks. • IMBCR bird surveys across the Region. • Upcoming bat monitoring. We are one of the States that has not had white-nose syndrome. • Some of our Biologists met with community members in Boulder and last night (May 20, 2024) and talked about what’s going on in Wildlife. • New Bald Eagle nest located on the Boulder Mountain, adult had been tagged in Flagstaff, Arizona. Very visible nest in Iron County. <p>Aquatics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panguitch Lake Dam: Temporary repairs to Dam are holding up well; however, there are still repairs to be done. Run-off is coming down slowly, good news and is helping • There were some issues with the Kolob Spillway; however, the Washington County Water Conservancy District quickly made repairs. • Gill Nettings are being conducted to monitor fish populations. Overall, fish look healthy in most bodies of water. <p>Washington County Field Office:</p>

- Native Fish Projects – main focus.
- Smallmouth Bass – spring monitoring at Quail Creek Reservoir.
- Virgin River Program Field Trips. There were 525 students along Virgin and Santa Clara rivers from May 6-10, 2024.
- Desert Tortoise population is doing well.

Habitat Section:

- Two new biologists: Hal Guymon (Farm Bill) and Gus Torgersen (USFS Partner) started on May 13, 2024.
- Permit grazing on select WMA's started on May 15 and runs through June 15.
- Northern Corridor Supplemental EIS.
- Wrapping up SR-18, study with recommendation for mitigation wildlife vehicle collisions.
- Lost Creek Collaborative, multiphase Fishlake unit projects, including over 10,000 acres of Mastication, chaining, lop and scatter, seeding and guzzler installation.
- Minersville Sagebrush planting is ongoing – multi-year project.
- Planted 100,000 seedlings so far
- Tammy Pearson asked if this was for Sage Hens or Mule Deer. She noted this is the only area in their area for Sage Hens. Kevin Bunnell answered it's for both.
- Utilized approximate 50 Dedicated Hunters and numerous BLM and UDWR.

Outreach Section:

- Dedicated Hunter program is busy with new participates, numerous projects available for hours.
- Fly fishing and fly tying events were a huge success. Gunlock fishing and cooking event was very well attended (20-30 people). Gunlock is a great place for kids to catch Crappie, they're plentiful.
- Adam Kavalunas stated they cooked approximately 100 fish at this event.

Law Enforcement:

- Boat registration was separated from the AIS registration process. It is now a two-step process. Compliance has gone done, we need to increase awareness in the community.
- **Paul Washburn** added that the website, stdofthesea@utah.gov has some great information regarding the new laws and boat registration.
- Encouraged people to get involved with the Bat surveys and process.

06:26:28	RAC Questions: None.
06:26:45	5) Cougar Update (Informational) - Darrin DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator Presented DWR recommendations and answered questions.
06:28:10	RAC Questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verland King: Can you tell us about the new partnership with the Department of Agriculture and Food? • Wondered if a person had a predator (Cougar) killing livestock, will it take them away from the taking care of the livestock? • Concerned they will be taken away from what the livestock guys to address livestock issues/loss. • Darrin DeBloois: Last year the Department of Agriculture decided to end their partnership with the Wildlife Services. Most of the government Trappers working with Wildlife Services were State employees. If you were working with Trappers, the personnel won't change. There were a couple of Federal employees. They are now directly by the Department of Agriculture. We have an agreement with them for several things, including livestock verification to address losses. Another thing is flying for Coyotes and other predator management. Bighorn sheep that wander, etc. Things seem to be working well. Good partner for us, mainly working with us in the Fall and Winter. • No. There are discussions about priorities right now. They're working on Lambing this time of year. Usually, when they are flying, they'll take care of both including livestock. We have good communication channels regarding what they're priorities are. • Kevin Bunnell: Anything specific you are wondering about Verland? • Chuck Chamberlain: In 2023, with the Cougar Depredation plan, the number of incidents have gone way down. Is that because we haven't finished collecting data? • Darren DeBloois: 2023 is the last complete year of data that we have. An incident is anytime a producer calls us, it's a good indication of trends. The number of animals killed seems to be down as well. Seems to correspond with the decline of Lions that we have. Depends on how accessible those Lions are for hunters. Some places are closed off during Winter there aren't a lot of areas open for hunting. That's something we can work with Agriculture as well.

- **Bryant Johnson:** Do you have any other ways of knowing what your population of Lions is?
- What about collars and collar data?
- **Darren DeBloois:** We are working with Utah State University to come up with some ways to track populations. Right now, it's based on our harvests and age of Lions harvested. Useful, but not ideal.
- You could use collars. Collars are labor intensive, the idea is you collar individuals and look at collared versus non-collared. USU is looking at a variety of ways to look at how many Lions we have on the landscape. Looking a most cost-effective ways, possibly rotating every five (5) years.
- **Tammy Pearson:** In working with the Legislature, there seem to be a lot of problems with staffing and equipment on the federal level. There's a lot of frustration from people getting things done on the ground. UDAF and the legislature decided to do that. Even after, that they've grounded all of the equipment and are not letting us transfer ownership to the State. Do you know if that has happened?
- Yes, initially the State put in a lot of funding.
- For two or three years we've had problems getting pilots again. Either didn't have staff or didn't have equipment that was up and running.
- A lot of it comes down to communication.
- Lacking contracts with the Counties. We made some calls and they came in and killed some dogs for us. After that, we didn't have a contract.
- **Darren DeBloois:** We've put in a lot of funding to get them up and going. They've got what they need, but are still in discussion about some of the gear that was in question. Beyond that, I'd have to refer it to them.
- One of the goals under the new agreement is to find deficiencies and they work more with contractors. Able to tell them well in advance when they need them to fly. We are happy with how things are going.
- The County had a lot of hurdles in the beginning, went as smooth as it could.
- **Austin Atkinson:** What changes can be recommended? You stated no changes were going to be recommended since the legislature changed this last year. What changes can be made?
- Right now, we are just waiting for data? No triggers in place for change?

- The D.W.R. created the ultimate bait station for Mountain Lions to be taken near Tabiona. How many Lions were taken out of that project? And, are they included on the depredation number?
- The Outreach Section is not doing a very good job at letting Hunters know what they can do with Lions. My office takes calls weekly. What can I do as a Hunter?
- **Darren DeBloois:** The statute is fairly simple. Simply states that a person only needs a hunting license in order to harvest a Cougar. Season is year-long, from January through December, and trapping is now legal. Within those parameters, we could make recommendations like season dates for hounds, regulations for traps, for example.
- The statute has only been in place for a year. After a couple of years, we might have a better idea of what needs to be changed and what concerns there may be.
- We are actively managing predators for our Bighorn populations.
- There were 31 Lions taken near Tabiona in an attempt to save the Bighorn Sheep population there. Ultimately, this was unsuccessful as most of the Sheep were lost. The remaining Sheep were moved to Promontory Point at a new nursery facility which was created to try again. And yes, they are included.
- Wildlife Services and UDAF was averaging about 30 Lions per year statewide. Take away is there are more than you think and we actively managing predator control.
- I can sit down with Outreach and Law Enforcement sections to see what we can do about educating Hunters on Cougar hunting.
- **Bryant Johnson:** Cougars seem to be basically off the radar. They're kind of like Coyotes, why do we still check them in?
- **Darren DeBloois:** Cougars are still protected wildlife. Coyotes are not managed by the Division of Wildlife Resources. Objective is not to eradicate Lions, just manage them to a lower density. In order to understand where we are, we need to gather the data from the Cougars that are checked in.
- **Mike Grant:** Watching the trends with the Lions now that it's open what are we going to do to keep people involved after we bring the population back to what it was 20 years ago? How are we going to bring people back?
- **Darren DeBloois:** We have a couple of options. Always prefer that hunters take them first. We could look at putting out information about where we could use Harvests. If we have good data from our Deer – if we are seeing between 6-8% adult mortality to Lion's – we seeing a decline in your Deer population. There are probable four or five units in

the State of Utah that meet that criteria. We can tell people that this is where we need to have Lions hunted. We also have opportunities with UDAF as well for predator management.

- **Austin Atkinson:** Almost 15 years ago the Coyote bounty was created. What would it take to create a similar program for Mountain Lions? Could D.W.R. be involved?
- **Darren DeBlois:** The bounty is a legislative thing and the money was appropriated that way. Not sure what the answer to that question is. This is not something the Division would initiate. We feel we have the tools in place to address Lion problems if we have it.
- **Mike Grant:** That's why I asked about trends. The Coyote bounty of \$50.00 was a good trend until gas hit \$4.00 per gallon and thermal optics cost \$6,000.00. It takes a lot of \$50.00 bounties to get you to that point. We may get to that point with Mountain Lions if it's a free for all with them. People may say they're done chasing them, paying for dog food, etc.
- **Darren DeBlois:** Our high with Mountain Lions was two years ago. That may indicate a decline in numbers or maybe other factors, like cost of gas, frustration with the whole process. Houndsmen are still the most effective way to remove Lions.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** Looking at your (inaudible) or birth rates, I don't see 21 through 23, those years. Do you have that data?
- **Darren DeBlois:** No, that's the problem with this model. You can't legally take kittens, so that age group doesn't show up in the harvest. You can really only project up to a couple of years in the past and then it starts to fall apart. It's good for trend though.
- **Russell Gardner:** We talk about the bounty on Coyotes. Is there any way we can increase the bounty?
- **Darren DeBlois:** It is probably time to look at something like that. There has been some discussion about this, especially if the focus is Mule Deer.
- **Kevin Bunnell:** Is the \$50.00 bounty set in legislations or do we have the ability to change that?
- **Darren DeBlois:** I believe \$50.00 is set in code, but not 100% sure. I might be wrong about this it may be at our discretion.

<p>06:46:20</p>	<p>Public Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Labrum: I've got a million dollars for predator control for the State and the relationship with UDAF is working out well. Had a guy call him with property East, over by the mountains. He had 10 carcasses of Does that had been during the winter, one out by each pond. The C.O. determined they were all Coyote kills. One of the Does had a collar on it and the C.O. retrieved it. Called Leann Hunting from UDAP and requested a plane to help with the Coyotes. They had a plane at the airport and went out and killed 11 dogs near the property where the Does were killed. Feels this partnership is working well. • Darren DeBloois: They are a really good partner. They've geared up with infrared and that's a game changer when finding Coyotes. • Lynn Abraham: Has there been any discussion on selling Lion parts, hides, etc. That would change people's efforts because you can't do anything with those now. • \$300.00 to have it tanned and worth \$300.00 when it's done. • Darren DeBloois: We've had a request to allow the sale of green pelts. You can sell a hide if it's tanned, so it has come up and we'll continue to have that conversation. • Austin Atkinson: Darren is that a societal issue? Or is it a State? • Darren DeBloois: Not sure the history behind this. There was much different outlook on Lions when a lot of these regulations were put in place. That has shifted recently, especially with the Deer data that we have. • Kevin Bunnell: The biggest thing that has come out of all of our collared data is that we've learned we don't know as much as we thought we did. • Covy Jones: Just for clarification. The Coyote bounty is not set in code. • Kevin Bunnell: Is that something we have discretion over? • Covy Jones: We have discretion, to target high priority areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tammy Pearson: You said Cougars are still a protected species. Is that Federal? Or State? I thought they made them a Varmint? In new legislation? • Darren DeBloois: It's State, there are other species that don't have much of a harvest limit on them. • This legislation didn't change the designation. • We have made management decisions within the last 5-8 years to try to keep the Deer and Lion populations balanced. • Kevin Bunnell: Prior to 1968, they were not protected. But you can still have very strict regulations or loose regulations with protected species. • Bryant Johnson: You keep bringing up Deer with Lions, which he understands. But with the Sheep, you get one Lion on some of these units where you can't get Houndsmen, you can get people. If you had a bounty program where you could offer a lot of money for someone to go in there and take one, it would make it worth it. • Darren DeBloois: That would be an option. What we've been doing now is call UDAF. All options are on the table. • Kevin Bunnell: We call our Biologists who will set traps for Lions. • Mike Grant: What is it going to take to get an agreeance on green pelts? Do we need to go through the Board? Through legislation? Right now, it's apples to apples. • Darren DeBloois: The Board can make that decision. • Tammy Pearson: Can he make a motion to recommend that to the Board?
<p>06:54:25</p>	<p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Kevin Bunnell: Online Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree: 1 (33%) • Somewhat agree: 1 (33%) • Neither agree nor disagree: 1 (33%) • Somewhat disagree: 0 (0%) • Strongly disagree: 0 (0%) • Total votes: 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted average: $[(0 * 1) + (1 * 2) + (0 * 3) + (1 * 4) + (2 * 5)] / 3 = 4$
<p>06:54:44</p>	<p>RAC Discussion: None.</p>
<p>06:55:05</p>	<p>6) CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 (Action) - Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator</p> <p>Presented his recommendations and answered questions.</p>
<p>06:56:00</p>	<p>RAC Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Atkinson: You had CWMU rules committee and that has been disbanded? Is that accurate? • You have an advisory committee that is always standing, actively standing? • You have created an Association that is not part of the D.W.R.? They have their own meetings, etc.? • These rule amendments are a result of the committee that you put together, not the advisory committee or association. Totally different committees. • What does it take to update the Utah Hunt Planner? Specifically, if a CWMU's operator's telephone number, email, or other information, were to change? The public is demanding it up until the application time, right? The Operator is busy as well with their operation. It seems cumbersome and the public seems to be demanding it. • Would it be possible to have permit numbers on there? Both private and public? • Chad Wilson: I don't know that it's been officially dissolved, but yes. • Yes, an Advisory Committee and an association that is not part of D.W.R. • We can look at streamlining the updating of the Utah Hunt Planner. Lots of checks and balances. Part of this rule is that it's updated by March 01. It should be a lot easier for the CWMU operator to see if their information is correct, if not, they'll contact and we will update it. • We can look at putting permit numbers there. The proclamation usually says how many public permits there are and you can get a pretty good idea of how many private permits are available.

- **Bryant Johnson:** Is there anyone that verifies that all property owners, other than the one that presented it, have agreed to be part of a particular CWMU?
 - We had the one problem that came up on the Beaver unit last year. I talked to one of the landowners that came up on the maps. When I asked him if he was part of the CWMU, he said he was not.
 - Wouldn't it be the person who is on the certificate of ownership with the County?
 - Is everything pulled out later if someone comes back and says we were supposed to be part of this? At that point, does the CWMU potentially go away?
-
- **Chad Wilson:** Yes, the Biologists will verify this and there is a signature page that the landowners sign.
 - Are there times where we have people say this is my land and I didn't sign anything? Yes. Sometimes, it's tricky, there are multiple people that have land ownership or claim ownership. I don't know that we have the expertise to verify everyone's signatures – there would be consequences.
 - Yes, usually, but sometimes we get some trust lands. I've had guys in Box Elder call me and asked why their land was included in there. It can be a lengthy conversation. Tricky situations that we try our best to work through. Our Biologists do their best to make sure it's signed for and right
-
- **Kevin Bunnell:** Bryant, if you take an issue like a family trust. That's the listed owner on the piece of property and there are several people that have the ability to sign. We aren't going to contact each one individually, we are going to assume they have talk to other family members and everyone is in agreement.
 - Potentially, if it drops below acreage.
-
- **Austin Atkinson:** If a CWMU falls below the 90 % acreage requirement, does that mean they have no shot at all to be considered?
 - With regard to trade lands, personally never seen a trade land. When a trade land is designated, does that stay for a three-year period? How do I know how long it is a trade land?
-
- **Chad Wilson:** We have some that are below 90 % right now that have been grandfathered in. If they lose acreage, they are no longer grandfathered in. Going forward, if this passes, if you are not within that 90 % then there really isn't an avenue to become that species of a CWMU.
 - Yes, it is a three year COR. Things can change, but if it were to change, it would come through a change application. It must be posted

on the ground and maps need to be updated and corrected on a yearly basis.

- **Chuck Chamberlain:** I just want to clarify. We've done away with variances, basically? If you're below 90 % then what can happen?
- **Chad Wilson:** The one variance we have still is the season dates for Elk. Sometimes we will extend those out.
- **Austin Atkinson:** Some of these CWMU'S have land that's non-contiguous that are way more than four miles apart. If that CWMU changes at all is that a chance for that CWMU to lose those non-contiguous acres?
- **Chad Wilson:** Some of this is from the beginning of the CWMU program and it's functioned for 30 years now. If that main contiguous piece falls below, then we would look and discontinuing those non-contiguous pieces. And that would be for all of them going forward. If you have 15,000 in your contiguous piece, as long as you stay over 10,000, then your non-contiguous pieces could stay in.
- **Mike Grant:** Going forward with the red line rules on the five full days for the Antlered species. You talked about Antlerless and the emergency action we can take. Are the CWMU's fulfilling their Cow permits? Do we have data to support that? Are we allowing the public enough time on those units?
- On these emergency Elk permits. Potentially you could have 60 Cow permits, if an Operator bought a Bull tag with a Cow tag. Is there a certain amount that we can allot in a lottery draw that we could put out when we know the Elk transition through these units at certain times (creatures of habit) based on snowfall, that we could allow the public or Sportsman to take "X" amount out during that?
- **Chad Wilson:** Yes, we get Harvest Reports back and we know what each CWMU is harvesting. We probably don't have an exact number of days that they are allowed to hunt. Fair to say, most CWMU operators allow more than three (3) minimum days to harvest Antlerless. We will be doing a better job at having an accountability of what that harvest is and making sure they get their minimum harvest. CWMU's take this very seriously. They don't want negative feedback and want to help the public hunters be successful. A lot of factors go into why a hunter doesn't harvest.
- There are a lot of factors that go into why a hunter didn't harvest.

- Yes, a lot of the transition is dependent upon snowfall. It would be hard to predict or gear a hunt just saying this a particular timeframe. Sometimes you get a good storm at the beginning of October that pushes them down, sometime the storm is in February, and sometimes you don't get that storm. The objective, priority and goal is always to give the public hunter as much opportunity as possible.
- Looking at major habitat damage and we can look at giving operators some private vouchers, we want to have this tool.
- **Austin Atkinson:** My wife drives a 12-passenger van because we have so many kids and it's for sale for anyone who's going to hunt a CWMU.
- Any concerns from previous RAC meetings? Any concerns about guest policy?
- At a previous RAC, it was asked, what is an enforceable boundary? Is OnX on your phone an enforceable boundary? If not, then is a sign on a tree an enforceable boundary? To I have to get a survey done? Find a corner boundary?
- Do CWMU's follow the posting requirements, like the yellow signs we've seen, the same as trespassing requirements?
- Posted as public?
- For example, if I'm driving to Randolph and Deseret has their signs right off the highway, I could hunt Coyotes there because it's public land, but not Deer, Elk or Antelope.
- **Chad Wilson:** Deseret was one that had an issue with it and we received a lot of feedback from them. CWMU hunts are very cool hunts.
- Most operators want these hunts to be a good experience for the hunters/public. Could there be potential for abuse? Sure. But, we are really trying to make sure that if there is only one hunter, that we have sufficient help there to get their harvested animal out. The committee felt the legal amount of the passengers in the vehicle was enough.
- On an enforceable boundary, that may have to go through the court system. We try to follow the code, have the corners posted, streams, crossings.
- Yes, the only exception would be if there is public land in it, then it's every 300 yards, with public signs, so the public is aware. It's supposed to be posted heavier. If there's public land within the CWMU, it's just for the hunting of that particular species. It's not a no trespassing. You can access those lands for any other purpose. It's not taking over the public land.
- Yes, but you could also take your dog for a walk, or go hiking because it's public land.

<p>07:14:14</p>	<p>Public Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Labrum (Kimberly CWMU): There was a list of things the Wildlife Board wanted you to address. The minimum acreage wasn't in that list. Was it the D.W.R. that wanted that addressed? You didn't rewrite the entire rule. You didn't address every line, only certain issues. Who wanted the minimum acreage addressed? The Board didn't specifically ask for this. Was there more concern on the Division's side to address that? • We are the Operators of the Kimberly. If there is someone that thinks they shouldn't be in there, please have them reach out to us. If they don't reach out to us, then we don't know. • Chad Wilson: Yes, we were looking for clarity on that. While the rule was open, why not address that. The Board did not specifically ask for that issue to be addressed. • We get at least one request every year looking at acreage. Can anyone come in, go through the variance process, and ask to be a CWMU? The CWMU advisory committee spends a lot of time looking at these. We thought it would be good to set up parameters. • Bryant Johnson: I wish Mike was here so I could ask him. My conversation with him was that D.W.R. doesn't have to contact him, you do. That particular one was Jim Leavitt. I asked him about being part of the CWMU and he said that he did not agree to that. • I wanted to see this addressed going forward with the amount of acreage. I think that's what we are doing with this. The more clarification we get on the acreage, the better. It makes it easier on us to not spend so much time on something that doesn't pass. • Travis Murphy: We contacted him and he said he did not want to be part of the CWMU. If you look at that piece of property, his property is not included on the map. We went around his property. Have him check the map again. I looked at the map on the Website and his corner is not in there. • We've only owned that for a couple of years. We specifically went around Leavitt's property to address this.
<p>07:18:58</p>	<p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Kevin Bunnell: Online Comments: Bottom line is because of the splits with Antlered, the public is pretty focused on making sure they keep the opportunity to harvest Antlerless Elk on CWMU's.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree: 8 (57%) • Somewhat agree: 1 (7%)

- Neither agree nor disagree: 0 (0%)
- Somewhat disagree: 3 (21%)
- Strongly disagree: 2 (14%)
- Total votes: 14
- Weighted average: $[(2 * 1) + (3 * 2) + (0 * 3) + (1 * 4) + (8 * 5)] / 14 = 3.71$
- **Travis Murphy:** Represents CWMU Association, on the Board and sat on the committee as well. Long year sitting on this diverse committee. Believes strongly in the CWMU and our membership. Believes strongly in the recommendations and wanted to be here to say so.
- Austin, they've hired a web designer and coordinator to work collaboratively with the Division on exactly what you talked about. Making some great inroads there so people can quickly and accurately access information between all 136 of the CWMU's.
- Mike, on the Antlerless Elk: Operates as a Landowner as well. Northern Utah operates a lot different than here. Had 1600 public hunters throughout our operations, as a group, collectively. No complaints were received with regard to Antlerless. We sat down with our Biologists to work with them. We have an 80% harvest over three years. If we fall below that, has to go before the Advisory Board. We We are self-driven to make sure the Biology and the resources are taken care of. The five (5) days seems to be sufficient, especially with larger groups of Elk. We are held to an objective.
- Lots of give and take and perspectives.
- Thinks they are doing a good job overall in allowing public hunters on their properties.
- **Travis Labrum (Kimberely CWMU):** As Bryant mentioned we came to you last year and you voted unanimously in our favor for a variance, but the Wildlife Board did not pass this. Concerned that by withdrawing that hard line of the 9,000 acres we are trying to solve a problem that's not there. Why are we trying to find a solution to something that's not there?
- As Chad said, I've been involved in the variance process for a number of years. There have been one, maybe two that have gone through variance process. Not a flood of people wanting a variance every year. Heard a lot of scare tactics of the flood of small ranches trying to get a variance. In 30 years, there hasn't been a flood of small ranches trying to get a variance. It's just not a problem.
- Strong opinions on where this hard line is coming from, a lot of it comes from Northern Utah CWMU's who have smaller ranches around them.
- Not a concern in Southern Utah. Different concerns than they do in Northern Utah. Didn't see representation on the committee from the Southern Region, believes they were all from Northern Utah.
- Twenty percent of CWMU Elk ranches are under acreage, but have a higher harvest success ratio. Presented their success ratios, average

	<p>success rate on smaller ranches is 88%. Average on larger ranches is 83%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kimberly Ranch on the Beaver unit has 5700 acres. Biologist studied this for three years and put in his report that he had no doubt they'd be successful. With this new rule, they have no chance anymore. • The Advisory Committee is not spending hours and hours studying his proposal. The Biologist supports what they are trying to do. Utah has not done a single study on what CWMU's can be successful. Elk may roam 10,000 acres. • He's okay with the rule changes, but leave off the 9,000 acre rule and leave it up to the Biologists. Adding permits for the public to their proposal, providing extra opportunity. Okay with giving an extra permit if you fall below acreage.
<p>07:30:55</p>	<p>RAC Discussion :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Grant: We looked at the same thing last year with the Kimberly CWMU. We are always looking for opportunity asking the Board for opportunities, but to pull the variance completely out of it isn't fair to the smaller ranches. Understands where Mike is coming from. What's the harm in having more opportunity? Private Landowners are feeding the public animals, what's the harm in allowing the public in there and providing them the opportunity to hunt? And allow the landowner to recoup a little bit of that. • Doesn't feel like 90 percent is the right thing to do. • Austin Atkinson: How did the 90 percent come up in the committee? • Chad Wilson: The vote was unanimously to do that. In the past, we have seen Elk CWMU's that are under 10,000 acres and they have functioned well. And, there are some that aren't Elk CWMU's anymore. We've had others that have tried back in the day that just didn't function. That's why we went to 10,000 acres, it's the Elk's home range. It was a clear number. If we just allow a variance for anything, if we have a landowner with 2,000 acres and ask for variance to be a Deer CWMU, could you have 4,000 acres and be an Elk CWMU? He • Averages one request per year. • Bryant Johnson: Have we created other ways for guys like Mike to get other permits that they can sell based on their acreage? • Isn't there a rule where he could sell it and they could unit the whole unit?

- **Chad Wilson:** If you have 640 acres on a Limited Entry unit, you can put in for a draw for a Limited Entry Deer or Elk and be able to hunt your own property.
- There are a couple of different rules. If they joined a LOA, 50% of the acreage needs to be habitat.
- **Tammy Pearson:** That's for Deer, not Elk.
- **Chad Wilson:** Deer and Elk. It's new this year, but he can't sell that. He can use it himself or give it to an immediate family member.
- **Mike Grant:** You mentions that some of the CWMU operators have failed in the past. What is the cost to the DWR, the State, or the Public if they fail? If the CWMU operators put up the money and their time to put up signs, etc. It isn't costing the public anything is it? Maybe we settle it two to one. One or two Elk tags in the variance if he's got less than 10,000 acres. If he fails, he fails on his own dime.
- **Chad Wilson:** The cost would be a Limited Entry, if you drew a Limited Entry and there were no Elk, you were unsuccessful, you've burned your points. That's quite valuable to some people, trying to avoid this.
- **Tammy Pearson:** Property owner. Firm believer in impacts to Ag and private property with wildlife. Hard to understand why it's such a hard thing to compensate property owners for the impacts of wildlife on their property. I voted on this last year. There should be a grade or scale on this property.
- Talked to Mike Wardle and he guarantees they would be successful on harvesting Elk. My family has hunted Elk near their property and found Elk sheds.
- Grind on Landowners and the impact of Wildlife. Owns a lot of property, not Elk property, but Deer and Pronghorn. We used to get Landowner permits, but now we don't because it has to go through a draw. Out of 16 permits, we got one.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** You mentioned you receive one or two requests per year. How many are approved? Is it rubber stamped once it gets there?
- **Chad Wilson:** Most are rejected. We had one approved in this region a few years ago, Sweetwater. It was 8800 or 8900 acres with no ability to obtain any additional private land. We've had a CWMU apply with 4,997 acres and it was not approved. We try to be consistent, so it's cut and dried, not choosing favorites.

- **Russell Gardner:** Is there a point where a point where landowners should be considered over acreage. I feed a lot of deer sometimes, you put 500 Deer on 100 acres of hay and you understand what I'm saying. And then a guy down the road might have more acreage, but feeds two or three Deer and he gets a lot more permits based on acreage. Seems like we should base some of this on depredation and not just acreage.
- **Chad Wilson:** In rule, it does says habitat, not just acreage. As a Division, if we had to go grade everyone's private land and acreage, it would be a lot of extra work. We try to have some sidebars to guide us to help people out. Ideally, it would be awesome, but just not feasible with our manpower.
- **Austin Atkinson:** Understands a line needs to be drawn in the sand. CWMU'S are carving out a piece of property to become their own unit, managed to have huge season dates starting on September 1st with rifle. They don't match regular season dates, they don't match hardly anything that we do on regular units. It's an entirely different program.
- To Tammy's point, we need to do more for landowners, they demand it. It might not fall under the CWMU program. We are going to continually look at the landowner program. The CWMU program is the largest landowner program, very unique. They become their own unit. Feels we need to draw the line somewhere.
- Spends a lot of time updating websites. As an operator, he would be frustrated at people trying to contact me in March for information on hunts, hunt dates, etc. Let's get more information on the website.
- We are missing the boat of CWMU's. There are phenomenal hunters, but people are too afraid to apply if they don't know the operator or the area. Wants to see more data on the website. Let's tout it as a cool program for the Public. Update website with pictures, encourage applicants. Five applicants for one permit – why? Make it more transparent.
- **Chad Wilson:** We are going in that directions i.e., Deseret. Have everything on the website available at their fingertips. It would help cut phone calls down to the operators too.
- **Bryant Johnson:** If we remove the 90%, there's a committee to review this correct?
- If that committee said no to the request, it wouldn't go before the Wildlife Board. If they said yes, it would go before the Wildlife Board?
- **Chad Wilson:** Yes, there's an Advisory Committee that reviews the request. Mike Wardle was able to go before the Committee and explain why he thought this should be a CWMU. They hear all the

	<p>information and make a decision. If it is approved then it would go to the Wildlife Board. If it's appealed it could still go before the Wildlife Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tammy Pearson: How many CWMU's are in Southern Utah? Specifically in our region? • Night and day difference between Southern and Northern Utah. Percentage of public land and big private property blocks. Not a lot of private land here, in Beaver County, 77% Federal land, 10% State land and 13% private property. A smaller block, especially if any of it is improved, that's where the wildlife congregate. How many of the Board or Committee are from Southern Utah? • Kevin Bunnell: How many Teresa? • Teresa Griffin: 12-15. We have Deer, Pronghorn and Elk. • Travis Murphy: There were very few involved, it's hard to get people involved. We would love to have more. It's not a big brother small brother type of thing. • Chad Wilson: Travis was our representative from down here. We try to get representation from a wide variety. Large and small CWMU's.
<p>07:46:25</p>	<p>MOTIONS:</p> <p>The following motion was made by Mike Grant, seconded by Tammy Pearson.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's CWMU Rule Amendments as present, but remove the 90 percent acreage requirement in order to request a variance.</p> <p>Passed unanimously.</p>
<p>07:53:20</p>	<p>7) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 (Action) - Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief</p> <p>Presented his recommendations and answered questions.</p>
<p>07:56:58</p>	<p>RAC Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Atkinson: Understands the order of permits. You changed that because of the Elk plan correct? Because if a hunter gets a choice they're going to go with a September rifle permit, correct? • Conservation permits are set on a three year (3) year cycle now? We are on the third year?

- Are there opportunities for new or younger Conservation groups to even have a chance or will they be stuck?
- Anti-setting permit numbers before we set permit numbers. What happens if you set the numbers way to high and it doesn't come in at 150?
- Bighorn Sheep: On most units, Utah is managing for 100% harvest success. Why do we want to give the Conservation permit holder until December 31st and not just match that for the draw permit holders?
- If a Sportsman draws a BHS permit, he can start September 1st with a rifle, but can a Conservation permit holder start September 1st? Or wait until the season starts with everyone?
- Was the Sportsman's draw ever consider in this rule revision for non-residents? Should it have been?
- A non-resident can purchase a Conservation permit?

- **Covy Jones:** The way it was before is six (6) out of the eight (8) permits could have been hunting the early September hunt. We back that off a little bit. Still at four (4) conservation permits. Goal is still to generate revenue, but with more equitable distribution. We moved permits into the midseason and late season now.
- Permits are set on a three (3) year cycle and we are on the third year now. This Fall we will have the Conservation Permit draft. The process is outlined in rule. They'll draft their permits again to sell for the following three (3) years based upon the last three (3) years of performance. Everyone is held to a high standard of what they do and how they do compared to other groups.
- Starts slow, but it does progress. They get a percent of the market share. The Youth Archery Association is a perfect example of this. Up to two (2) new groups can enter every three years. If you market those permits and do well compared to other groups. You get to keep that market share when you go back to the draft. It's a lot of work, but there are benefits to them.
- If something catastrophic happens, we can pull that number of permits back. We usually won't do that for consistency sake, but we can do that for something big.
- With Bighorn Sheep it's a historical thing. You saw I eliminate the variance in there. It doesn't make sense to go every three (3) years and asked for a variance every year. I'm not sure why we do this, it's just been done since the program started and a variance has become expected. Let's be transparent.
- It depends on if it's a unit tag or statewide tag. A statewide tag would start the same day. The unit tag would have to wait until that unit opened. This change allows that unit tag holder to go through (inaudible). If it's a unit Conservation permit, same starting date as the unit. There's only one statewide tag for Rockies and one for Desert and then your Sportsman's and Governor's tag.

- Opening it up to non-residents was not something we considered in the rule revision. We'd have to talk to Lindy about that. It's a special tag offered for our residents. I will fight for non-resident opportunity, we are all non-resident hunters elsewhere.
- Yes, they can purchase a Conservation permit as a non-resident.
- **Bryant Johnson:** If we open this up for the Bighorn Sheep, does that bring it up for the Conservation Deer?
- **Covy Jones:** This isn't a change a change, it's just transparency. It's a variance we used to have to ask for every year. We just want to put it in rule. This is just locking it down.
- **Tammy Pearson:** There is some strong consternation about this now more than ever before. What is the percentage that the group receives themselves? What's the breakdown of the funds?
- The 60% that comes back as part of the cooperative agreement, that goes to WRI doesn't it? None of it goes toward Grazing Improvement Program (G.I.P.), right?
- **Covy Jones:** Thirty percent comes directly back to the agency in September in a check. We use that money for our surveys and research and we match those funds. Sixty percent comes back as a cooperative agreement used for Habitat projects. That leaves 10% for the group to use at their discretion.
- It goes through WRI, but WRI and G.I.P. become partners too. It's probably been used on G.I.P. projects.
- **Kevin Bunnell:** The only requirement is they agree and we agree. But you are correct, they have some input on how the funds are spent. It has to be mutually agreed upon.
- **Covy Jones:** WRI is the mechanism where all funds are tracked. It's the clearing house. It's what makes sure we have those cooperative agreements in place.
- **Bryant Johnson:** With regard to those 10% funds, can they use that on out of state projects or does everything have to stay in state?
- The 90% has to go completely to projects within the state?
- Is it in the State's benefit to look at that 10% and how it's spent. If a large portion of that is being spent on Elk in Montana or Colorado instead of Utah?
- **Covy Jones:** Ninety percent stays in the State. The 10% can be used for administrative overhead, we don't oversee the expenditure of the

10%. Most groups give back more than 90%. Wildlife is receiving quite a bit more than 90%.

- Yes, or projects that directly benefit the State wildlife or spent in Utah.
- Ten percent sounds like a lot of money until you see the amount of work and effort put into this. We usually get back a lot more than 90%. It's a small sacrifice, really. RMR, SFW and the folks are great partners who give back a lot more than 90%.

- **Tammy Pearson:** The Conservation tags themselves, and you said there's a percentage, right? That you carve out of the public draw system that you allow for Conservation permits, right?
- Does the D.W.R. donate them to these organizations or do they purchase them?
- Just wanted clarification.

- **Covy Jones:** Yes, it's all detailed in rule. This many permits equals this many Conservation permits.
- This is where we'll read through the rule together, it's a bit complicated. There's a value based on the permit, based on a three-year history of that permit. Based on their performance, it's not real money, but they say they want that permit. Their buying power is dependent upon the amount they sell that permit for over three years. There's no real money exchanged. This is a really detailed rule because of all the potential pitfalls. All the money has to be spent within two years of it being generated. Audit and detailed accounting every year and a report is printed and posted on the website.

- **Kevin Bunnell:** They bid on them essentially. No cash is exchanged.

- **Rachel Bolus:** There was a comment online about the verification process. Making it harder for people in the South to obtain permits. Is that true?
- I actually receive a small amount of money from WRI for research. Do I need to recuse myself from voting because of that?

- **Kevin Bunnell:** There was a comment about having to requiring a person to validate their application in person and the Expo. Those are not Conservation permits, but great question. The comment was are we really maximizing those permits by requiring in person application validation.
- Great question Rachel. No, WRI is a lot bigger than just Conservation tags. I think you are fine, thank you for asking.

<p>08:16:15</p>	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brayden Richmond: (Representing himself). As most people on the RAC know I've heavily participated heavily in the conservation group for years and have donated thousands of hours over the years. Echoes what Covy has said. Always those who are in favor and those opposed. We are dealing with a public resource always need to be mindful of that, it's a trust in the State. We take that very seriously and the benefits are unbelievable. Utah puts more money on the ground in conservation than all of the other Western States combines. It's a huge amount of money. D.W.R. doesn't toot their own horn very well on this topic. Utah is leading the way and it comes from this money. All of you that drove here on the freeway tonight saw the benefits of that money. It's everywhere, you can see the habitat from the freeway. This year we are having a Sheep hunt on the Mineral Mountains in Utah. Yes, there is some controversy. Let me address this 10%. Several of your major players in the Conservation tags said that they would spend 100% of there 10% for overhead back on conservation and they've done that and provided an accounting of that also. • It takes a lot of work and effort to raise this money.
<p>08::45</p>	<p>Public Comments:</p> <p>Kevin Bunnell: Online Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree: 2 (40%) • Somewhat agree: 1 (20%) • Neither agree nor disagree: 0 (0%) • Somewhat disagree: 1 (20%) • Strongly disagree: 1 (20%) • Total votes: 5 • Weighted average: $[(1 * 1) + (1 * 2) + (0 * 3) + (1 * 4) + (2 * 5)] / 5 = .4$
<p>08:18:50</p>	<p>RAC Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Austin Atkinson: I look at Conservation permits as the cost of doing business. Feels the reason we don't open the Sportsman's raffle to be open to non-resident is because we have so many other revenue generating resources. We don't make any money relatively off of the Sportsman's raffle because it's open to residents only. The same could be said for the Expo. Maybe we don't need everyone with a computer or phone to buy Expo permit entries because we have so many other funding sources. States that open it to everyone are going away from it. Arizona just did away with Conservation permits, they want no more auctions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see that if you are able to buy a Bighorn Sheep permit that's great. If you want to hunt until December 31st, but I think the guy that draws a Sheep permit should be allowed to hunt until December 31st as well. • Pay to slay (nod to Gene Boardman). • Mike Grant: Essentially, what you are saying is if someone that purchases the permit and the person who waited 28 years to draw the permit should have the same opportunity to hunt. • For me, as an Archer, I would much rather kill using my bow. It gives me more opportunity if I drew a Sheep tag, I have that much more opportunity and not pack a rifle. • Austin Atkinson: It's really a minor thing. Honestly, most people are going to kill their Sheep anyway. It's more of a principle for me. If you are saying they have to wait until the opening day in September or whatever that date is for the unit, then they should end on the same day too. • I'm not a proponent of 100% harvest on any hunt, but that's what these Sheep hunts are managed for on the rifle hunts. And, they've already asked for the variance.
<p>08:23:17</p>	<p>MOTIONS:</p> <p>The following motion was made by Bryant Johnson, seconded by Mike Grant.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 as presented, but make December 31st the end date for all sheep unit hunts if it is approved for the conservation permit holder on that unit.</p> <p>Passed unanimously.</p>
<p>08:26:20</p>	<p>Next Board Meeting: June 13, 2024 at Farmington Bay, Utah. You many still submit comments to the Wildlife Board.</p> <p>Next Meeting: August 06, 2024 6:00 p.m. DNR Cedar City Complex</p>
<p>08:27:02</p>	<p>Chuck Chamberlain made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Mike Grant.</p> <p>Meeting adjourned.</p>

**RAC AGENDA
MAY 22, 2024**

The meeting will stream live at <https://youtube.com/live/RC3VROuljhE>

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes **ACTION**
- RAC Chair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- RAC Chair
4. Regional Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. Cougar Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator
6. CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Private lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator
7. Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 **ACTION**
- Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief

Regional Presentations Only

- Juab County WMA's Habitat Plan – CR Only **INFORMATIONAL**
-Mark Farmer, Habitat Program Manager

Meeting Locations

CR RAC – May 14th, 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Room
1115 N. Main Street, Springville
<https://youtube.com/live/HlroRCqox4g>

SER RAC – May 22nd, 6:00 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River
<https://youtube.com/live/RC3VROuljhE>

NR RAC – May 15th, 6:00
PM Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden
https://youtube.com/live/JSH9N5v_Fk4

SR RAC – May 21st, 6:00 PM
DNR Richfield City Complex
2031 Industrial Park Rd., Richfield
<https://youtube.com/live/iBN9Z908Hq8>

NER RAC – May 23rd, 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources NER Office
318 North Vernal Ave., Vernal
<https://youtube.com/live/fyclLwzrSxg>

Board Meeting – June 13th, 9:00 AM
Eccles Wildlife Education Center,
Farmington Bay
<https://youtube.com/live/sMQihQZGxKc>

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

1) Approval of agenda and minutes **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Dana Truman and passed unanimously.

Motion: To approve the agenda and minutes from last meeting.

2) CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Brad Richman, seconded by Scoot Flannery and passed unanimously.

Motion: To accept the divisions proposal as presented.

3) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Cash Stallings and passed unanimously.

Motion: To accept the divisions proposal as presented.

Southeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
December 13, 2023
Attendance

RAC Members

Eric Luke – Chair
Dana Truman – Vice Chair

Steven Duke
Charles Fischer
Brad Richman
Cash Stallings

Kirk Player
Scoot Flannery
Darren Olsen

Board Member

Kent Johnson

RAC Excused

Jack Cantsee Jr.
Sunshine Brosi
Chris Wood – Executive Secretary

Lynn Sitterud
Joe Sacco

Justin Ivins
Tyler Gilson

Division Personnel

Mike Canning
Darren DeBloois

Brandon Behling
Chad Wilson

JD Abbott
Ashley Kennedy

**Southeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
May 22, 2024
Minutes**

00:02:50 1) Chairman Erik Luke read an opening statement, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. All RAC members introduced themselves.

00:07:00 2) **Approval and Agenda of Minutes** (Action)

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Dana Truman and passed unanimously.

Motion: To approve the agenda and minutes from last meeting.

00:07:28 3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update by Dana Truman** (Informational)

Available at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/news/utah-wildlife-news/1881-watch-the-may-2024-wildlife-board-meeting.html>

00:09:30 4) **Regional Update – Brandon Behling, Conservation Outreach Manager** (Informational)

Brandon Behling updated the RAC on all regional activities.

00:13:17 5) **Cougar Update – Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator** (Informational)

View Presentations at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

Darren DeBlois summarized the cougar update.

00:18:00 6) **CWMU Rule Amendments – R657-37** (Action)

View Presentations at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

Chad Wilson was open to questions and discussion regarding the proposal.

00:18:51 **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Process if quota is not met for overpopulated CWMU's and if anything is set in rule for the 3-year quota. Non-contiguous lands not meeting acreage requirements being set in rule. Conducting depredation hunts vs non-marketable tags. Separation of public and private harvest data. Clarity regarding hunt planner updates. Timeline for review process. 90/10 split when units don't have antlerless permits available. Flexibility within 90% acreage. CWMU's grandfathered in.

Public Questions

None

00:37:27 Electronic/Public Comment Report by JD Abbott, Lieutenant

JD Abbot summarized the public comments received.

00:39:01 Public Comment

Kevin Albrecht – Past discrepancies between CWMU’s seem to be cleaned up through this review. This rule is making strides in the right direction.

00:41:58 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

President of the CWMU association unable to have a representative attend and asked that Cash Stallings state that they support the divisions recommendations fully. Appreciation for public comments regarding hunt planner updates. Opportunities CWMU’s have for people with limited mobility. 3-year quota and effects of not filling antlerless tags early in the season. Committee efforts regarding private and public hunters. Change in guest policy. Parameters for granting variances. Committee discussion on splits. Stopping points for variance. Support for CWMU program.

01:10:03 The following motion was made by Brad Richman, seconded by Scoot Flannery and passed unanimously.

Motion: To accept the division’s proposal as presented.

01:10:47 7) Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments – R657-41 (Action)

View Presentations at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

Covy Jones summarized the background of the conservation permit program.

01:15:44 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Auction tags vs expo permits. Auction tags vs draw.

Public Questions

None

01:20:35 Electronic/Public Comment Report by JD Abbott, Lieutenant

JD Abbot summarized the public comments received.

Public Comment

None

01:20:49 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Allowance to add items to the agenda.

01:21:34 The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Cash Stallings and passed unanimously.

Motion: To accept the proposal as presented.

01:21:59 Motion to Adjourn: Charles Fischer, seconded by Dane Truman

DRAFT

**Northeastern Region RAC Meeting
May 23, 2024
Vernal, Utah**

RAC Members

Attending

Rebekah Jones
Richard Buhler
Eric Major
Natasha Hadden
Jake Huber
Nathan Crapo
Mark Chynoweth
Ritchie Anderson

Absent

Brad Horrocks
Malarik Harrison
Grizz Oleen

Ute Tribe Present

Wildlife Board Members Present

Randy Dearth

DWR Personnel Present

Miles Hanberg
Torrey Christophersen
Tonya Kieffer-Selby
Dallon Christensen
Darren Debloois
Covy Jones
Pat Rainbolt
Rusty Robinson
Anthony Christianson
Randall Thacker
Chad Wilson
Mike Christensen

Northeast Region RAC Meeting
May 23, 2024
Vernal, Utah
Summary of Motions

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The following motion was made by Jake Huber, seconded by Natasha Hadden, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the Agenda and Minutes as presented.

CWMU Rule Amendments-R657-37

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Rebekah Jones, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments R657-41

The following motion was made by Richie Anderson, seconded by Natasha Hadden, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

The following motion was made by Jake Huber and seconded by Ritchie Anderson and Passed unanimously

MOTION: To have the Wildlife Board look at different ways to generate revenue from current Conservation permits to open more affordable avenues for the general public.

06:00:00	RAC Co-Chair Eric Major called the meeting to order. RAC members introduced themselves. He explained the process and said that there would be no live presentations. Public comments are to be kept at 3 min. Welcomed public.
06:04:18	<p>1) <u>Approval of Agenda & Minutes</u> (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Jake Huber, seconded by Natasha Hadden, and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes as presented.</p>
6:04:44	<p>3) <u>Wildlife Board Meeting Update</u> (Informational)</p> <p>Eric Major updated the RAC and the public on the latest Board meeting.</p>
6:07:45	<p>4) <u>DWR Regional update</u> (Informational)</p> <p>Miles Hanberg updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
6:23:55	<p>5) <u>Cougar update</u> (Informational)</p>
6:26:00	<p>RAC Questions:</p> <p>Do we break out the highest data?</p> <p>Seeing a split in population?</p> <p>Is the same effect on Big Horn Sheep?</p> <p>How confident are you with the numbers?</p> <p>What is the population goal?</p>
6:30:43	<p>Miles Hanberg read online comments:</p> <p>100% Somewhat agreed</p>
6:31:30	<p>6) <u>CWMU Rule Amendments-R657-37</u> (Action)</p> <p>Presented by Chad Wilson</p>
6:32:50	<p>RAC Questions & Comments:</p> <p>What is the total acreage of the trade lands?</p>
6:36:23	<p>Discussion on antlerless tags 90-10 split?</p> <p>Will one more tag go to the public?</p>
6:45:40	<p>In-person Public comments:</p> <p>None.</p>
6:45:50	<p>Miles Hanberg read Online Public Comments:</p> <p>69% Strongly agree.</p>

	<p>7.7% Somewhat agreed. 15% Somewhat disagreed. 7.7% Strongly disagreed.</p>
6:47:30	<p>Public Comments: Clay Batty-CWMU Association Thanks to all those passionate people who sat on committees and are in support of this. David Gurr—Thanks to the DWR for giving the 501Cs and 3s the opportunity to go hunting. I fully support the division's recommendations and hope it continues.</p>
6:52:35	<p>RAC Comments: Wish there was a better split with sportsmen.</p>
6:54:50	<p>6) The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Rebekah Jones, and passed unanimously. MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.</p>
6:55:19	<p>7) <u>Conservation Permit Program Rule Amendments R657-41</u> (action) Presented by Covy Jones</p>
7:00:03	<p>RAC Questions and Comments: Strikeout at Antelope Island? How many tags are given? How many units have 8 or more? How did the DWR come up with the ratio? Are we open to reducing numbers? What kind of revenue impact is there?</p>
7:02:58	<p>Discussion on affordable tags, more general public tags and different drawings.</p>
7:24:05	<p>Public Questions and Comments: N/A</p>
7:24:15	<p>Miles Hanberg read online comments. 50% strongly agreed. 50% somewhat agreed. Should not have to be at the Expo in person to put in for the 5\$ hunts. .</p>
7:25:28	<p>RAC Comments: Maybe look into the general public getting more opportunity for the Conservation tags and increase the money brought in. Open the Expo tags to main stream public. Discussion on hunts, recommendations and fees.</p>
7:35:40	<p>7) The following motion was made by Ritchie Anderson, seconded by Natasha Hadden, and passed unanimously. MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division</p>

7:36:00	RAC discussion on percentage of tags.
7:40:22	<p>8) The following motion was made by Jake Huber, seconded by Ritchie Anderson And passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To have the Wildlife Board look at different ways to generate revenue from current Conservation permits to open more affordable avenues for the general public.</p>
7:41:25	<p>The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Mark Chynoweth And passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: to Adjourn</p>



SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DIEDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

JOEL FERRY
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

J. SHIRLEY
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members

FROM: Kyle Maynard, Assistant Attorney General

DATE: May 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Rule Amendments resulting from Legislative changes.

The following rules will be amended to incorporate changes resulting from HB382:

- R657-5: Big Game
- R657-13: Taking Fish and Crawfish
- R657-38: Dedicated Hunter Program
- R657-42: Fees, Exchanges, surrenders, refunds, and reallocation of wildlife documents
- R657-44: Big Game Depredation

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-5. Taking Big Game.

R657-5-1. Purpose and Authority.

- (1) Under authority of Sections 23A-2-304 and 23A-2-305, the Wildlife Board has established:
 - (a) this rule for taking deer, elk, pronghorn, moose, bison, bighorn sheep, and Rocky Mountain goat.
 - (b) appropriate weapons or devices to take big game and restrictions to weapons or devices to take big game.
- (2) Specific dates, areas, methods of take, requirements, and other administrative details which may change annually are published in the guidebook of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.

R657-5-5. Duplicate License and Permit.

(1) When any unexpired license, permit, tag or certificate of registration is destroyed, lost or stolen, a person may obtain a duplicate from a division office or online license agent, for ten dollars or half of the price of the original license, permit, or certificate of registration, whichever is less.

(2) The division may waive the fee for a duplicate unexpired license, permit, tag or certificate of registration provided the person did not receive the original license, permit, tag or certificate of registration.

(3) Upon issuance of a duplicate license, permit, tag, or certificate of registration, the original license, permit, tag, or certificate of registration is invalid.

KEY: wildlife, game laws, big game seasons

Date of Last Change: February 7 2024

Notice of Continuation: September 8, 2020

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23A-2-304; 23A-2-305; 23A-11-201; 23A-11-202

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-13. Taking Fish and Crayfish.

R657-13-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under authority of Sections 23A-2-305 and 23A-2-304, the Wildlife Board has established this rule for taking fish and crayfish.

(2) Specific dates, areas, methods of take, requirements and other administrative details which may change annually and are pertinent are published in the proclamation of the Wildlife Board for taking fish and crayfish.

R657-13-2. Definitions.

- (1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23A-1-101.
- (2) In addition:
 - (a) "Aggregate" means the combined total of two or more species of fish or two or more size classes of fish which are covered by a limit distinction.
 - (b) "Angling" means fishing with a rod, pole, tipup, handline, or trollboard that has a single line with legal hooks, baits, or lures attached to it, and is held in the hands of, or within sight, not to exceed 100 feet, of the person fishing.
 - (c)(i) "Artificial fly" means a fly made by the method known as fly tying.
 - (ii) "Artificial fly" does not mean a weighted jig, lure, spinner, attractor blade, or bait.
 - (d) "Artificial lure" means a device made of rubber, wood, metal, glass, fiber, feathers, hair, or plastic with a hook or hooks attached. Artificial lures, including artificial flies, do not include fish eggs or other chemically treated or processed natural baits or any natural or human-made food, or any lures that have been treated with a natural or artificial fish attractant or feeding stimulant.
 - (e) "Daily limit" means the maximum limit, in number or amount, of protected aquatic wildlife that one person may legally take during one day.
 - (f) "Bait" means a digestible substance, including corn, worms, cheese, salmon eggs, marshmallows, or manufactured baits including human-made items that are chemically treated with food stuffs, chemical fish attractants or feeding stimulants.
 - (g) "Camp" means, for the purposes of this rule, any place providing temporary overnight accommodation for anglers including a camper, campground, tent, trailer, cabin, houseboat, boat, or hotel.
 - (h) "Chumming" means dislodging or depositing in the water any substance not attached to a hook, line, or trap, which may attract fish.
 - (i) "Commercially prepared and chemically treated baitfish" means any fish species or fish parts which have been processed using a chemical or physical preservation technique other than freezing including irradiation, salting, cooking, or oiling and are marketed, sold or traded for financial gain as bait.
 - (j) "Dipnet" means a small bag net with a handle that is used to scoop fish or crayfish from the water.

- (k) "Filleting" means the processing of fish for human consumption typically done by cutting away flesh from bones, skin, and body.
- (l) "Fishing contest" means any organized event or gathering where anglers are awarded prizes, points or money for their catch.
- (m) "Float tube" means an inflatable floating device less than 48 inches in any dimension, capable of supporting one person.
- (n) "Free Shafting" means to release a pointed shaft that is not tethered or attached by physical means to the diver in an attempt to take fish while engaged in underwater spearfishing.
- (o) "Gaff" means a spear or hook, with or without a handle, used for holding or lifting fish.
- (p) "Game fish" means Bonneville cisco; bluegill; bullhead; channel catfish; crappie; green sunfish; largemouth bass; northern pike; Sacramento perch; smallmouth bass; striped bass, trout including rainbow, albino, cutthroat, brown, golden, brook, lake or mackinaw, kokanee salmon, and grayling or any hybrid of the foregoing; tiger muskellunge; walleye; white bass; whitefish; wiper; and yellow perch.
- (q) "Handline" means a piece of line held in the hand and not attached to a pole used for taking fish or crayfish.
- (r) "Immediately Released" means that the fish should be quickly unhooked and released back into the water where caught. Fish that must be immediately released cannot be held on a stringer, or in a live well or any other container or restraining device.
- (s) "Lake" means the standing water level existing at any time within a lake basin. Unless posted otherwise, a stream flowing inside or within the high water mark is not considered part of the lake.
- (t) "Length measurement" means the greatest length between the tip of the head or snout and the tip of the caudal fin when the fin rays are squeezed together. Measurement is taken in a straight line and not over the curve of the body.
- (u) "Liftnet" means a small net that is drawn vertically through the water column to take fish or crayfish.
- (v) "Motor" means an electric or internal combustion engine.
- (w) "Nongame fish" means species of fish not listed as game fish.
- (x) "Permanent residence" means, for the purposes of this rule only, the domicile an individual claims pursuant to 23A-1-101-13(15).
- (y) "Possession limit" means, for purposes of this rule only, two daily limits, including fish in a cooler, camper, freezer, livewell or any other place of storage, excluding fish stored in an individual's permanent residence.
- (z) "Protected aquatic wildlife" means, for purposes of this rule only, all species of fish, crustaceans, or amphibians.
- (aa) "Reservoir" means the standing water level existing at any time within a reservoir basin. Unless posted otherwise, a stream flowing inside or within the high water mark is not considered part of the reservoir.
- (bb) "Seine" means a small mesh net with a weighted line on the bottom and float line on the top that is drawn through the water. This type of net is used to enclose fish when its ends are brought together.
- (cc) "Setline" means a line anchored to a non-moving object and not attached to a fishing pole.
- (dd) "Single hook" means a hook or multiple hooks having a common shank.
- (ee) "Snagging" or "gaffing" means to take a fish in a manner that the fish does not take the hook voluntarily into its mouth.
- (ff) "Spear" means a long-shafted, sharply pointed, hand held instrument with or without barbs used to spear fish from above the surface of the water.
- (gg) "Tributary" means a stream flowing into a larger stream, lake, or reservoir.
- (hh)(i) "Trout" means species of the family Salmonidae, including rainbow, albino, cutthroat, brown, golden, brook, tiger, lake or mackinaw, splake, kokanee salmon, and grayling or any hybrid of the foregoing.
- (ii) "Trout" does not include whitefish or Bonneville cisco.
- (ii) "Underwater spearfishing" means fishing by a person swimming, snorkeling, or SCUBA diving and using a mechanical device held in the hand, which uses a rubber band, spring, pneumatic power, or other device to propel a pointed shaft to take fish from under the surface of the water.

KEY: fish, fishing, wildlife, wildlife law

Date of Last Change: March 13, 2024

Notice of Continuation: August 24, 2022

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23A-2-305; 23A-24-304; 23A-4-201; 23-2-403

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-38. Dedicated Hunter Program.

R657-38-1. Purpose and Authority.

- (1) Under the authority of Section 23A-2-305, this rule provides the standards and requirements for qualified deer hunters to participate in the Dedicated Hunter Program by obtaining a certificate of registration.
- (2) The Dedicated Hunter Program is a program that:
 - (a) provides expanded hunting opportunities;

- (b) requires participation in wildlife conservation projects; and
- (c) provides educational training in hunter ethics and wildlife management principles.

R657-38-12. Dedicated Hunter Permits.

(1)(a) Pursuant to Sections 23A-4-706 and 23A-4-707 a person must have a valid Utah hunting or combination license to apply for or obtain a big game permit.

(b) Except as provided in Subsection (c), a permit may not be issued if the participant does not have a valid hunting or combination license at the time of permit issuance.

(c) A valid hunting or combination license is not required to obtain a permit in the first year of the enrollment period, provided the participant possessed a valid license when applying for the Dedicated Hunter certificate of registration.

(2) The participant must have a valid Dedicated Hunter permit in possession while hunting.

(3) Upon completion of the minimum annual requirements, a Dedicated Hunter permit may be issued as published on the division's website.

(4)(a) The division may issue a duplicate Dedicated Hunter permit pursuant to Section 23A-4-208.

(b) If a participant's unused Dedicated Hunter permit and tag is destroyed, lost, or stolen before, or during the hunting season in which the permit is valid, a participant may obtain a duplicate after paying the associated handling fee.

(c) A duplicate Dedicated Hunter permit may not be issued after the closing date of the general buck deer season.

(d) Upon issuance of a duplicate Dedicated Hunter permit, the original Dedicated Hunter permit is invalid.

(5)(a) A participant may surrender a Dedicated Hunter permit in accordance with Rule R657-42.

(b) A participant may not surrender a Dedicated Hunter permit after the earliest season allowed by the permit has begun, unless the Division can verify that the permit was never in the participant's possession.

(6)(a) Lifetime license holders may participate in the program.

(b) A lifetime license holder shall apply for a certificate of registration in the same manner as all other prospective participants.

(c) A lifetime license holder participating in the program agrees to forgo any rights to receive a lifetime license buck deer permit as provided in Section 23A-4-402 while enrolled in the program and until all outstanding service hours owed from a period of enrollment are complete.

(d) A refund or credit is not issued for a forgone lifetime license permit.

KEY: wildlife, hunting, recreation, wildlife conservation

Date of Last Change: February 7, 2024

Notice of Continuation: September 8, 2020

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23A-2-305

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-42. Fees, Exchanges, Surrenders, Refunds, and Reallocation of Wildlife Documents.

R657-42-1. Purpose and Authority.

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23A-4-201 and 23A-4-207 the division may issue wildlife documents in accordance with the rules of the Wildlife Board.

(2) This rule provides the standards and procedures for the:

- (a) exchange of permits;
- (b) surrender of wildlife documents;
- (c) refund of wildlife documents;
- (d) reallocation of permits; and
- (e) assessment of late fees.

R657-42-10. Duplicates.

(1) If an unexpired wildlife document is destroyed, lost or stolen, a person may obtain a duplicate from a division office or online license agent for a duplicate fee as provided in the fee schedule.

(2) The division may waive the fee for a duplicate unexpired wildlife document, provided the person did not receive the original wildlife document.

(3) To obtain a duplicate wildlife document, the applicant may be required to complete an affidavit testifying to such loss, destruction or theft.

(4) Upon issuance of a wildlife document, the original wildlife document is invalid.

KEY: wildlife, permits

Date of Last Change: February 7, 2024

Notice of Continuation: March 15, 2023

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23A-4-201; 23A-4-207; 23A-4-301

R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.

R657-44. Big Game Depredation.

R657-44-1. Purpose and Authority.

Under authority of Section 23A-1-206, 23A-2-201(4), 23A-8-401, 23A-8-402, 23A-8-403, 23A-8-404 and 23A-8-405, this rule provides:

- (1) the procedures, standards, requirements, and limits for assessing big game depredation; and
- (2) mitigation procedures for big game depredation.

R657-44-3. Damage to Cultivated Crops, Fences, or Irrigation Equipment by Big Game Animals.

(1) Except as provided in Sections 23A-1-206 and 23A-2-201(4), if big game animals are damaging cultivated crops on cleared and planted land, or fences or irrigation equipment on private land, the landowner or lessee shall immediately, upon discovery of big game damage, request that the division take action by notifying a division representative in the appropriate regional office pursuant to Section 23A-8-402 (1).

(2) Notification may be made:

- (a) orally to expedite a field investigation; or
- (b) in writing to a division representative in the appropriate division regional office.

(3)(a) The regional supervisor or division representative shall contact the landowner or lessee within 72 hours after receiving notification to determine the nature of the damage and take appropriate action for the extent of the damage experienced or expected during the damage incident period.

(b) The division shall consider the big game population management objectives as established in the wildlife unit management plan approved by the Wildlife Board.

(c) Division action shall include:

- (i) removing the big game animals causing depredation; or
- (ii) implementing a depredation mitigation plan pursuant to Sections 23A-8-402 (2)(b) through 23A-8-402

(2)(f) and approved in writing by the landowner or lessee.

(4)(a) The division mitigation plan may incorporate any of the following measures:

(i) sending a division representative onto the premises to control or remove the big game animals, including:

- (A) herding;
- (B) capture and relocation;
- (C) temporary or permanent fencing; or
- (D) removal, as authorized by the division director or the division director's designee;
- (ii) recommending to the Wildlife Board an antlerless big game hunt in the next big game season

framework;

(iii) scheduling a depredation hunter pool hunt in accordance with Sections R657-44-7, R657-44-8, or R657-44-9;

(iv) issuing mitigation permits to the landowner or lessee for the harvest of big game animals causing depredation during a general or special season hunt authorized by the Wildlife Board, of which:

(A) the hunting area for big game animals may include a buffer zone established by the division that surrounds, or is adjacent to, the lands where depredation is occurring;

(B) the landowner or lessee may designate an immediate family member or employee to receive mitigation permits;

(C) a person may receive no more than five antlerless deer permits, five doe pronghorn permits, and two antlerless elk permits per mitigation plan;

(D) each qualified recipient of a mitigation permit will receive from the division a Mitigation Permit

Hunting License that satisfies the hunting license requirements in R657-44-11(c) to obtain the mitigation permit.

(E) the Mitigation Permit Hunting License does not authorize the holder to hunt small game; nor does it qualify the holder to apply for or obtain a cougar, bear, turkey, or other big game permit.

(v) issuing big game mitigation permit vouchers for use on the landowner's or lessee's private land during a general or special hunt authorized by the Wildlife Board of which:

(A) mitigation permit vouchers for antlerless deer may authorize the take of one or two deer as determined by the division;

(B) mitigation permit vouchers for pronghorn may authorize the take of one or two doe pronghorn as determined by the division;

(C) the division may not issue mitigation permit vouchers for moose, bison, bighorn sheep, or mountain goat; and

(D) the hunting area for big game animals may include a buffer zone established by the division that surrounds, or is adjacent to, the landowner's or lessee's private lands where depredation is occurring.

(b) The mitigation plan may describe how the division will assess and compensate for damage pursuant to Section 23A-8-405.

(c) The landowner or lessee and the division may agree upon a combination of mitigation measures to be used pursuant to Subsections (4)(a)(i) through (4)(a)(v), including a damage payment or a description of how the division will assess and compensate the landowner or lessee under Section 23A-8-405 for damage to cultivated crops, fences, or irrigation equipment.

(d) The agreement pursuant to Subsection (4)(c) must be made before a claim for damage is filed and the mitigation measures are taken.

(5) Vouchers may be issued in accordance with Subsection (4)(a)(v) to:

(a) the landowner or lessee; or

(b) a landowner association that:

(i) applies in writing to the division;

(ii) provides a map of the association lands;

(iii) provides signatures of the landowners in the association; and

(iv) designates an association representative to act as liaison with the division.

(6) In determining appropriate mitigation, the division shall consider the landowner's or lessee's revenue pursuant to Subsections 23A-8-402 (2)(f) and 23A-8-405 (3)(b).

(7) Mitigation permits or vouchers may be withheld from persons who have violated this rule, any other wildlife rule, the Wildlife Resources Code, or are otherwise ineligible to receive a permit.

(8)(a) The options provided in Subsections (4)(a)(i) through (4)(a)(v) are for antlerless animals only.

(b) Deer and pronghorn hunts may be August 1 through December 31, and elk hunts may be August 1 through January 31.

(9)(a) The division director may approve mitigation permits or mitigation permit vouchers issued for antlered animals.

(b) A mitigation permit may be issued to the landowner or lessee or a qualifying individual designated by the landowner or lessee to take big game for personal use, provided the division and the landowner or lessee desires the animals to be permanently removed.

(c) A mitigation permit voucher may be issued to the landowner or lessee, provided:

(i)(A) the division determines that the big game animals in the geographic area significantly contribute to the wildlife management units;

(B) the landowner or lessee agrees to perpetuate the animals on their land; and

(C) the damage, or expected damage, to the landowner's or lessee's cleared and planted land equals or exceeds the expected value of the mitigation permit voucher on that private land within the wildlife unit; or

(ii)(A) the big game damage occurs on the landowner's or lessee's cleared and planted land;

(B) the division and the affected landowner or lessee desire the animals to be permanently removed; and

(C) the damage, or expected damage, to the cleared and planted land equals or exceeds the expected value of the mitigation permit voucher on that private land within the wildlife unit.

(d) The hunting area for a mitigation permit or permit voucher issued under this subsection includes the landowner's or lessee's cleared and planted land where the depredation occurs and may include a buffer zone established by the division that surrounds, or is adjacent to, that land.

(10)(a) If the landowner or lessee and the division are unable to agree on the assessed damage, they shall designate a third party pursuant to Subsection 23A-8-405(3)(d).

(b) Additional compensation may be paid above the value of any mitigation permits or vouchers granted to

the landowner or lessee if the damage exceeds the value of the mitigation permits or vouchers.

(11)(a) The landowner or lessee may revoke approval of the mitigation plan agreed to pursuant to Subsection (4)(c).

(b) If the landowner or lessee revokes the mitigation plan, the landowner or lessee must request that the division take action pursuant to Section 23A-8-402 (1)(a).

(c) Any subsequent request for action shall start a new 72-hour time limit as specified in Section 23A-8-402 (2)(a).

(12) The expiration of the damage incident period does not preclude the landowner or lessee from making future claims.

(13) The division may enter into a conservation lease with the landowner or lessee of private land pursuant to Section 23A-8-402 (5).

R657-44-4. Landowner or Lessee Authorized to Kill Big Game Animals.

(1) Except as provided in Sections 23A-1-206 and 23A-2-201(4), the landowner or lessee is authorized to kill big game animals damaging cultivated crops on cleared and planted land pursuant to Section 23A-8-403.

(2) The division director may prohibit the killing of big game animals under Subsection (1) if, within 72 hours after a landowner or lessee has requested that the division take action to remove depredating animals, the division determines the criteria in Section 23A-8-403 (2)(a) are satisfied and the landowner or lessee is offered a depredation mitigation plan.

(3) A landowner or lessee who is offered a depredation mitigation plan may:

(a) accept the plan in writing; or

(b) refuse to accept the plan and appeal it, in writing, to the division director and mitigation review panel as provided in Sections 23A-8-403 (2)(b) and 23A-8-404 (3).

(4)(a) A depredation mitigation plan accepted by the landowner or lessee shall remain effective during the entire damage incident period, unless otherwise revoked by the landowner or lessee pursuant to Section 23A-8-402 (4) and R657-44-3(11).

(b) A depredation mitigation plan approved or modified by the mitigation review panel pursuant to Section 23A-8-404 (3)(b) shall remain effective during the entire damage incident period unless earlier modified by the mitigation review panel upon petition and showing by the landowner or lessee that a substantial change in the nature and extent of the big game damage or the method of calculating damages necessitates further review and modification to the plan.

(i) A petition to amend an existing depredation mitigation plan approved or modified by the mitigation review panel shall be directed to the director of the division.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the division and the landowner or lessee from mutually agreeing to alter or amend an existing depredation mitigation plan in order to better address big game damage.

(i) If the parties cannot reach agreement on amending the plan, the landowner or lessee may petition the mitigation review panel for relief as provided in Subsection (4)(b).

(5) The division director's order under Subsection (2) prohibiting the killing of big game animals shall remain in full force and effect during the same time period that the original or amended depredation mitigation plan associated with the big game damage incident remains effective.

(6) The expiration of the damage incident period does not preclude the landowner or lessee from making future claims.

R657-44-5. Compensation for Damage to Crops, Fences, or Irrigation Equipment on Private Land.

(1) Except as provided in Sections 23A-1-206 and 23A-2-201(4), the division may provide compensation to landowners or lessees for damage to cultivated crops on cleared and planted land, or fences or irrigation equipment on private land caused by big game animals pursuant to Sections 23A-1-102 and 23A-8-405.

(2) For purposes of compensation, all depredation incidents end on June 30 annually, but may be reinstated July 1.

R657-44-6. Damage to Livestock Forage on Private Land.

(1)(a) Except as provided in Sections 23A-1-206 and 23A-2-201(4), if big game animals are damaging livestock forage on private land, the landowner or lessee shall immediately, upon discovery of big game damage, request that the division take action to alleviate the depredation problem pursuant to Section 23A-8-402, and as provided in Subsections R657-44-3(1) through R657-44-3(4)(a)(v), and R657-44-3(5) and R657-44-3(8)(a).

(b) In determining appropriate mitigation, the division shall consider the landowner's or lessee's revenue pursuant to Subsections 23A-8-402 (2)(f) and 23A-8-405 (3)(b).

(c) Damage to livestock forage is not eligible for monetary compensation from the division.

(2)(a) Antlerless deer and doe pronghorn hunts may occur August 1 through December 31, and antlerless elk hunts may occur August 1 through January 31.

(b) Antlerless permits shall not exceed ten percent of the animals on the private land, with a maximum of twenty permits per landowner or lessee, except where the estimated population for the management unit is significantly over objective.

(c) Mitigation permits or vouchers may be withheld from persons who have violated this rule, any other wildlife rule, the Wildlife Resources Code, or are otherwise ineligible to receive a permit.

(3) The division may enter into a conservation lease with the landowner or lessee of private land pursuant to Subsection 23A-8-402 (5).

(4) Permits and vouchers for antlered animals using livestock forage on private land are issued only through the provisions provided in Rule R657-43.

KEY: wildlife, big game, depredation

Date of Last Change: October 1, 2023

Notice of Continuation: April 4, 2022

Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: [23A-1-206](#); [23A-2-201](#); 23A-8-401; 23A-8-402



SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

JOEL FERRY
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

J. SHIRLEY
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Utah Wildlife Board

FROM: Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief

DATE: May 31, 2024

SUBJECT: Proposed Conservation Permit List

Esteemed members of the Utah Wildlife Board, Every three years, the Division (DWR) recommends a list of conservation permits to the Wildlife Board for approval. These conservation permits generate revenue to fund habitat improvement projects and to research, translocate, and monitor wildlife.

In preparing the 2025-2027 conservation permit list for recommendation, DWR adhered to the conservation permit rule (R657-41). New, non-traditional hunts, or Hunts with a high risk of being discontinued during the 3-year term were not included in the proposed list (e.g. management buck deer hunts, HAMS hunts, etc.).

From 2022-2024, the Wildlife Board approved 318 conservation permits. The UDWR is recommending an increase of 18 permits for a total of 336 conservation permits for 2025-2027. The increase in permits is primarily due to the increase in public draw permits for elk and pronghorn

Please see the attached hunt tables for details on proposed conservation permits

Recomended Deer Conservation Permits for 2025-2027		
Hunt Name	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Henry Mtns	49	2
Paunsaugunt	135	7
Book Cliffs	221	8
Cache, Crawford Mtn	8	0
Diamond Mtn	120	6
Fillmore, Oak Creek LE	49	2
La Sal, Dolores Triangle	20	1
San Juan, Elk Ridge	74	4
West Desert, Vernon	210	8
Statewide	1	1
Total	887	39

Recomended Elk Conservation Permits for 2025-2027		
Hunt Name	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Beaver, East	86	4
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/East	87	4
Book Cliffs, Little Creek Roadless	9	0
Boulder	125	6
Box Elder, Grouse Creek	26	1
Box Elder, Pilot Mtn	13	1
Cache, Meadowville	55	3
Cache, South	36	2
Diamond Mtn	92	5
Fillmore, Pahvant	75	4
Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	343	8
La Sal, Dolores Triangle	7	0
La Sal, La Sal Mtns	159	8
Manti	680	8
Monroe	75	4
Mt Dutton	71	4
Nebo/San Pitch Mtns	80	4
North Slope, Three Corners	27	1
Panguitch Lake	60	3
San Juan	105	5
Southwest Desert, South	142	7
Wasatch Mtns	826	8
Statewide	1	1
Total	3180	91

Recomended Pronghorn Conservation Permits for 2025-2027		
Hunt Name	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Beaver (hunter's choice)	50	2
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	65	3
Book Cliffs, South	38	2
Box Elder, Promontory	20	1
Box Elder, Puddle Valley	20	1
Box Elder, Snowville	46	2
Box Elder, West	49	2
Cache/Rich	9	0
Fillmore, Oak Creek South	65	3
Kaiparowits	2	0
La Sal, Potash/South Cisco	26	1
Mt Dutton/Paunsaugunt	40	2
Nine Mile, Anthro-Myton Bench	144	7
Nine Mile, Range Creek	13	1
North Slope, Summit	15	1
North Slope, Three Corners/West Daggett	59	3
Panguitch Lake/Zion, North	39	2
Parker Mtn	75	4
Pine Valley	36	2
San Juan, Hatch Point	6	0
San Rafael, Desert	6	0
San Rafael, North	104	5
Southwest Desert	159	8
Vernal	100	5
West Desert, Riverbed	84	4
West Desert, Rush Valley	41	2
West Desert, Snake Valley	101	5
Statewide	1	1
Total	1413	69

Recomended Moose Conservation Permits for 2025-2027			
Hunt Name	Hunt Number	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Cache	MB6000	15	1
Chalk Creek	MB6001	3	0
Diamond Mtn/Vernal	MB6009	2	0
East Canyon	MB6002	4	0
East Canyon, Morgan-St	MB6003	3	0
Kamas	MB6004	4	0
Morgan-South Rich	MB6005	5	0
North Slope, Summit	MB6006	22	2
North Slope, Three Corn	MB6007	9	0
Ogden	MB6008	8	0
Wasatch Mtns/Central	MB6011	22	1
Yellowstone	MB6010	4	0
Statewide		1	1
Total		102	5

Recomended Mtn Goat Conservation Permits for 2025-2027			
Hunt Name	Hunt Number	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Beaver (early)	G06800	9	1
Beaver (late)	G06801	9	0
Beaver (archery)	G06822	2	0
High Uintas Central	G06805	4	0
High Uintas East	G06806	2	0
High Uintas Kamas	G06804	1	0
High Uintas Leidy Peak	G06807	1	0
High Uintas West	G06808	9	1
La Sal, La Sal Mtns	G06817	11	1
Mt Dutton	G06814	2	0
Nebo (any legal weapon)	G06803	13	1
Nebo (archery)	G06821	11	1
Ogden, Willard Peak	G06810	1	0
Wasatch Mtns, Box Elder	G06818	3	0
Wasatch Mtns, Lone Peak	G06819	2	0
Wasatch Mtns, Provo	G06813	5	0
Wasatch Mtns, Timpano	G06820	10	1
		1	1
Total		96	7

Recomended Bison Conservation Permits for 2025-2027			
Hunt Name	Hunt Number	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (cow only)	BI6536	3	0
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (hunter's choice)	BI6534	5	1
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (hunter's choice)	BI6535	3	0
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (archery, hunter's choice)	BI6532	5	0
Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (cow only)	BI6529	5	0
Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (hunter's choice)	BI6530	5	0
Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (hunter's choice)	BI6531	5	0
Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (hunter's choice)	BI6537	10	1
Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (archery, hunter's choice)	BI6528	5	0
Henry Mtns (hunter's choice)	BI6503	11	1
Henry Mtns (hunter's choice)	BI6504	10	0
Henry Mtns (cow only)	BI6505	6	0
Henry Mtns (cow only)	BI6506	7	1
Henry Mtns (archery, hunter's choice)	BI6509	5	0
Henry Mtns (hunter's choice)	BI6516	7	1
Statewide		1	1
Total		93	6

Recomended DBHS Conservation Permits for 2025-2027			
Hunt Name	Hunt Number	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Henry Mtns	DS6600	2	0
Kaiparowits, East	DS6601	9	1
Kaiparowits, Escalante	DS6602	8	1
Kaiparowits, West	DS6603	6	1
La Sal, Potash/South Ci	DS6604	6	1
Mineral Mtns	DS6625	2	0
Pine Valley, Beaver Dan	DS6621	6	1
Pine Valley, Virgin River	DS6620	2	0
San Juan, Lockhart	DS6606	2	0
San Juan, North	DS6622	3	0
San Juan, San Juan Rive	DS6623	1	0
San Juan, South	DS6607	2	0
San Rafael, Dirty Devil	DS6608	7	1
San Rafael, Dirty Devil	DS6624	2	0
San Rafael, North	DS6609	4	0
San Rafael, South	DS6610	12	1
Zion	DS6611	2	0
Statewide		1	1
Total		77	8

Recomended RMBHS Conservation Permits for 2025-2027			
Hunt Name	Hunt Number	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Book Cliffs, South	RS6701	6	1
Box Elder, Newfoundland	RS6703	6	1
Box Elder, Newfoundland	RS6704	6	1
Box Elder, Newfoundland	RS6722	3	0
Fillmore, Oak Creek (early)	RS6720	4	0
Fillmore, Oak Creek (late)	RS6726	5	1
Fillmore, Oak Creek (arche)	RS6727	2	0
Nebo	RS6725	2	0
Nine Mile, Gray Canyon	RS6712	6	1
Nine Mile, Jack Creek	RS6713	4	0
North Slope, Three Corner	RS6708	2	0
North Slope, Summit/Wes	RS6709	3	0
Oquirrh-Stansbury, West	RS6721	4	0
Wasatch Mtns, West	RS6724	4	0
Statewide		1	1
Total		58	6

Recomended Turkey Conservation Permits for 2025-2027

Hunt Name	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Northern Region	360	8
Central Region	275	8
Northeastern Region	200	8
Southeastern Region	200	8
Southern Region	450	8
Statewide	1	1
Total	1486	41

Recommended Bear Conservation Permits for 2025-2027						
Hunt Name	2024 Permit Breakout					Conservation Permits
	Spring Hound	Summer Bait	Fall	Multi Season	Excluding Spot and	
Beaver	10	10	8	2	30	1
Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	43	10	18	3	74	4
Book Cliffs, Little Creek Roadless	10	4	7	2	23	1
Cache/Ogden	2	2	1	1	6	0
Central Mtns, Manti-North	18	13	11	11	53	3
Central Mtns, Manti-South/San Rafael, North	8	17	17	13	55	3
Central Mtns, Nebo	8	9	6	3	26	1
Chalk Creek/East Canyon/Morgan-South Rich	5	6	3	0	14	1
Fillmore, Pahvant	1	0	1	0	2	0
Kamas/North Slope, Summit	5	6	4	4	19	1
La Sal	43	27	6	10	86	4
Monroe	1	1	0	0	2	0
Mt Dutton	3	3	3	1	10	0
Nine Mile	22	16	31	7	76	4
North Slope, Three Corners/West Daggett	3	1	2	1	7	0
Panguitch Lake/Zion	9	4	8	4	25	1
Paunsaugunt	4	3	3	1	11	1
Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	29	22	11	10	72	4
Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	7	6	4	2	19	1
San Juan	43	27	6	10	86	4
South Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn/Vernal	12	9	7	7	35	2
South Slope, Yellowstone	7	5	4	2	18	1
Wasatch Mtns, Avintaquin/Currant Creek	12	7	9	5	33	2
Wasatch Mtns, West-Central	40	24	12	14	90	4
Statewide				1	1	1
Totals	345	232	182	114	873	44

Spot and stalk hunts not included for conservation permits

Recomended Antlerless Elk Conservation Permits for 2025-2027		
Hunt Name	2024 Permit Total	Conservation Permtis
Cache	200	4
Manti	920	4
Fishlake	220	4
La Sal	750	4
Wasatch Mtns	2375	4
Total	4465	20

May hunt any antlerless elk unit or sub-unit

Summary by Species		
Species	2022-24 Cons Permits	Conservation Permtis
Deer	38	39
Elk (Bulls)	80	91
Pronghorn	60	69
Moose	6	5
Mtn Goat	7	7
Bison	8	6
RMBHS	8	6
DBHS	8	8
Turkey	41	41
Cougar	1	0
Bear	41	44
Antlerless Elk*	20	20
Total	318	336