

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
December 12, 2024, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The meeting can be viewed live at <https://youtube.com/live/nJlwj-iFevl>

Thursday, December 12, 2024 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 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. Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030
– Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5
– Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates
– Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates
– Rusty Robinson, Once-in-a-lifetime Species Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations
– Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land
LOA Renewals
– Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Antelope Island Conservation Permit
– Rusty Robinson, Once-in-a-lifetime Species Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. Residency Amendment – R657-45 and R657-62
– Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 13. 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:

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

Spring 2025 – Target Date – Green Pelts

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into the viability of selling green pelts for both bear and cougar. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Paula Richmond
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 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

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Sheep Hunt Ending Date

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look at a consistent sheep hunt ending date. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 2024

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Dedicated Hunter Hours Bank

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to explore the concept of “banking” dedicated hunter hours the months prior to the tags being issued the first year. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Gary Nielson
Assigned to: Bryan Christensen
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 2024

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Spearfishing

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to study the possibilities of increased opportunities for spearfishing and to look at the impact spearfishing on fisheries in Utah may have. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Trina Hedrick
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: September 19, 2024

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

September 19, 2024

Eccles Wildlife Education Center

1157 S. Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtube.com/live/71Jrrj9C2x8>

AGENDA

Thursday, September 19, 2024 Board Meeting 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 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. 2025 Fishing Recommendations and R657-13 Rule Amendments
– Trina Hedrick, Coldwater Sportfish Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. R657-61 Valuation of Real Property Interests
– Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Conservation Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 8. Conservation Permit Annual Report
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 9. Expo Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 10. Expo Permit Allocation
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 11. LOA Committee Membership
– Chad Wilson, Private Lands Public Wildlife Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. 2025 RAC/Board Meeting Dates
– Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Other Business
– Randy Dearth Chairman | CONTINGENT |

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

Wildlife Board Motions

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

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

Spring 2025 – Target Date – Green Pelts

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into the viability of selling green pelts for both bear and cougar. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Paula Richmond
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 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 only to 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

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Sheep Hunt Ending Date

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look at a consistent sheep hunt ending date. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Rusty Robinson
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 2024

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Dedicated Hunter Hours Bank

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to explore the concept of “banking” dedicated hunter hours the months prior to the tags being issued the first year. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Gary Nielson
Assigned to: Bryan Christensen
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: June 13, 2024

Fall 2025 – Target Date – Spearfishing

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to study the possibilities of increased opportunities for spearfishing, and to look at the impact spearfishing on fisheries in Utah may have. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Kent Johnson
Assigned to: Trina Hedrick
Action: Under study
Placed on Action Log: September 19, 2024

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 19, 2024, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 S. Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the June 13, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting as submitted.

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 22, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting as submitted.

3) 2025 Fishing Recommendations and R657-13 Rule Amendments (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to study the possibilities of increased opportunities for spearfishing, and to look at the impact spearfishing on fisheries in Utah may have. This is to be placed on the Action Log.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal regarding ice hold size, but ask the Division to monitor the use of ice holes and the size of holes being used, and to report back in one year.

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the proposal on Manning Meadows Reservoir and Barney Lake, and to re-evaluate the reservoirs in two years.

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

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

- 4) R657-61 Valuation of Real Property Interests (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the Rule R657-61 amendments as presented by the Division.

- 5) Conservation Permit Audit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Bret Selman and passed 4 in favor, with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

- 6) Conservation Permit Annual Report (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor, with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented by the Division.

- 7) Expo Permit Audit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed 4 in favor, with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Expo Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

- 8) Expo Permit Allocation (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor, with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Expo Permit Allocation as presented by the Division.

9) LOA Committee Membership (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve Eric Luke as the RAC representative on the LOA Committee.

10) 2025 RAC/Board Meeting Dates (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the 2025 RAC/Board Meeting Dates as presented.

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 19, 2024, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 S. Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

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

RAC Chairs

Central – Brock McMillan
Northeastern – Grizz Olean
Northern – Brad Buchanan
Southeastern – Eric Luke
Southern – Austin Atkinson

Division Personnel

Ashley Green	Paul Gedge	Drew Cushing
Justin Shannon	Rusty Robinson	Seth Magers
Kenny Johnson	Trina Hedrick	Phil Grey
Eric Edgley	Craig Walker	Chris VanHeusen
Chris Wood	Blair Stringham	Chad Bettridge
Drew Cushing	Charles Lyons	Chris Penne
Staci Coons	Chelsea Duke	Miles Hanberg
Paige Wiren	Covy Jones	Craig Walker
Mike Canning	Darren DeBlois	

Public Present

Angie Wonnacott	Ken Strong
Ronald Dunn	
Ryan Peterson	
Steve Gottfredson	
Mike Kennedy	

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 19, 2024, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 S. Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
<https://youtube.com/live/71Jrr9C2x8>

00:00:12 [Technical issue: no audio]

Chairman Dearth called the meeting to order and read a meeting structure and rules statement. The Board and RAC members introduced themselves.

00:02:51 **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

00:03:35 **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the June 13, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting as submitted.

The following motion was made by Gary Nielson, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 22, 2024 Wildlife Board Meeting as submitted.

00:05:14 **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**

There were no Action Log items to report on at this meeting.

00:05:58 **4) DWR Update (Informational)**

Director Shirley gave updates on the Administrative Services, Aquatics, Habitat, Law Enforcement, Outreach and Wildlife sections, and a video about pelican banding on Hat Island was shown.

The Board asked a question about reports of mussels in the Upper Colorado River.

00:22:41 **Technical issues**

00:33:49 **5) 2025 Fishing Recommendations and R657-13 Rule Amendments (Action)**

Coldwater Sportfish Coordinator Trina Hedrick shared how management decisions are made, and noted that the recommendations for this agenda item are reflective of data collected from angler surveys.

00:38:12 **Board/RAC Questions**

The Board asked how much biological data vs social input was reflected in the

decisions and recommendations for Manning Meadows Reservoir, asked if more fish need to be removed from Manning Meadows Reservoir, asked about the current average length of harvested trout, and if that reservoir is becoming size-limited.

The Board further asked about how the Division came to the recommendation of eliminating the ice fishing ice hole size limit.

00:45:39 Public Input

Director Shirley shared the online public input.

00:48:17 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the rule amendments with various stipulations. The Central RAC asked the Board to consider an Action Log item to monitor the take by spearfish anglers and the impact that spearfish anglers have on fisheries.

00:52:54 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

01:08:09 Division Clarification

There was no clarification from the Division.

01:08:29 Board Discussion

The Board asked about Wyoming's unrestricted ice fishing hole size rule, and if Wyoming has reported problems, and asked about the difference in winter climate conditions between Wyoming and Utah. The Board asked if it would be a problem to have different ice fishing regulations on the Wyoming and Utah sides of Flaming Gorge Reservoir. The Board commented that the location of ice holes, especially large ones, are an unknown, whereas other features, such as springs, are in the same location year to year.

The Board then asked if it would be realistic to have different regulations on Barney Lake and Manning Meadows Reservoir given their proximity.

The Board asked about the motion that the Central RAC made, and commented that one set of rules for Flaming Gorge would be helpful.

The Board further commented that people's negative impression of spearfishing comes from media photos of early fishing derbies or contests.

The RAC asked if it would be possible to ask anglers to submit harvest reports. The Board asked how many lure and non-bait fisheries there are in the southern region, and asked about stocking rates at Manning Meadows.

The Board asked how many fish caught on artificial flies and lures end up dying after being released, and asked about potentially increasing take limit versus changing the bait, and the impact that could have on fish populations.

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

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to study the possibilities of increased opportunities for spearfishing, and to look at the impact spearfishing on fisheries in Utah may have. This is to be placed on the Action Log/

The Board asked the division's opinion on ice hole size.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's proposal regarding ice hole size, but ask the Division to monitor the use of ice holes and the size of holes being used, and to report back in one year.

The Board asked if there was social pressure to influence the division's recommendation to use bait to fish Manning Meadows Reservoir.

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond seconded by Kent Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the proposal on Manning Meadows Reservoir and Barney Lake, and to re-evaluate the reservoirs in two years.

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

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

01:49:02 6) R657-61 Valuation of Real Property Interests (Action)

Wildlife Lands Coordinator Chelsea Duke summarized the proposed rule changes.

01:49:45 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked about land transfers, and voiced concern about the Division being outbid on land being sold, and the state then losing the opportunity to use the land for wildlife conservation.

01:54:21 Public Input

Director Shirley shared the online public input.

01:54:45 RAC Recommendations

All RACs unanimously passed the division's proposal.

01:55:39 Board Discussion

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the Rule R657-61 amendments as

presented by the Division.

01:56:35 7) Conservation Permit Audit

Administrative Services Section Chief Kenny Johnson gave a presentation titled, “Utah’s Conservation Permit Program 2024 Audit.”

02:04:20 Board/RAC Questions

Chairman Dearth highlighted the importance of the conservation permit program. The RAC asked if the 2024 audit – executive summary that Kenny presented is available online for the public to see.

02:05:23 Public Input

There was no public input collected on this agenda item.

02:05:24 RAC Recommendations

This agenda item was not presented at the RAC meetings.

02:05:35 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

02:06:20 Board Discussion

There was no Board discussion.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Bret Selman and passed 4 in favor with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

02:07:11 8) Conservation Permit Annual Report

Wildlife Section Chief Covy Jones gave a presentation titled, “Utah’s Conservation Permit Program Annual Report – Fiscal Year 2024.”

02:14:56 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked what the Utah Wildlife Migration Initiative is.

02:19:04 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

02:20:33 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented by the Division.

02:21:23 **9) Expo Permit Audit**

Administrative Services Section Chief Kenny Johnson gave a presentation titled, “Expo Audit for 2024.”

02:30:17 **Board/RAC Questions**

The Board thanked the Division for the time and effort that goes into the expo permit audit.

02:30:53 **Public Comments**

Public comments were accepted at this time.

02:31:53 **Board Discussion**

The Board wondered whether the funds generated by the expo permit program would keep increasing, or eventually plateau. The Board asked about the original intent of creating the expo permit requirement that the applicant appear in-person at the hunting and conservation expo to validate their application.

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed 4 in favor with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote

MOTION: I move that we accept the Expo Permit Audit as presented by the Division.

02:34:27 **10) Expo Permit Allocation**

Wildlife Section Chief Covy Jones gave a presentation titled, “2025 Expo Permit Allocation.”

02:38:31 **Board/RAC Questions**

The Board asked about the recommended increased permit number for later archery elk.

02:39:23 **Public Comments**

There were no public comment cards submitted for this agenda item.

02:39:39 **Board Discussion**

The following motion was made by Bret Selman, seconded by Kent Johnson and passed 4 in favor with 1 recusal. Paula Richmond recused herself from the vote

MOTION: I move that we accept the Expo Permit Allocation as presented by the Division.

02:40:56 **11) LOA Committee Membership**

Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator Chad Wilson recommended that Eric Luke serve on the LOA Committee.

02:41:37 Board Discussion

There was no board discussion.

The following motion was made by Paula Richmond, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve Eric Like as the RAC representative on the LOA Committee.

02:42:42 12) 2025 RAC/Board Meeting Dates

Wildlife Board Coordinator Staci Coons presented changes to the 2025 RAC/Board meeting dates, and announced the 2025 Wildlife Board member recruitment schedule.

02:45:14 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked where the 2024 meeting dates would be published.

02:45:26 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, seconded by Paula Richmond and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the 2025 RAC/Board meeting dates as presented by the Division.

02:45:55 13) Other Business

Director Shirley announced that there were still any bull elk permits available at the time of this meeting.

02:46:46 Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

1 - Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (Action)

NR:

MOTION: I move we accept Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 as presented.

VOTE: Passed 10-1

CR, NER:

MOTION: I move we accept Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

SR:

MOTION: Accept the plan as presented for general season units with the exception of the changes to the buck to doe ratios for the southern region, and not allowing the 30% change without going through the public process.

VOTE: Failed 8-3

MOTION: Approve the LE and Premium LE with the exception of reducing the range on the buck to doe ratio.

VOTE: Passed 8-3

MOTION: Accept the remainder as proposed with the exception that all permit recommendations need to come through the public process.

VOTE: Passed 8-3

SER:

MOTION: Accept the Division's proposal as presented with one change – the wording regarding mule deer research should be broadened to include all research topics needed for population management.

VOTE: Passed 8-1

**2 - Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (Action)
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)**

NR:

MOTION: I move we accept Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting) as presented.

VOTE: Passed 7-4

CR:

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations concerning antler restrictions as presented.

VOTE: Failed 4-6 with 1 abstention

MOTION: Reject the Division's recommendations concerning antler restrictions as presented.

VOTE: Passed 6 -4 with 1 abstention

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations concerning restricted weapons as presented.

VOTE: Passed 9-1 with 1 abstention

MOTION: Accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SR:

MOTION: Approve the proposal as presented but don't exempt youth hunters from the antler restriction on the Pine Valley unit.

VOTE: Passed 7-4

SER:

MOTION: Accept the proposal as presented.

VOTE: Passed 7-2

NER:

MOTION: Accept the Hunt Structure research proposal for R657-5 as presented by the Division but ask the Wildlife Board to direct the Division to add a general season antler restricted Mule Deer Hunt unit in the Northeastern Region.

VOTE: Passed 5-3

3 - Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

NR:

MOTION: I move we accept Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates as presented with the exception on the Paunsaugunt. Management hunts will mirror the premium limited entry dates and the rifle will mirror the cactus buck season dates.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

CR:

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations with the addition of aligning the management hunts on the Paunsaugunt to line up with the archery and the muzzleloader with the archery and muzzleloader management hunts, and for the rifle hunt to line up with the cactus buck hunts.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SR:

MOTION: Accept the proposal as presented with the addition of aligning the Paunsaugunt hunts as follows:

- Same dates for Archery LE and Archery Management
- Same dates for Muzzleloader LE and Muzzleloader Management buck
- Align ALW management buck and cactus buck hunts with an ending date of November 20
- Keep a single ALW hunt on the Oak Creek

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SER:

MOTION: Accept the Division's proposal as presented with the change that we align the management hunts on the Paunsaugunt with the archery and the muzzleloader management hunts, and for the rifle hunt to line up with the cactus buck hunts.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

NER:

MOTION: Ask the Wildlife Board to direct the Division to look into the season date structure of the 3 Corners elk hunt.

VOTE: Passed 7-1

MOTION: Accept the rest of the proposal as presented by the Division with the amendment to change the Eastern boundary of the private land bull elk hunt from the White River and Colorado State line to the Green River, following the extended season boundary.

VOTE: Passed 7-1

4 - Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

NR:

MOTION: I move we accept Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables as presented and ask the Wildlife Board to have the Division work with Antelope Island State Park in the MOU to explore the option of alternating seasons for the auction permit and state draw permit.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

CR:

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations and that a recommendation is made to the Wildlife Board that they direct the Division to make the conservation permit hunt dates line up with the public hunt dates.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SR:

MOTION: Pass as proposed except for extending the Big Horn Sheep draw dates to December 31 and recommend that the CP rule be changed so that the Big Horn Sheep hunt dates match the draw dates after 2025.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

SER:

MOTION: Accept the Division's proposal as presented, except that we do not extend the sheep hunt dates to the end of the year. Instead, make a recommendation to the board that they direct the Division to make the conservation permit hunt dates line up with the public hunt dates.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

NER:

MOTION: Accept as presented by the Division.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

5 - R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and youth allocations. (Action)

NR, SR:

MOTION: I move we accept R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH application and youth allocations as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

CR:

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations for the youth allocation process as presented.

VOTE: Passed 9-1

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations for the general season and dedicated hunter applications as presented.

VOTE: Passed 7-3

MOTION: Reject the Division's recommendations for the youth to get a bonus point in the first year.

VOTE: Passed 8-2

SER:

MOTION: Accept the Division proposal as presented, except that we do not accept the Dedicated Hunter portion of the proposal. And instead, we ask the Division to figure out a way where an applicant either earns a tag or a point, but not both.

VOTE: Passed 6-5

NER:

MOTION: Accept as presented by the Division.

VOTE: Passed 6-2

6 - CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with Public land LOA Renewals. (Action)

NR, SR:

MOTION: I move we accept CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimous

CR:

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

VOTE: Passed 7-3

SER:

MOTION: Accept the Division's proposal as presented.

VOTE: Failed 5-4

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendation as presented, except for the denial of the JB Ranch.

VOTE: Passed 5-4

NER:

MOTION: Accept as presented by the Division with the exception of JB Ranch, and allow them to become a CWMU.

VOTE: Passed 7-1

RAC AGENDA

November 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. Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator
6. Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 **ACTION**
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)
- Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator
7. Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator
8. Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Rusty Robinson, Once-in-a-lifetime Species Coordinator
9. R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations **ACTION**
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator
10. CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

**Central Region RAC Meeting
Summary of Motions
November 7, 2024
Springville, Utah**

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Braden Sheppard and passes unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.

2) Approval of August 27, 2024 RAC Meeting Minutes

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Braden Sheppard and passes unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the August 27, 2024 Central Region RAC meeting as transcribed.

3) Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Brock McMillan and passes unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented

4) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5

The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by Jim Shuler and failed 4 in favor and 6 opposed and 1 abstention.

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations concerning antler restrictions as presented

The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed 6 in favor and 4 opposed (Eric, John, Drew, Jim) and 1 abstention.

MOTION: Reject the Division's recommendations concerning antler restrictions as presented

The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by John Zeigler and passed 9 in favor and 1 in opposed (Josh) and 1 abstention.

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations concerning restricted weapons as presented.

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.

- 5) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates

The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Joshua Lenart and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations with the addition of aligning the management hunts on the Paunsaugunt to line up with the archery and the muzzleloader with the the archery and muzzleloader management hunts, and for the rifle hunt to line up with the cactus buck hunts.

- 6) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates

The following motion was made by John Ziegler and seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations and that a recommendation is made to the wildlife board that they direct the Division to make the conservation permit hunt dates line up with the public hunt dates.

- 7) R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations

The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto and passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Scott)

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations for the youth allocation process as presented

The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by Scott Jensen and passed 7 in favor and 3 opposed (Kellen, Brade, Bryce).

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations for the general season and dedicated hunter applications as presented

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart and seconded by Scott Jensen and passed 8 in favor and 2 opposed (Eric, Drew).

MOTION: Reject the Division's recommendations for the youth to get a bonus point in the first year

- 8) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals

Central Region RAC Meeting
November 7, 2024

The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by John Ziegler and passed 7 in favor and 3 opposed (Joshua, Josh, Scott).

MOTION: Accept the Division's recommendations as presented

Central Region RAC Meeting

Attendance
August 27, 2024
Springville, Utah

RAC Members

Attending

Brock McMillan - online
Joshua Lenart
Mike Christensen
John Ziegler
Bryce Castagnetto
Josh Greenhalgh
Scott Jensen
Braden Sheppard
Kellen Hyer
Eric Reid
Jim Shuler - online

Absent

Steve Lund
Amos Murphy

Wildlife Board

Gary Nielson
Paula Richmond - online

DWR Personnel

Jason Vernon
Dax Mangus
Scott Root
Kent Hersey
Lt. Matt Briggs
Officer Jason Anderson
Jason Robinson
Wes Alexander
Jacob Barnes

Chad Wilson
Rusty Robinson
Mike Christensen
Mike Packer
Bailee Prestwich
Lindy Varney
Elicia Cotcher
Bradley York
Justin Shannon

Total members of the public in attendance: 30

Central Region RAC Meeting

November 7, 2024

Springville, Utah

https://youtube.com/live/Dnsi1WcF_n0

06:08:14	RAC Chair Mike Christensen 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.
06:12:03	1) Approval of Agenda & Past Minutes (Action) The following motion was made by Jim Shuler, seconded by Braden Sheppard and passes unanimously MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.
06:13:17	2) Update on the past board meeting (Informational) Mike Christensen provided a brief update on the past board meeting held on September 19, 2024.
06:16:29	3) DWR Regional Update (Informational) Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities. Wildlife Section <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pheasant season is here. The wildlife section has been releasing pheasants throughout the region.- Conservation species biologists installed bat roosting boxes at Strawberry Reservoir.- Over 130 deer came through our Spanish Fork Canyon check station during opening weekend. Aquatics Section <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Completed Middle Provo River surveys (held every 3 years) and found lots of healthy Brown Trout and Mountain Whitefish.- During the Deer Creek Gill Netting we found healthy rainbow trout and multiple year classes of Walleye.- The Provo River Delta is open now to the public.- At Strawberry Reservoir the Fall curtain net surveys are wrapping up. There was also no detection of Walleye in the reservoir via netting, anglers of eDNA. Kokanee egg take was completed with about 1 million eggs collected. Habitat Section <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Has scalped and planted seedlings at 10 locations in the Region to improve mule deer wintering range.- Mastivation over 1,000 acres of juniper trees on 12-Mile and Lasson Draw WMA's to improve mule deer wintering habitat.- Work has been done to improve the mule deer summer range by removing conifer trees in aspen stands on 1,019 acres in 12 Mile Canyon and Strawberry Ridge. Outreach Section <ul style="list-style-type: none">- New and Youth Pheasant hunt to be held this Saturday November 9th at Pine Canyon WMA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A “Duck Decoy Placement” seminar took place last month and was filmed for the DWR’s Youtube. - The Dedicated Hunter busy season has passed with over 48,000 hours of service being provided so far. <p>Law Enforcement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigations into several individuals hunting within Springville and Mapleton city limits were started with over 10 deer heads being seized at this time. - Waterfowl season has started and officers are finding normal violations. - Officers saw many good size bucks harvested this year during the rifle hunt. - Still receiving a lot of calls for trail cameras around waterholes along game trails.
<p>06:25:49</p>	<p>4) Statewide Mule Deer Plan, 2025-2030</p> <p>Dax Mangus presented to the board.</p>
<p>06:26:22</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>The RAC members asked questions on adjusting our buck to doe ratios on premium limited entry hunts. Specifically around if slower population growth rates are a factor in fueling this adjustment and what they may mean for permit quantities moving forward. The RAC discussed if they were to bring the ratios down by one increment, how would that contribute to point creep and antler quality. The RAC asked for clarity on the portion of the plan covering splitting units. The RAC conversed on what else goes into permit calculations besides buck to doe ratios. The RAC questioned why the plan would propose we continue the further removal of cougars and other predators as a method of restoring mule deer population size when there is data coming from other states such as Colorado showing this type of approach not being as effective. The RAC asked for CWD infection rates on units where predator numbers are high. The RAC asked for a brief synopsis of some of the habitat projects that the state is pursuing to increase mule deer population size. The RAC asked how the CWD management plan has changed since the previous Mule Deer Plan was made. Specifically surrounding the testing of domestic species being raised by the public.</p>
<p>06:56:53</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None.
<p>06:57:12</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Troy J. (Mule Deer Committee) - In favor of the plan. - Wade Garrett (Mule Deer Committee/Utah Farm Bureau) - In favor of the plan. - Jeremy Anderson (Mule Deer Foundation) - In favor of the plan. - Caitlyn Curry - In favor of the plan. - Garrett Slatcoff (BHA) - In favor of the plan. - Ben Lowder - In favor of the plan.

	- Kevin Norman (SFW) - In favor of the plan.
07:05:40	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed their support in the public speaking on the plans that are being proposed and urged them to feel supported in voicing concerns they may have. The RAC discussed the mutual understanding that weather plays a very large role in how our populations of mule deer are affected. The RAC discussed the concerns that arise with the consumption of CWD infected meat as well as the severity of the disease itself on our herds. Members of the RAC have had individuals reach out to them personally on concerns with the Thousand Lakes Unit management plan changes to weapon type restrictions. The RAC expressed their gratitude to the committees involved in creating this plan and the appreciation for all the time dedicated to it.</p>
07:13:55	<p>Statewide Mule Deer Plan, 2025-2030</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Scott Jensen and seconded by Brock McMillan. This was passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the Mule Deer Plan as presented.</p>
07:14:38	<p>5) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Kent Hersey presented to the board.</p>
07:17:01	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>The RAC asked questions surrounding if the buck to doe ratios will be altered in consideration of these proposed weapon specific hunt restrictions. From a data validity standpoint, the RAC questioned if the data received for the Thousand Lakes unit would be accurate enough to make the changes being proposed. The RAC questioned how the Pine Valley Research study collected feedback from landowners and what their perspectives were on this proposal. Specifically surrounding the four point or better proposal for Pine Valley. The RAC asked how under this new proposal would bucks harvested still in velvet be handled from a law enforcement standpoint. RAC members also questioned the objective to get more mature bucks on the landscapes without cutting tags on specific units. RAC members asked if we have done research into other states and how they handle both weapon restrictions and antler point restrictions.</p>
07:30:08	<p>Public Questions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- None</p>
07:30:23	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- Ben Lowder (UT Archery Association) - We support the restricted weapons proposal as presented. We do not support altered restrictions, however we do</p>

	<p>understand the pressure to do so. We will support this one unit for a few years to support the committee. We should not invalidate the study by allowing youth to shoot any size.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kevin Norman (SFW) - Supports this recommendation - Wade Garrett (Farm Bureau) - Representatives/farmers in the Pine Valley area have concerns around the point restriction. However everything else is supported. - Jeremy Anderson (Mule Deer Foundation) - Supports this recommendation. - Brett Davis - Does not support this recommendation - Garrett Slatcoff (BHA) - Does not support this recommendation. - Chavis Lundsco - Supports the recommendation except for the point restriction. - JD Sorenson - Does not appreciate the recommendation for point restriction. The harvest survey data is greatly supported and appreciated but could use some adjustments (i.e. muzzleloader scope technology feedback should have been included). - Erik Stevens - Strongly opposes the antler restriction. The restrictions on weapons should be spread across the board for all weapons types. - Troy J. (Mule Deer Committee) - Supports the recommendations.
<p>07:56:06</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed pros and cons of the weapon restrictions being proposed. The RAC argued that the size of bucks being harvested with the current weapon restriction we have, are those that are mature four points not necessarily the smaller 2-3 points. This makes the public more inclined to be less selective of what bucks they are harvesting. The discussion was proposed around how these inclinations would affect the herds and how it could produce larger bucks over time as individuals want to harvest regardless of antler size. The RAC in turn also discussed the biological data that supports how over 60% of bucks on the landscape die before reaching 3 years of age (without hunting) and that with the proposal surrounding antler point restriction being 4 point or better, we would squander that opportunity to harvest the 60%. RAC members spoke on the fact that a “quality” buck is something determined by the hunter themselves. What one individual may pass on, could potentially be the buck of a lifetime for another. The option to possibly perform this proposal on Limited Entry units instead of General units was discussed as possibly a better candidate for the changes. RAC members suggested that there may be an option to instead of four points or better for harvest, throwing in the chance to harvest something in between on a scale similar to the spike/bull elk hunts.</p>
<p>08:15:46</p>	<p>Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by Jim Shuler. This motion fails 6 opposed, with 4 in support and 1 abstention.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the antler restrictions as proposed by the DWR.</p>

<p>08:17:03</p>	<p>Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto. This motion passed 6 in favor and 4 opposed (Eric, John, Drew, Jim) and 1 abstention.</p> <p>MOTION: To reject the antler restriction as proposed.</p>
<p>08:29:27</p>	<p>Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by John Zoegler. This motion passed 9 in favor and 1 opposed (Josh) and 1 abstention.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the Division’s recommendations concerning restricted weapons as presented.</p>
<p>08:32:52</p>	<p>Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Scott Jensen and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto. This motion passed 10 in favor and 1 abstention.</p> <p>MOTION: To pass the balance of the Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal.</p>
<p>08:33:31</p>	<p>6)Bucks and Bulls 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Dax Mangus presented to the board.</p>
<p>08:35:16</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>RAC members asked questions surrounding the unit split for the Tinic and Stansbury units. The RAC asked to get clarification on how the split would affect the choices for Dedicated Hunters who are choosing what units they would like. The RAC questioned the portion of the proposal surrounding the Little Rockies and San Juan new hunt units on how many tags would be guaranteed on those boundaries. The RAC brought up other individuals who shared feedback on the experiences they had with the overlap of the archery hunters and the youth hunters on any bull units throughout the state. The RAC asked if the complaints surrounding the overlaps of season dates came from the majority of young(youth) hunters or from adult hunters and how their feedback differentiated. The RAC brought up how in the Northern Region RAC meeting the possibility of extending the Three Corners hunt was recommended and how the public/region may react to such a change. The RAC asked if those hunting during the extended archery portion of the East Canyon unit would still have this opportunity to do so under the proposed changes.</p>

<p>08:45:47</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None
<p>08:45:56</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ben Lowder (UT Archery Association) - We are in support. - Lonney Rasmussen Youth Hunters - The youth any bull overlap is a once in a lifetime event. I do not support the overlap as I feel it does have many conflicts. - Kevin Norman - The management buck hunts on the Paunsaugunt, should be aligned with the archery and muzzleloader hunts. The two week hunt for the Cactus Buck, should be aligned with the rifle hunts. - Garrett Slatcoff BHA - We are in support.
<p>08:52:46</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed concerns around where the two new limited entry permit numbers will land under this new proposal. The possibility of keeping these permits available to residents vs non residents for the first year was considered. RAC members debated the option of moving the youth elk hunt to overlap the muzzleloader deer hunt. The RAC discussed if the proposal would limit the management tags to the Paunsaugunt or if it would include the Henry Mountains as well.</p>
<p>09:03:29</p>	<p>Bucks and Bulls 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Joshua Lenart. This was passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the division's recommendations as presented with the added language on the Pausagunt management season dates.</p>
<p>09:04:40</p>	<p>7) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rusty Robinson presented to the board.</p>
<p>09:06:25</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>RAC asked for a summary of the quantity of tags that will be made available for Antelope Island. They also asked what the estimated population size of rams is currently on Antelope Island. Possible conflicts surrounding what may happen should the public hunter and a "purchased" tag hunter have overlapped hunts. RAC members questioned if the division considered a management ram hunt perhaps three quarters or less to target the abundance of rams on Antelope Island to help manage the ram to ewe ratio without all the pressure.</p>

<p>09:10:28</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None
<p>09:10:33</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ben Lowder Utah Archery Association - Concerning the extended dates for the sheep hunts, we feel that will create some unnecessary comments. We recommend sticking with the current dates. Other than that we support the recommendations as presented. - Garrett Slatcoff (BHA) - Support the recommendations as presented. - Troy - We support the recommendations as presented other than the sheep dates being extended. You are going to have some upset hunters when we already have surveys with helicopters happening at the same time.
<p>09:13:46</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed how the conservation permit holders have a variance to hunt through the end of December and now possibly given this new proposal, how all public draw hunters would have the same opportunity. The RAC asked how these changes may potentially put pressure on these animals biologically by adding the longer season dates.</p>
<p>09:19:18</p>	<p>Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by John Ziegler and seconded by Scott Jensen. This was passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the proposal as written for the first year and ask the wildlife board/division to move the extended season dates for the public to match conservation permit holders.</p>
<p>09:20:12</p>	<p>8) GS/DH Applications and Youth Allocations</p> <p>Lindy Varney presented to the board.</p>
<p>09:22:53</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>RAC questioned if the 20% allocation of tags to youth hunters was in rule or not. The RAC questioned the proposals changes and how it would create more challenges with point creep for youth hunters just starting to apply. The RAC asked how the turnover of left over tags into any legal weapon permits would work structurally. The RAC discussed the unallocated tags being kept within the same unit when put back through the proposed second draw for youth hunters and if there would be a possibility of researching under subscribed archery/muzzleloader applications by unit. This way they</p>

	could in turn possibly consider allowing some of the rifle tags to switch to the other weapon types.
09:29:51	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None
09:29:56	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ben Lowder Utah Archery Association - We oppose the GS and DH application changes. We are unsure of the youth 1 point entry for first time youth applicants. With the unallocated youth permits, we are taking a no position on this recommendation. - Kevin Norman - We support this proposal with one exception being the GS and DH application. - Garrett Slatcoff (BHA) - We are in support of all three proposals. - Lonney Rasmussen (Youth Hunters Voice) - We are in support of all three proposals. - Troy J. (Mule Deer Committee) - In support of the proposal.
09:37:17	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed the Dedicated Hunter and General Season points system and the reasoning why the recommendation for these changes was proposed in the first place by the committee. Giving youth more of a chance to get involved in hunting may possibly cause other adult hunters to be subject to long wait periods to draw out will be of concern. The RAC brought up the need for data to be more easily accessible to the public to see what weapon types and units the public youth hunters are applying for.</p>
09:51:08	<p>GS/DH Applications and Youth Allocations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Braden Sheppard and seconded by Bryce Castagnetto. Passes 9 in favor, 1 opposed (Scott-encourage to choose different weapon).</p> <p>MOTION: To support the Division's recommendations for the youth allocation process.</p>
09:52:42	<p>GS/DH Applications and Youth Allocations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by Scott Jensen. Passes 7 in favor, 3 opposed. (Kellen, Braden, Bryce - current point system is working)</p>

	MOTION: To accept the GS/DH point system proposal as presented.
09:53:47	<p>GS/DH Applications and Youth Allocations</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Josh Lenart and seconded by Scott Jensen. Passes 8 in favor to 2 opposed (Eric, Drew - support the DWR's recommendation)</p> <p>MOTION: To not accept the recommendation for youth getting an extra bonus point the first year they apply.</p>
09:54:45	<p>8) CWMU Renewals and Public Lands, LOA Renewals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Chad Wilson presented to the board.</p>
09:55:22	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>The RAC asked for clarification on a slide in the presentation. Specifically the one slide where they covered the impacts of removing public lands within CWMU's and how it could possibly put them under the non-contiguous boundary. The RAC asked Chad to list specific CWMU's that would fall under acreage or remove themselves as non-contiguous. The RAC asked for more insight on why specific CWMU's (such as Junction Valley) would request to increase their bull tags by 2 when their success rate for harvest percent is extremely low.</p>
10:00:21	<p>Public Questions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- None</p>
10:00:26	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- None</p>
10:01:24	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC discussed proposed CWMU's that are currently over objective and are taking far more bull tags than cow tags. The RAC raised concerns around the timeliness of addressing big issues with CWMU's in such a predicament. The RAC discussed the possible issues surrounding the COR process for CWMU's and how the flexibility to enforce and changes to the program become far more difficult after the fact. The RAC discussed the motivation and need for CWMU's throughout the region to harvest more cows.</p>
10:22:37	<p>CWMU Renewals and Public Lands, LOA Renewals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Reid and seconded by John Ziegler. Passes 7</p>

	in favor, 3 opposed. MOTION: To accept the proposal as presented.
10:24:13	The meeting adjourned.

**RAC AGENDA
November 6, 2024**

The meeting will stream live at <https://youtube.com/live/M0qeAT4OuJE>

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. Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
6. Mule Deer Hunt Structure Research Proposal and R657-5 **ACTION**
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)
- Kent Hersey, Big Game Program Coordinator
7. Bucks and Bulls 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Coordinator
8. Once-In-A-Lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Rusty Robinson, Once-In-A-Lifetime Coordinator
9. R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and youth allocations **ACTION**
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensng Coordinator
10. CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Meeting Locations

NR RAC – Nov. 6th, 6:00 PM
Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden
<https://youtube.com/live/M0qeAT4OuJE>

CR RAC – Thursday, Nov 7th 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Room
1115. N. Main Street, Springville
https://youtube.com/live/Dnsj1WcF_n0

SR RAC – Nov 12th 6:00 PM
South Utah University
Hunter Conf. Center, Charles R Hunter Room
<https://youtube.com/live/dnJhkeznJDQ>

SER RAC – Nov 13th 6:00 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River
<https://youtube.com/live/WjQ4Rx7M0N4>

NER RAC- Nov 14th 6:00 PM
Uintah Conference Center
313 E 200 South, Vernal
https://youtube.com/live/gnzo2Je_3pU

Board Meeting- Dec 12th 9:00 AM
Eccles Wildlife Education Center, Farmington Bay
<https://youtube.com/live/nJlwj-iFevI>

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

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

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

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

2) Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by James Carlson, seconded by Nikki Wayment and passed For: 10 Against:1. Ross Worthington. Managing to data.

MOTION: I move we accept Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 as presented.

3) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (**Action**)
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)

The following motion was made by Robert Dale, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed For: 7 Against: 4. James Carlson- Represent the public at large. Emails and conversations do not support the proposal. Randy Hutchison- Doesn't support the science. Darren Parry- Limited resource. Ross Worthington- Represent the public. Public did not want. Point restrictions are not supported by the science.

MOTION: I move we accept Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting) as presented.

4) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Steve Sorensen and passed unanimous.

* Ryan Brown left the meeting. Jessica Wade's name was called for the vote, but did not give a response.

MOTION: I move we accept Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates as presented with the exception on the Paunsaugunt. Management hunts will mirror the premium limited-entry-dates, and the rifle will mirror the cactus buck season dates.

- 5) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimous.

* Jessica Wade was available for vote.

MOTION: I move we accept Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables as presented and ask the Wildlife Board to have the Division work with Antelope Island State Park in the MOU to explore the option of alternating seasons for the auction permit and state draw permit.

- 6) R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and youth allocations. **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Steve Sorensen and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH application and youth allocations as presented.

- 7) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with Public land LOA Renewals. **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Robert Dale seconded by Nikki Wayment and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals as presented.

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

November 6, 2024

Attendance

Brad Buchanan - Chair
Blair Stringham - Exec Sec

RAC Members

Marshall Alford-Online	Casey Snider-Online
Ryan Brown-Online	Steve Sorensen
James Carlson	Jessica Wade-Online
Robert Dale	Nikki Wayment
Randy Hutchison	Ross Worthington
Darren Parry	

Board Member

Kent Johnson
Paula Richmond
Bret Selman

RAC Excused

Jaimi Butler
David Earl
Junior Goring

Division Personnel

Jodie Anderson	Mike Christensen
Jim Christensen	David Beveridge
Chad Wilson	Lindy Varney
Sam Robertson	Mike Kinghorn
Daniel Sallee	Krystal Tucker
Xaela Walden	Brooklyn Joseph
Dax Mangus	Riley Peck
Rusty Robinson	David Smedley
Kent Hersey	
Covy Jones	

Regional Advisory Council Meeting

November 6, 2024

- 00:10:11** 1) Chairman Brad Buchanan called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience and reviewed the meeting procedures.
- 00:14:35** 2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed unanimous.
- MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.**
- * Moved to Regional Update until RAC Chair could find details from Wildlife Board meeting.**
- 00:24:09** 3) **Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Brad Buchanan**
Link on website to view.
- 00:16:14** 4) **Regional Update - Blair Stringham (Informational)**
Blair Stringham updated the RAC on regional activities.
- 00:27:55** 5) **Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (Action)**
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
- Dax Mangus summarized the presentation for the RAC.
- 00:29:05** **Questions from RAC Members/Public**
Data on collars. Coyote control, coyote bounty program. Targeting winter ranges. Top down to bottom up cougar predation study units. Extended archery only permit application. Percentage on permit numbers. Change on premium hunting units and why

the change to the buck deer to doe ratios. Purpose of a management buck deer hunt. Exploring the management program on limited- entry- units. Working with other land agencies on OHV use to protect wildlife. Units with a lot of private land and managing buck-to-doe ratios.

Public Questions

None

00:57:33 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

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

Public Comment

Brandon Zundel- Did a great job on the mule deer management plan. We are moving in the right direction. Striking a balance with what will biologically work versus keeping hunters happy. Hope the extended archery permits take pressure off of less desirable units.

Kevin Norman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Supports the plan as presented.

Ben Lowder- Utah Archery Association- Supports the plan as presented.

Troy Justensen- Mule Deer Committee- Supports the plan as presented.

01:05:26 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Thank the division for putting the Mule Deer Committee together. Like what was in the plan and infavor of the extended archery decision. Social aspects of people wanting big bucks. Public just wants opportunity to hunt. Buck-to-doe ratios and their transitions based on drought and good weather years. Studies from Colorado. Will see a lower buck-to-doe ratio if growing the deer herd is the goal. Should be science first and not social aspects first. RAC managing social issues. Give the public the opportunity to hunt, but having enough bucks on the landscape. Getting rid of the age class on the premium hunting units. Crowding public lands with more permits.

The following motion was made by James Carlson, seconded by Nikki Wayment and passed For: 10 Against: 1 Ross Worthington. Managing to the science and the data. Social will take care of itself.

MOTION: I move that we accept Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 as presented.

01:17:05 **6) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (Action)**
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)

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

Kent Hersey summarized the presentation for the RAC.

01:18:30 **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Impact the change would have on Dedicated Hunters. Antler point restrictions. Weapons restrictions and valid data. Concerns with the rifle restrictions; money that will need to be spent to purchase equipment that meets the hunt criteria. Reducing magnification instead of taking scopes off rifles. Antler point restriction studies and where to find them. Cut the size of the study on the Cache unit. Feed-back from other regions regarding the Boulder and Beaver West.

Public Questions

Units picked for the study. Antler point restrictions used as a method to increase permits.

01:36:35 **Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor**

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

Public Comment

Brian Brown-In the Dedicated Hunter Program. Hunts the Cache. It's turning into a primitive hunt. Older hunters can't see with open sights. Don't want to lose older hunters. Will result in more wounded game that is not retrieved.

Dave Anderson- You do have the ability to collect the data with the mandatory reporting system. Would take a couple of years to gather the data, but we could find out from the public how they would want to proceed rather than taking a guess and making it into a study. Take a look at the data and actual facts, then blend them in with your goal to reduce the number of bucks taken to have a healthier herd. Particularly on the Cache where winters are so severe. He can't see as well as he used to. Opposed to this proposal based on sight limitation. We took scopes off of muzzleloaders, and the muzzleloader definition would now require us to get yet another muzzleloader with an exposed 209 or musket cap nipple. Most guns don't have sights. If someone wants to use their grandpa's

old 30-30, you can still do that under the current guidelines. Not a good idea to require this of everyone on the Cache unit.

David Allen- A lot of my concerns were mentioned in the summary report by Blair. Spent five weeks every day with the exception of Sundays on the Cache scouting and hunting for elk and deer. Don't know what the objective of this study is. He suspects one of the objectives is to provide more opportunities and sell more tags. Going to iron sights is going to reduce the harvest rate dramatically. If harvest objectives are the same, you are going to maybe double the number of tags you sell. Issues with trespassing on property even with property heavily posted. Pressure on the deer with the number of hunters. Lack of winter range. If we have a bad winter, it wipes out a lot of deer. Smaller bucks are going to get killed

Brandon Zundel- Supports this proposal. Not a fan of point restrictions. Lets give it a try. Need to try the other weapon restrictions. May or may not increase wounding loss. I think people will spend the money to hunt the Cache.

Jeff Davis- Weapon restrictions. There are a lot of people on the public land. Putting more hunters on the land will make it tougher to take an animal. It is already crowded.

Kevin Norman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife-Supports the proposal with the exception of two things. Not in support of the antler point restrictions on the Pine Valley. Concerned the harvest will be so low, the tags are going to go through the roof and it's going to be a mess.

Propose splitting the Cache following the North Cache/South Cache elk boundaries. Making the North Cache restricted weapons and leaving the South Cache as is. It is probably more palatable and people can still draw the Cache and still choose how they are going to hunt. It might not force everybody to go to Box Elder. My opinion behind this is to help quality and opportunity go up. I want to hunt with my family and friends. Want more tags and want to see good bucks. Create more opportunity on these general units.

Ben Lowder- Utah Archery Association- Supports the Thousand Lakes. Do not like antler point restrictions on the Pine Valley. We believe the exception for the youth just invalidates the study. If this is a research project, then this needs to be a real research project. For that reason, we do not support the exception on the Pine Valley antler restrictions for the youth. The rules need to apply to everyone.

Garret Larsen- Supports the restrictions on the Cache. Going to have more deer and more opportunities. Thinks we will have older-age-class bucks. Thinks we will have a

healthier deer herd. Thinks more animals are wounded by long-range hunting.

Troy Justensen- Mule Deer Committee- Did discuss the power restrictions on scopes. Felt it was a law enforcement nightmare. Point restrictions? I personally do not support them. Increase quality and opportunity. Many of our constituents down south are in favor of the restrictions on the Boulder. There is going to be added cost. It is worth exploring to see if people like it. Ask you to support this.

Travis Hobbs- Opportunity versus quality. There is only way to provide that and it is by limiting weapon systems. This will bring back family deer hunting. We can handle more pressure. Want my daughter to be able to hunt every year. It doesn't take a new rifle. Rifles can be tapped and sights can be added. The age class keeps going up on the North Cache since the HAMS hunt for elk was created. Give it a go.

02:05:57 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Concerns with the weapon restrictions. There is no data supporting antler point restrictions. Antler point restrictions do not help the herd. Caving to peer pressure. CWMU's or LOA's on the Cache study unit. Do the restrictions apply to them? Need to be held to the same restrictions. We have sciened the hell out of everything. Think it is the worst idea I have ever heard. This has been turned into a commodity. Pine Valley one of the most coveted general units and putting an antler point restriction on it. Will negatively impact the deer herds. Antler point restrictions have never worked. Mule deer committee was tasked with providing more opportunity and better quality. Wounding loss is going to happen. A scope is not a fix all. Representing the public, can't see this happen. Have been a proponet of trying restricted weapons on a unit. Think the unit can be split and still get relative data. Heavy winters having effect on the Cache deer herd. In 2016, a lot of big deer were killed on the Cache and across Northern Utah. It was because of the weather, it had nothing to do with the weapons. Public sentiment has been pretty clear from the feedback. The restrictions are not necessarily acceptable. Don't think the Cache is the right unit to try it on. APRs on the southern part of the state. This has been done over and over again. The argument is this is the only way to grow bigger bucks. Think it is the opposite. Banking on younger age class bucks. Increased hunting pressure. Don't think the studies are there. Don't support it across the Cache as a whole. Definition of the restricted weapons. Mandatory harvest reporting. Change of hunt technology certain surveys are not accurate. Early primitive hunts. SFW proposal to carve off the north side of the Cache would not work unless the old elk boundary that takes in the Wellsvilles and Clarkstons is included. The area currently proposed is too small. Problem with getting more hunters into the field. There is such a limited resource. Don't know what the weather is going to do from year to year. When you have these two variables, it's nuts to put more hunters out in the field. Not blessed with an over abundance of deer. Needs to be managed differently. Problem with getting tags and getting kids in the field cause they can't draw a tag. Concerned with the vibe to move away from what the committee did. Need to support the committee and give it a

try. Feedback on the comments. Money grab for the division. Not feasible to go out of state to hunt. Comments shared by the public being anecdotal. Research to collect data. Tasked the committee to do this.

The following motion was made by Robert Dale, seconded by Ryan Brown and passed . For: 7 Against: 4 James Carlson- Represents the public at large. Emails and conversations do not support the proposal. Randy Hutchison- Doesn't support the science. Darren Parry- Limited resource; have to accept the restrictions. Ross Worthington- Represent the public. Point restrictions are not supported by science.

MOTION: I move to accept Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting) as presented.

03:00:40 7) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

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

Dax Mangus summarized the presentation for the RAC.

03:04:27 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Age classification on elk. Email from Northeastern RAC member regarding date changes. General season any bull elk permits and harvesting bulls off of limited-entry units. Name change to the hunt.

Public Questions

Email shared from Northeastern RAC member with RACs and Wildlife Board not available to the public.

03:12:14 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

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

Public Comment

Brandon Zundel - Moving elk hunt start dates to avoid overlap with the youth hunt dates.

Ben Lowder-Utah Archery Association- Accepts the recommendation. Going to hear a recommendation from Kevin Norman concerning management deer hunting on the Paunsaugunt. Supports him on that recommendation as well.

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife-Supports the recommendation with the exception of the Oak Creeks. Propose we have an early season there. Our chapter down there fears it's going to continue to lengthen the amount of time crowding exists there. Would like it to stay to the one hunt.

Kevin Norman- Weapon hunt dates don't coincide. Need to align hunt dates.

03:18:56 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Success rates on management hunts. On the youth hunts, like the idea of pushing dates rather than having overlap. Youth hunt was already in place before the archery hunt. Archery hunters already have a long season. Agree with moving the archery hunt back to the original dates. Management hunts are designed to get the animals off the landscape. We do the same thing with the Antelope Island permit. The deer hunter that buys the permit gets to start hunting before the public guy that draws the permit. Completely unfair. Disagree with one segment of hunters getting advantage over the other. This is a public resource. Like the idea of the Paunsaugunt and matching up the season dates. Fan of the Three Corners going from September 1 to September 30. More unique situations where we have agreements with other states. Feedback with the youth. Mindset of the proposal.

**Ryan Brown has left the meeting. Jessica Wade's name was called for the vote, but did not give a response.

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Steve Sorensen and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates as presented with the exception of the Paunsaugunt. Management hunts will mirror the premium limited-entry-dates, and the rifle will mirror the cactus-buck season dates.

03:31:35 **8) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)**
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

Rusty Robinson summarized the presentation for the RAC.

03:33:12 **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Sheep hunt access issues and hunt dates. Hunt date extensions. Length of sheep hunt dates. Division's position on swapping hunt dates every other year. Draw hunter should hunt first on Antelope Island. Number of moose in Box Elder County. Antelope Island bighorn sheep herd size and why we are not transplanting sheep off the island. Conservation and public tags on the island. Transmission of pathogens through wild horses that have been living with sheep and goats.

Public Questions

None

03:45:20 **Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor**

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

Public Comment

Brandon Zundel- Supports the proposal.

Ben Lowder- Utah Archery Association- Support the recommendation with the exception of one season date. Recommends maintaining the current season end dates on those sheep hunts.

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Problem with proposal to move the sheep dates to December 31. Too long. Bring conservation permit dates to match the public hunter season dates. Have bighorn season dates align. Support letting the public hunter go first.

03:49:04 **RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Capture dates. Conservation tag dates should match the public hunter dates. Have hunt dates end at the end of November.

**Jessica Wade available for vote.

The following motion was made by Ross Worthington, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables as presented and ask the Wildlife Board to have the Division work with Antelope Island State Park in the MOU to explore the option of alternating seasons for the auction permit and state draw permit.

04:02:13 9) R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and youth allocations (Action)

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

Lindy Varney summarized the presentation for the RAC.

4:05:03 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Tags taken from the muzzleloader hunt staying in the same units. Draw process for youth.

Public Questions

Dedicated Hunter point system. Clarification of youth permit allocation.

04:10:49 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

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

Public Comment

Ben Lowder-Utah Archery Association- For the general season, would like to see the Dedicated Hunter application process stay the same. Do not support the recommendation to eliminate the ability to apply for both. Support giving first-time youth hunters a point. Struggling with the allocation of left over permits. It will change the weapon splits percentage. Success rates are different especially archery versus rifle. Concerned about reducing the allocation of archery and muzzleloader permits.

Brandon Zundel- Like opportunities to get youth involved. With the Dedicated Hunter program, I don't like the idea of people being able to get a point and also getting to hunt.

Cody Rhees- Youth Hunters Voice- We think youth can have a deer tag every year in our state. There is a lot of opportunity for youth to hunt in our state. If we're going to retain recruits, youth need tags in their hands.

Kevin Norman-Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Opposed to Dedicated Hunters having to choose between applying for general season or Dedicated Hunter permits. Explore opportunities for youth.

04:20:15 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Total number of youth general season applicants. Giving youth a permit every year. Lifetime license holders still active. Mentor program. Limited resources and being able to have every youth get a permit. Dedicated Hunter. Unlimited youth hunting tags for elk and other species.

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Steve Sorensen and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH application and youth allocations as presented.

04:36:38 10) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals

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

Chad Wilson summarized the presentation for the RAC.

04:36:59 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Public land included in CWMU's. Signage for CWMU's.

Public Questions

None

04:39:31 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Blair Stringham, Regional Supervisor

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

Public Comment

None

04:41:08 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Support the Division not taking the application for JB Ranch. Does not meet the standards. Cactus Ranch; none of it is posted. Is it just as much public land as it is private.

The following motion was made by Robert Dale, seconded by Nikki Wayment and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move we accept CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals as presented.

04:43:24 Motion to Adjourn. Randy Hutchison

Southern Regional RAC Meeting

November 12, 2024
Southern Utah University
Cedar City, Utah
6:00 P.M.

RAC Members

Attending

Austin Atkinson
Bart Battista
Rachel Bolus
Chuck Chamberlain
Brooklynn Cox
Mike Grant
Tammy Pearson
Russell Gardner
Chad Utle (On-line)
Riley Roberts On-line)
Verland King (On-line)

Absent

Travis Duran

Wildlife Board

Paula Richmond
Randy Dearth (On-line)
Gary Nielson (On-line)
Kent Johnson (On-line)

Utah State Representative Rex Shipp in attendance.

DWR Personnel

Kevin Bunnell
Jordan Ence
Phil Tuttle
Justin Shirley
Teresa Griffin
Kyle Christensen
Covey Jones
Kent Hersey
Mike Wardle
Lindy Varney

Sherry Gilge (On-line)
Denise Gilgen (On-line)
Mike Christensen
Riley Peck
Jason Nicholes
Brandon White
Dax Mangus
Vance Mumford
Danielle Dershem
Paul Washburn

Morgan Hinton

**Public invited to join online: <https://youtu.be/8VjmK9Pi8xE>
https://youtube.com/live/cKzEbd1fu_Q**

06:01:25	1) RAC Chair Austin Atkinson called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and recognized the Wildlife Boards members that were present. He explained the RAC process and that there will be no live presentations. The public will be given the opportunity of providing comments and asking questions at the appropriate time. Encouraged the public to submit comment cards if they wish to provide comments or ask questions. He asked for respect and professional conduct from all those in attendance. The Wildlife Board makes the final decision, not the regional RAC's.
06:06:53	2) Approval Of Agenda and Minutes (Action) The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson , seconded by Bryant Johnson . MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.
06:07:23	3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Informational) RAC Chair Austin Atkinson provided the RAC members and public with an update from the last Wildlife Board Meeting held on September 19, 2024, which focused on Fishing regulations. Motion: Ask the division to study the possibilities of increased opportunities for spearfishing, to look at the impact of spearfishing on fisheries in Utah. This was to be placed in the action log. Passed unanimously. Motion: Accept the Division's proposal regarding the ice-hole size at Flaming Gorge, but ask the Division to monitor the use of ice-holes and the size of the holes being used and to report back in one year. Passed 3-2. Motion: Accept the proposal on Manning Meadow and Barney Reservoir and re-evaluate the reservoirs in two years. Passed unanimously. Motion: Accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations for fishing regulations as presented. Passed unanimously. Motion: Approve the amendments to R657-41, valuation of real property interests, as presented by the Division. Passed unanimously. Motion: Accept the Conservation permit audit as presented by the Division. Passed unanimously. Motion: Accept the Conservation annual report as presented. Passed unanimously. Motion: Approved the Expo Permit audit presented by the Division. Passed unanimously.

	<p>Motion: Approve the Expo Permit allocation for this upcoming year. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>Motion: Approved the Landowner Association committee membership, which included a motion to accept Eric Luke as the Regional Representative on the LOA Committee. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>Motion: Approve the 2025 RAC Board meeting dates. Passed unanimously.</p>
<p>06:09:50</p>	<p>4) DWR Update (Informational)</p> <p>Kevin Bunnell, DWR Regional Supervisor provided an abbreviated update on regional activities to the RAC and public due to the possible length of tonight’s meeting.</p> <p>Wildlife Biologists: Currently conducting Bighorn Sheep flights. Things look good in general; however, there are still some concerns with the numbers on the Zion unit. But those numbers have been on a downward trend for a while. Working on finding the reasons for this and getting it reversed.</p> <p>Pheasant releases and youth hunts: Youth hunts have been completed, but we will continue to release Pheasants throughout the Region until November 27, 2024. Release locations may be found on the DWR website.</p> <p>Washington County Field Office: The Northern Corridor Supplemental EIS final report was release. Disappointing result, not sure where this will end up. Has impacts on traffic in Washington County and our role in that is the Mojave Desert Tortoise.</p> <p>Wayne County: Meeting next Monday, November 18, 2024, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., in Wayne County at the Wayne County Community Center in Bicknell. It’s a Forest Service meeting, kick-off for the NEPA process that they are doing for the Boulder Mountain. Will set us up for habitat projects on the Boulder Mountain, especially on the Fish Lake side. For the next several decades it will be a large scale NEPA project. All the support we can give the Forest Service will be greatly appreciated.</p> <p>Aquatics: Finished their annual Lake Powell sampling, went well. Seeing some changes with the introduction of Quagga Mussels a decade ago. But fishing is still really good at Lake Powell.</p> <p>will be capturing collaring goats to keep track of habitat use</p> <p>Starting tomorrow we will be capturing Goats on the Tusher Mountains. We’ll send a few Goats to the Ruby Mountains in Nevada and some to the Willard Peak in Northern Utah. In addition to collaring some Goats to help us keep track of habitat use on the Tusher Mountains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tammy Pearson: We raise good goats, so you’re welcome.
<p>06:13:20</p>	<p>5) Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (Action) Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator</p> <p>Dax Mangus presented the Division’s recommendation and answered questions from the RAC and public members. For clarification, at one point the Mule Deer Committee had talked about a lower Buck to Doe ratio on Premium Limited</p>

	<p>Entry units, 35 to 40, but then later revisited this issue. The recommendation is 40 to 45 for Premium Limited Entry units. That information was not updated. There are a lot of issues that are tangential to each other.</p>
<p>06:16:25</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chuck Chamberlain: Appreciates all the hard work that was put into this proposal. • Question regarding lower Buck to Doe ratio. Some research suggests it leads to more deer in general. Is this universally true? Regardless of carrying capacity conditions? • Dax Mangus: It was an analysis from the State of Utah. Information from that analysis indicated that what affects the Deer population, productivity and growth the most is environmental factors - most powerful driver of what's happening with Deer populations. We work hard with Habitat Managers and other partners to do good things in habitat, but weather patterns are out of our control. The most powerful driver we have control over is Buck to Doe ratio. Manage for higher or lower Buck to Doe ration. Data indicates that when you are at a lower Buck to Doe ratio – Does are in better body condition, higher survival, higher productivity. Observational data, not experimental. The Division has not gone into a unit and done a treatment, lowering Buck to Doe ratios and then comparing it to neighboring units. We have talked about doing this, but we couldn't come up with a consensus. • Part of the recommendation is that data set in conjunction with looking at some disease issues and their relationship to Buck to Doe ratios and the desire to provide opportunity for hunters on a more regular basis. These were taken into account when making these recommendations. • Bryant Johnson: Are you saying someone observed this and then said that was what it was? There isn't any hard data saying that this is for sure what happens? • When we have conditions like we have now. We keep increasing our Deer herds and still have 20 to 25 Bucks per 100 Does on the landscape. • Was there a survey done with the public asking them how they felt about Buck to Doe ratios? Did that come back with nearly 60% saying don't drop the Buck to Doe ratios? • About 60% is what is came back as, with two other categories, saying don't drop the Buck to Doe ratios, correct? Was that survey ever released to the public? It would be great if we could release it to the public so they could see the comments, etc. • Dax Mangus: No, there are thousands of data points and observations. • Environmental factors are going to outweigh this to a large degree. If you have favorable conditions, you can grow Deer even at a higher Buck to

Doe ratio. If you're in a drought unfavorable conditions, that's where the effects of this is seen more.

- Yes. Most hunters want high Buck to Doe ratios, that want to draw regularly and not feel crowded when they're hunting.
- Yes, sounds right on the survey. Never released to the public, but we could.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** Some units will be split, will you split the permits? How will the permits be split up on the some of the units? Will they be split proportional to territory?
- You talked about using models and data to automatically move permits up to 30% without RAC approval. Is that going to be an automatic? If the model says we go up 15% and we just go up 15% or how much sat at that point doe the Biologists have in the movement of those permits?
- **Dax Mangus:** From talking to the Biologists on some of the units where we are recommending changes, like the Oquirrh Stansbury for example. We have a fairly good idea of where Hunters were hunting. On the Minerals and Bald Mountain splitting off from the Beaver, we don't know if our data is as good on that unit. The ideas is to try to match what the current distribution of Hunters is. A bit of a guess on some units.
- The proposal is that the Biologists will look at the current population size, productivity information like Fawn to Doe ratios, previously observed Buck to Doe ratios, look at survival data, weather conditions and trends and look at previous Hunter harvest. We look at these things when making our recommendations. When we receive the recommendation that we are asking for based on the data, we've done a pretty good idea of hitting right around the objective we are aiming for. Lots of contention and argument with this issue. Do we actually want to manage to these objectives that we've agreed to in the plan? This is a great discussion and thank you for bringing this up. If Hunters want to manage for higher Buck to Doe ratios, this is where we need to have those discussions, then manage to those discussions. Not to try to effectively accomplish that every spring by not giving enough permits or giving too many permits to actually manage the Buck to Doe ratios. Then, we hope to manage to that plan. If there are going to be really big changes, we'll bring them through the public process. If we're making adjustments to manage to the agreed upon objective in the approved plan it would give us more flexibility to do that.
- **Austin Atkinson:** Knows Utah is unique. Do you know of any other western States that manage for higher Buck to Doe ratios as low as Utah is proposing?
- Will you please explain the 30% automatic permit setting will not go through the public process? If you go up or down 30% of permits, was that from the committee? DWR? Where did that come from?

- Can you tell us the discussion that went into the Deer committee? We've pushed a lot of ideas to the Deer committee from this RAC and other RACs over the last couple of years. We've said wait for the Deer committee, they'll fix it. What was the discussion of merging Deer draws or dissolving General Season terminology units? Was that shut down or was it discussed?
- **Dax Mangus:** Idaho may have some units that are in the same ballpark as Utah. Many other western States manage for high Buck to Doe ratios that we do in Utah.
- The DWR initiated that conversation and had good support from the committee. The committees actually settled on the number there. If you watched the last Spring RAC cycle, or the Wildlife Board work session this last spring as well, you'll see a graph that shows Hunter numbers have been a flat or declining line since the early 90's. Periods where the population really grew, but we didn't add permits. If the population shrinks, we would probably cut some permits. We haven't done a great job of reflecting what is actually available for Hunters to harvest and how we adjust permit numbers. That was what prompted that conversation and discussion. How can we optimally utilize the resource that's available to us and do it in a proactive way.
- It was discussed and the division talked about this quite a bit, the Division talked about this quite a bit and went through a lot of data. Lindy Varney with our Licensing program went through a lot data and talked about it with the Deer committee. The committee was laser focused on Deer. Some of the side effects of making those changes, such as getting rid of the General Season preference point system or merging it somehow with the Limited Entry Bonus point system could potentially result in some huge changes to the drawing odds for Pronghorn and Elk. After going full circle, throwing just about everything out there, different combinations, modifications and changes, the committee ultimately moved forward to keep things very close to the way we are currently operating.
- **Bryant Johnson:** Believed the Deer plan in 1996 the DWR managed for 15 Buck per 100 Does on a unit for several years. Did that work? Did this come back from the public and say you've got to do more?
- Agreed with Dax to a point. The public did say don't over Buck to Doe ratios in this survey.
- Was it ever discussed to take away the Dedicated Hunter program? That takes away all those tags for the next two out of those three years and puts them back into the general draw system for someone else to have a tag.
- Did you get a feel as to why the committee liked the Dedicated Hunter Program? Been a member of the Dedicated Hunter since it came out. Did it ever come out to the money it provides? The Mule Deer

Committee wanted to provide opportunity - came up many times. The Mule Deer Committee felt like a loaded deck when he attended the meeting – opportunity over public interest. Felt like the lone man, argued for keeping Buck to Doe ratios on these units. – Great conditions for growing Deer. Was only able to go to one meeting, but the committee ignored 90 % of what the public said in that survey.

- When the survey results came out, the public opinion was we would hunt less often if we could hunt a better sized animal. There were some on the committee who threw their hands in the air and said people will say whatever they want. There was a question, how often is it alright to hunt a General Season unit. The majority came back with every year. That question did not include how often is it okay to hunt a General Season unit if you could hunt a more mature animal. It kind of tricked them.
- Do you see a need to talk about social issues? We've talked about scientific issues in these meeting. The Mule Deer Plan is a lot of how we hunt Deer is social.
- Believes this is setting things up for the Lifetime License Holders, this hasn't even come up yet. What was said in the Mule Deer Committee? Are they guaranteed a permit on any unit?
- If it changes to General Season to Limited Entry, that would change that? They desire a permit, that's what they purchased. Or we should reimburse them. It's becoming a big social issue.
- **Dax Mangus:** Sounds right, no plan in front of him from 1996. Biologically at 15 Bucks per 100 Does you're fine
- We've probably heard that every year from the public that we managed General Season Deer units. There are always Hunters that would like to see our General Season Deer units managed at a higher ratio. There are also Hunters that want to draw more often. There's some trade-off. If you manage a higher Buck to Doe ratio, you give fewer permits you get to hunt less. Often if you manage to a lower Buck to Doe ratio you give more permits, more opportunities.
- Discussed the Dedicated Hunter program. Eliminate it or reduce it to a program – 15% permits annually almost like a multi-season permit. And, everything in between. Ultimately, the Division agreed with the committee's recommendation. Committee felt like they liked the program the way it is and the Division agreed.
- That's why we have these public meetings for Hunters to express their desires if they want to see the Division manage at different Buck to Doe ratios. The committee looked at all the information and data they received. When you ask the public what do you want, they say they want a lot of Bucks, we want high Buck ratios, we also want to draw every year and don't want to be crowded. Some of these people were really involved and engaged in the process. Understand the trade-offs. It doesn't mean that we don't value what the public has to say. Doesn't

feel the committee was stacked with folks that only wanted hunting opportunities. We didn't cherry pick members of the committee.

- Most people said they were willing to wait every other year, which are the average current drawing odds across the State. Talked about Lifetime License Holders. Some felt they took advantage of an opportunity that was presented to them and a promise was made to them. We need to fulfill that promise and it shouldn't be modified in any way. Things have change as far as what we call a General Season Deer hunt since the Lifetime License Holders were issued a permit. Ultimately, there was a part of the committee that they would like to see some type of limitation on the percentage of permits that might be allocated to Lifetime License Holders on some units. That would require a change to State Code, isn't something we could do through the Deer Plan.
- Lifetime License Holders are guaranteed a permit and can choose any General Season unit they want. If this were changed, I believe a lot of Lifetime License Holders would feel they weren't getting what they signed up for.
- **Riley Roberts:** Thanked Dax for being here tonight. We manage to Buck to Doe ration. Where are we at as far as Deer population statewide? Do you have a number?
- With the proposals we are putting in place, we talked a lot about increasing the Deer herds. What are the projections for total numbers in the State?
- That's what the objective is right now? Over 400,000?
- Just managing Buck to Doe ratio, what percentage are we looking at gaining? Especially on some of the units in the Southern end of the State? What are we gaining? We are trusting you in changing these numbers, which we aren't comfortable with. What are we getting out of this, percentage wise? If we drop the Buck to Deer ratio one-step down, what are we looking at percentage wise and increase in overall population on a particular unit?
- It's like NIMBY, not in my backyard. What are the Hunters in the field getting out of this percentage wise? Looking for more than just trust us.
- **Dax Mangus:** Approximately 280,000 Deer as of the end of the survival year last year.
- Depends on a lot of factors. Data suggests that if we have a mild November and into December, Bucks can put some fat back on and Does before they go into winter that can change survival rates. Hard to predict what will happen through the winter. Updated today, survival looks good in Southern Utah. Fawn production and survival. It's more average in Central and Northern Utah. Suspects we'll see some population grown back to that 300,000 number, but this is premature and a guess. Trying to do the best job we possibly know how to grow Deer

and move toward that statewide population objective of a little over 400,000 Deer.

- If we do drop the Buck to Doe ratio and that increases productivity, they want more concrete numbers. Is it worth lowering out Buck to Doe ratio to 15-17 if that means a 3% increase in the population or 10% increase?
- The numbers haven't been crunched.
- **Austin Atkinson:** If we don't harvest yearling Bucks, we are going to waste so many of them anyway because survivability shows they die. Do you have numbers from the most recent survivability that are yearling Bucks dying as bad as we thought?
- Many DWR staff have said how we hunt Bucks does not affect the it doesn't affect the productivity of the herd. Yet, we are asking to lower the Buck to Doe ratios. Is this going to increase the herd by lowering Buck to Doe ratio? Is that the DWR's position? Or is it how we hunt Bucks? Or does it matter?
- Very few changes are made to season date, season lengths, weapon types, unit boundaries. Biggest change is Buck to Doe ratio. Is that all we should be looking at today? Knows what 20 Bucks per 100 Does looks like because he hunted this year. Is that the ultimate question we should be asking because nothing else was changed on the plan?
- **Kent Hersey:** Previous years data suggests that we are about 45% of Bucks going from one and a half to two and a half were dying due to causes other than hunting. Two primary causes being predation by Lions and Road Kill. DWR has place many collars on Deer, targeting yearling Bucks on the Pine Valley, Monroe, Boulder and Zion units. We still had some collared Deer throughout State that were from Fawns that were collared at six months old that lived and survived to that point. We don't have official numbers on that yet, but it's generally it 65-75 % survival this year. For whatever reason it's higher. We want to look into this survival rate more.
- **Dax Mangus:** We've heard shut down the unit to grow the herd. Or, stop hunting Bucks here and the herd will grow. There's no evidence to suggest that works. That's been the messaging for a lot of years, Bucks don't have babies. Shutting down hunts isn't going to grow your herds. We've said that over the years. Highly recommends going back and watching the Wildlife Board work session. Suggests how we hunt Bucks is directly correlated to can affect herd productivity, but relationship is negatively correlated. Meaning if we manage to lower Buck ratios it appears to increase herd productivity and it might grow Deer. That is different than the messaging we've shared in the past. Could grow Deer. New data set.
- Our position is that what drives Deer populations is primarily weather conditions and habitat and sometime predators. When we hunt Bucks,

there is some potential that there is some impact to the population growth based on how we hunt Bucks. Updated a lot of information in the plan and what we are learning with our Deer collar survival study across the State. Quite a bit of input from our Habitat section.

- Hunters generally tend to be more interested in how we hunt Bucks, rather than comments we make on a NEPA document, although those comments are very important. Most focus is on how we hunt Bucks. There wasn't a lot of support to adjust season dates. There were some pretty significant unit boundary changes.
- Lot of work going on behind the scenes to improve habitat, etc.
- **Bart Battista:** Didn't read that presentation that Dax mentioned. Somewhat skeptical about lower Buck to Doe ratios. Seems like this is a convenient tool to get more permits out there. Not against more permits, always seems we are looking at ways to get more permits out there despite being well below objective for Deer herds' population wise.
- How many years was that study? Did it show that hunting more Bucks causes a bigger population? Are we confident in that study and will you continue with this study?
- Not a hunter, but has managed Deer programs before at Camp Pendleton. If a Deer has one to two Fawns every year and it is 50% male, 50% female, and you're going to have 40% survival rate. Yet, you say the biggest factor is weather, which affects habitat, forage, etc. which we can't control. That's the reason for his skepticism.
- Cut permits in the Northern Region due to weather, then magically increased the permits in the Southern Region.
- **Dax Mangus:** Looking at the study, we are looking at herd productivity, Buck to Doe ratios, Doe to Fawn ratios over a 15 year period 2008 through 2022. Last eight years 2015-2022) looked specifically at body fat and how that factors in. It's a pretty substantial data set, 100's of animals distributed across the State.
- Regarding looking at increasing permit numbers, if you look at that graph, permit numbers have declined since 1992. The Division has often made recommendations to increase permits, especially in the Southern Region, then those recommendations often been changed or we haven't increased permits. These units might be below the population objective, but they're above the Buck to Doe ratio.
- Understands how it might appear that way. This is where we set the Buck to Doe ratios is in these meetings. Weigh the trade-offs, is it worth it?
- **Russell Gardner:** Member of the committee, lot of discussion about another tier on Buck to Doe ratio. Personal observation, most hunters were satisfied at 18-20 Buck to Doe ratio in our area. Seemed we were growing Deer even with the droughts until several years ago. We had

the diseases hit as well, but point is when the proposals came out to actually increase Buck to Doe ratios we were the minority, especially after the presentation by Brock and Randy. Presentation indicated we needed to lower the Buck to Doe ratios. Mood shifted from keep the ratio as is or increasing some of them, to we need to lower them.

- Is it the way we hunt these Bucks. Actually, the fat on the Does and Fawn that aids in survivability. Is it the Bucks fault? The habitat? Are we chasing the fat off the Deer? Both Randy and Brock indicated the Bucks are not the problem, but the study indicates it could be.
- **Austin Atkinson:** The study that Dr. Millan has referenced, this is not a peer review. Not a published journal. This is inconclusive at this point, right?
- **Dax Mangus:** It's been submitted for publication and they're in the review process. May be published soon.
- **Rachel Bolus:** Is the Buck to Doe ratio highly correlated with the population size generally? Are we the main drivers of that? If there is less hunting then there are more Bucks to Doe population? Or is it pretty loosely correlated?
- **Dax Mangus:** Loosely correlated. There are some biological thresholds at the bottom end and it appears maybe at the top end of a Buck to Doe ratio as well. We'll see great population growth, pregnancy rates on units with lower Buck to Doe ratios and lower Buck to Doe ratios and lower Buck to Doe ratios.
- If that were true, we would see populations on military installations and National Parks.
- **Bryant Johnson:** How much discussion went into lowering the permits on the Premium Limited Entry units? A lot more than 40, maybe down to 30.
- Now, 30-40 years to draw these permits.
- Observation, there are a lot of older Deer that aren't harvested.
- Is money the driving factor?
- Give more opportunity, but don't turn the Henry Mountains into the Beaver unit, where there are few 4-points.
- Lot of social issues that need more discussion.
- Talking about disease and managing at 40-45, we are asking for a nightmare with CWD.
- Seems to go against your Mule Deer plan if you have these numbers of Deer.
- There are some of your Limited Entry units that are not Premium Limited Entry units that are performing at or above the Henry's and Paunsaugant the last few years.

- **Dax Mangus:** Committee spent a lot of time discussing Buck to Doe ratios on all types of units. Most of the state is managed for General Season units. Only a few are managed for Premium Limited units.
- Substantial percentage of population wants to see higher Buck to Doe ratio.
- Plan cycle truncates the Buck to Doe ratio for General Season units from 25-35, Premium Limited Entry at 40-45. Idea to give diverse opportunities on those units.
- If disease is detected on these units, managing some of these units for higher Buck to Doe we may be increasing risk of disease spread. Relatively smaller amount of units.
- To your point that we don't need to manage units specifically for 200 inch Bucks, there are good Bucks taken off each unit every years.
- **Mike Grant:** On our Premium Limited Entry units where we manage at 40-45 Buck to 100 Does. You're telling us we have a more prominent herd at 15-17 or 17-20 Bucks per 100 Does. Doesn't remember herding a lot of Does and Fawns in front of his truck on Henry Mountains. If we are managing our Deer for trophy or opportunity, you're telling us we could grow more Deer if we lower the Buck to Doe ratio. .
- All for opportunity, but feels we are managing backwards. Sees very few Does and Fawns, and we should be seeing more. Is that rock solid data or do we leave it where we are at, 18-20 Bucks per 100 Does?
- Starting to see effects of depredation, freeways, high fences, summer pastures, etc. Is there going to be a benefit if we wait for this plan for three years? Where is the trade-off?
- **Dax Mangus:** Data indicates that managing at a lower Buck to Doe ratio can increase productivity. Small changes in growth rate, compound over time.
- Lowering Buck to Doe ratios, we haven't experimentally tried that yet. Data indicates you have a higher growth rate with lower Buck to Doe ratios. This was considered by the Mule Deer Committee. There is still a demand and desire from people with 30 plus bonus points putting in for the Henry Mountains. Again, a trade-off.
- **Austin Atkinson:** When a Biologist does a Buck classification survey in November and count 20 Bucks per 100 Does, what does that look like? Is any Spike Buck is counted as a Buck?
- How many are mature Bucks, not yearlings or 2-points?
- Experience on classification has been it's been very low where 2-3 may be a 3-year old and the other 17 or 18 are younger.
- **Dax Mangus:** One to two years ago in this RAC someone said there are no Bucks, all he saw was two and three point Bucks. The Division is

	<p>considering these Bucks, 4-point and Spikes when classifying on a General Season unit. We don't count Fawns as Bucks. If it's a Spike Buck, they will classify that as a Spike Buck.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't have those numbers on the top of his head, but we do have that data. • Might depend on the unit you are on. • Bart Battista: Habitat Management. The plan states ideal restoration projects that benefit Mule Deer should be large in scale including mosaic patterns to increase patchiness and edge effects, and coordinate with Federal Agencies. Do we do that? Is there coordination? • Most of what he sees in the Kanab area is chaining mastication of these large swaths. What is the ideal patch size across the landscape to benefit Mule Deer, understanding we manage the landscape for fire, cattle and other things? • Dax Mangus: We do coordinate with other agencies for these types of project. • What's the ideal patch size? Not the guy to ask this question. Gary Bezzant in the Cedar City Office can best answer this question. <p>Addition questions from the RAC after public questions and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Russell Gardner: How is CWD spread? Do predators eating on a carcass help spread the disease? • Dax Mangus: CWD is spread through direct contact that is why Bucks are more likely to spread the disease during the rut. They're checking Does, they're touching noses to tails, etc. Some evidence Does are transmitting the disease to Fawns when they are giving birth. No conclusion evidence that predators are spreading CWD. Some evidence that predators are more likely to kill CWD positive animals. Animals get to those terminal stages and are not as mobile.
<p>07:11:10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Questions: • Paul Marshall, Beaver County: • Question about data. Lower Buck to Doe ration is counterintuitive to anything we've ever thought as to growing Deer. • All about growing Deer, but wants quality Deer. • Mental Health Counselor, studies data all the time. • Data is in the review process, doesn't mean data is accurate yet.

- Data is manipulated very easily.
- Personally troubled by presented data that has not been reviewed.
- Where is data coming from?
- We've been in years of drought, Deer herds have been on the decline. We blame the weather. Seen habitat work, especially in Southern Utah over last several years.
- Highway improvement, everything we can to save Deer.
- A lot of questions about the data and how we are pulling out Buck to Doe ratios as compared to everything else we are doing to grow Deer.
- Is this the silver bullet?

- **Dax Mangus:** We try to make science-based management decisions.
- Sometimes, it takes a while to get data through the public process.
- Pretty intuitive and doesn't go through a giant scientific review process.
- Hearing through comments that there is some hesitancy to lower Buck to Doe ratio based on this data. That's why we are having this RAC/public meeting. If folks want to propose different metrics or Buck to Doe ratios, that's their prerogative.
- No agenda here except to grow Deer and provide Hunting opportunities.
- The committee couldn't come to a consensus to even choose a unit or two to try experimentally managing at a lower Buck to Doe ratio.

- **Garth Jensen:**
- Do you have an idea of what units could benefit from lower Buck to Doe ratio?
- Sees that the Division may transition from 18-20 to 15-17. Are those the units that have been targeted to benefit from that?
- How broad was the discussion in the committee going to 10-12 Bucks per 100 Doe and then having some units all the way up to 23-25 and then see how that goes?
- Discussion on carrying capacities within these units as part of the management plan?
- Is harvest a determining factor in the population objective? If X amount of Hunters hit the field and X amount of Deer are harvested is that a qualifier, is it figured into the population objective? If the harvest number is 20-30% versus 40-50%, then do you say you don't have enough Deer on the landscape to issue this many permits?
- Do you have any ratings of Hunter satisfaction on 15-17 versus 18-20 and if Hunters are satisfied or if it's close?

- **Dax Mangus:** Yes, the units we recommended managing at 15-17, we felt could benefit from this. Production factor, but also disease resilience. Most units that we are recommending keeping at 18-20 ratio are units where we have a large amount of private lands or tribal lands. Exception would be the Pine Valley.

- People are passionate about the Pine Valley unit. Committee and the DWR agreed to leave the Pine Valley at 18-20, because it's a high profile unit.
- Yes, there was a lot of talk about this. We've already managed units to have a higher Buck to Doe ratio. Managing units at a lower Buck to Doe ratio was where most of the talk was. Going as low as 12-14 Bucks per Doe, but the committee was broad enough, no one wanted it on their units.
- Statewide plan we talked more generally. Unit population objectives are set in the unit plans with local committees. Based on a more specific look at winter range, what are we looking at with Elk populations, how are our conflicts on private lands or agriculture, etc.
- We have a range trend crew that does an assessment of habitat on the unit. DWR looks at that information along with body condition of Deer. At that point, the regions typically look at all their unit management plans and population objectives in those plans to see if it's the correct objective. Objective is not to grow a bunch of Deer and then kill a bunch of Deer.
- We recognize that in some circumstances we aren't going to be able to manage to the Buck to Doe ratio. Example, the East Canyon unit or the Morgan South Rich unit that are 90% private property and most of those landowners want to manage at a higher Buck to Doe ratio. Primary driver for permits is Buck to Doe ratio. We see success ratios vary based on weather conditions, for example.
- Hunter satisfaction rates are highly correlated to Hunter success rates. Lower satisfaction rates for 15-17 versus 18-20, but it's slight.
- **Brayden Richmond:**
- Question on the Thousand Lakes unit, back and forth between General Season, Limited, back and forth. Why was the change made? What will be different this time?
- A lot of concern that Elk numbers impact to Deer. I didn't see any discussion in the management plan regarding the impact of Elk to Deer.
- My understanding is that there hasn't been a good study on this, not even from other states. We didn't pull Elk off the Book Cliffs to look at the impact.
- CWD. Some people think it's as real as COVID, other people think it's going to kill all the Deer. General feeling seems to be that is you kill the bigger Bucks that will slow the spread. Montana has had a runt hunt for a month forever and they have some of the fastest spreading of CWD. Have we looked at that study before we jump ship and join Colorado
- **Dax Mangus:** We've tried it General Season, Limited Entry and a hybrid on this unit, back and forth. The scale may be wrong. The unit size is probably not big enough to capture what's happening there. We've talked about combining it with Fishlake unit. It's a unit where we could try

	<p>new things without giving up much. Most commonly received comment from public was add a restrictive Archery hunt. Biologically, it might make sense to combine it with the Fish Lake unit, but from an opportunity standpoint or ability to test restricted weapon types and see what the public's perception is. That's why we chose that unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some impact, data isn't conclusive to show that Elk have much of an impact on Deer. • The Book Cliffs was an experiment to see the impact if we reduce the number of Elk. • CWD: The risk and consequences of CWD is so severe and substantial. Studies in many states with lots of data and conclusions. Not really any great answers. May be able to manage for higher Buck to Doe ratios and older class Bucks, but the risk is substantial, so there's hesitancy. • Bransen Jackson: • Yearling Buck and mortality rates. Apparently, there have been some studies going on. Last RAC meeting the Division talked about utilizing these yearling Bucks that are dying by harvesting. Have there been any numbers going into establishing this in the amount we should harvest, this is the percentage that are dying. Are those numbers going into anything to establish these numbers? • If there is a finite number that you have, how do you know that you're going to harvest a Deer that was already going to die, instead of adding that percentage to what's already going to die? • Dax Mangus: No, they are not right now. As Kent mentioned, we are putting more collars out on yearling Bucks this last year to increase the sample size to get a better idea on what's happening. We don't have any strategies specifically directed at harvesting more yearling Bucks. • When you look at additive versus compensatory mortality, harvesting an animal that would have died anyway versus harvesting an animal that would have survived. I don't know there's a specific way to know that. If you harvest an additional 100 yearling Bucks and 30% of those were going to die anyway, then 30% of that harvest is most likely compensatory harvest. Not possible to predict.
<p>07:32:18</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Comments • Kevin Bunnell (Online comments/Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030) • Question #1: Which best describes your position regarding the proposed mule deer management plan?

- Strongly agree: 10 (18%)
 - Somewhat agree: 19 (35%)
 - Neither agree nor disagree: 3 (5.5%)
 - Somewhat disagree: 5 (9.1%)
 - Strongly disagree: 18 (33%)
 - Total votes: 55
 - Weighted average: $[(18 * 1) + (5 * 2) + (3 * 3) + (19 * 4) + (10 * 5)] / 55 = 2.96$
 - Pretty evenly split. 53% of the people that commented expressed some level of agreement versus 42% that expressed some level of disagreement.
 - Buck to Doe ratios: 3-1 in terms of people that disagreed with that proposal versus those that agreed.
 - Splitting the Beaver unit: Nearly evenly split.
 - Thousand Lakes: Comments in each direction.
 - Giving the Division the ability to change up to 30% without public comment: Only two comments.
- 55 total comments on this agenda item, 194 pages of comments in total for the whole meeting.
- **Public comment (in person)**
- **Kevin Norman, SFW:** SFW get their fulfillment committee together, which is comprised of our chapter chairs across the State to form our official position. We know the plan isn't perfect, but they support plan as present.
 - **Russell Todd:** There needs to be discussion when habitat is being studied and also on Doe hunts.
 - In support of plan, but needs to be some other discussion.
 - **Craig Laub:** Appreciates the RAC and DWR.
 - Buck to Doe ratio on Pine Valley. If we go to 4 point or better, the Buck ratio will go out of sight.
 - Against the proposal.
 - **Troy Justensen, Member of the Mule Deer Committee:**
 - Emphasized that this is a recommendation, nothing is set in stone. This is was the Mule Deer Committee recommends. Now, goes before the public to correct anything we missed or got wrong.
 - Not a fan of surveys, it's very difficult to not have a bias.
 - Puts a lot of trust in the people in the room and has a member of the Mule Deer Committee he supports the plan.

- **William Thomas Vernon:** Observation of Pine Valley unit. Hunted all 10 days, saw one 4-point, and did take some nice Deer. The Deer he saw in the Southwest unit were more large 2 X 3 points. Didn't see a lot of 4 points.
- Doesn't support the recommendation of 4-point only.
- **Thomas Chase Vernon:** Need to focus on opportunity for all generations of Hunters and making the maximum opportunity for people to have successful hunts.
- Not making decisions on not only the maturity of Deer, but the opportunity to keep it rolling.
- **Garth Jensen:** Struggles with committees in general, but has only been to a handful of them. Would like to see the Division step back from forming these committees and conducting these committees.
- Feels there is definitely a direction they are leading the committee to go and there are certain topics that are available and certain that are not.
- Would like to see a committee where the handcuffs are removed and be able to discuss it all.
- Would like to see the Deer draw consolidated into one. It would simplify the process and fix a lot of things, like the Lifetime License Holders.
- Still trying to figure out why we have a Premium Limited Entry and Limited Entry at different price tiers when the only thing that is different is the Buck to Doe ratio. We could figure out what unit is managed for what Buck to Doe ration without titles.
- Opposed to 30% increase in permits without having to go through the public process.
- On test units or at least the Buck to Doe ratios, would like to see these spread out throughout the state and have more of them. Rather see a low Buck to Doe ratio and then a high Buck to Doe ratio.
- **Jeremy Anderson, Mule Deer Foundation and also a Mule Deer Committee member.** Thanked the RAC for having him there.
- You've got 20 members plus lots of diversity and opinions. Representatives from Southern Utah were included. Not everyone agreed.
- Good plan, not perfect as mentioned.
- Surveys indicated opportunity was huge. That was a bigger factor to him with the lower Buck to Doe ratio than perhaps growing bigger Deer or better Deer herds.
- Mule Deer Foundation stands behind this.
- **Josh Pollock, representing himself.** 18-20 Bucks per 100 Does is not high.

- In 2016, we had open houses throughout the State. People came and spoke to Biologists and filled out comment cards. 18-20 Bucks per 100 Does seemed to be a happy medium where people felt they could have opportunity and have a successful hunt. If you go lower, you'll decrease your success, decrease the number of Buck on the landscape as well as the number of mature Bucks.
 - From the surveys and public comment, people are willing to wait a year or two to have Bucks there as well as mature Bucks. Higher quality of hunt. Encourages the Division to stay at this number.
 - As far as Premium Limited Entry and Limited Entry. 50 Bucks per 100 Does, that high and so is 40 Bucks per 100 Does is high when we talk about Buck to Doe ratios. That's where you start to see Fawn productivity drop. On some General Season units you'll see 90% Fawn survival rates. The Paunsaugunt is a stable unit, but it's a Premium Limited Entry unit. We aren't there managing Fawn, but we do want that population to stay stable and continue to grow. We are there to hunt Bucks, there are only two of those in the State. Let's keep those Premium Limited Entry units. They bring in a lot of money for research projects and collaring, etc.
 - Plenty of opportunity to hunt Limited Entry units in the State with the HAMS, Muzzleloader, and late hunts and the CWMU hunts.
 - Has nine Deer points, there are plenty of units for him to hunt nine different Limited Entry units.
 - Wants to have a good Deer hunt and be able to take his kids out. Feels like if we go back to lower Buck to Doe ratios, we're going in the wrong direction. We'll have more upset people coming to the RAC for the next six years because just giving out more permits isn't the answer.
 - As far as 30%, this should be a public process.
 - Appreciates science, but as a Biologist you might have an idea of what is going on in a particular area; however, that might not necessarily be what is happening.
-
- **Paul Marshall, SFW:** In favor of the Beaver East/West split.
 - Buck to Doe ratio, feels like the Deer population is on the upswing. Good winter and habitat. Recommends stay pat and let the Deer grow, let them decide when we actually increase permit numbers. Don't change our objective to increase permits.
 - Would like to see a higher quality and opportunity, but we need to let our Deer grow, we are going to get that.
 - Can't control the weather, but we've had favorable conditions over the last couple of years.
 - Predators are down, we've opened up Mountain Lion hunting and have killed more Lions as well as Coyotes.
-
- **Brayden Richmond, representing himself:** There have been a lot of Elk and Deer impact studies on movement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't believe there's ever been a study of where Elk are pulled off a unit and then watching the impact to Deer. We're a little late to the table on this, but better late than never. • A few years ago when we change the Beaver West from a Limited Entry unit. We drew the line at I-15 and made it a General Season Elk unit with the intention of trying to get the Elk off the Mineral Mountain range. • If we are going to study the Deer under the new proposal and we are already doing a study on the unit, can we please try to capture that Elk study? It's an opportunity to see what pulling Elk off a unit may have on Deer. • Bransen Jackson: Didn't know about the public survey about the Buck to Doe ratios. • We shouldn't go against the public when it comes to what they want and the Buck to Doe ratio increasing. Keep them the same. • We should merge the Deer draws into one, which would help a lot of different things. • Opposed to 30% increase without public input.
<p>07:51:04</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tammy Pearson: Everyone she has talked to in Beaver county likes the split on the East and West, but hesitant on the weapon choice. Hoped with the Milford Flat fire, this would become our next Premium Limited Entry unit. • Runs cattle on part of the Beaver unit. Has seen amazing rehabs since the fires of 2001. Biggest issue is they aren't even touching the feed as far as grazing. Someone has mentioned that the best wildlife habitat is overgrazed grassland. • Deer are coming back. Good winters and moisture, getting rid of Cougars and Coyotes. • Likes comment about getting rid of Elk on that unit, would like to see the Elk off of that unit. We can't get rid of Elk, I don't know how you do it. They're coming across the freeway from the West and there are a lot of Elk on that unit. • Kevin Bunnell: You make me nervous looking at me when you're talking about that, like it's my decision. • Mike Grant: Agrees with Sportsman in the room with regard to the 30%, needs to be public comment. • Buck to Doe ratio: Let's leave it 18-20 Bucks per Doe for the first three years of the study, the herds will increase if we are going down the right path. It will increase our Hunters in the field over the next three years. If it's a flop we'll find out in the beginning of the study, not the end.

- 100 % for opportunity. But, in a research study, we don't want to manipulate the data by lowering the ratio and raising permits.
- Start at ground zero. It works. We've been through drought, predation, etc.
- **Austin Atkinson:** Appreciates everyone on the committee doesn't want to discredit anything they've done.
- Hopeful on pulling the rug out and starting over. Has listened to Mule Deer discussions fights since he's lived in Utah.
- Wanted to see a red wave take over and say that we are starting over, doesn't feel we saw this with the Mule Deer Plan.
- Season date changes, getting permits in the hands of youth, weapons changes, shortening season, moving season all misses. They were considered lightly, not sure why changes weren't made either by the Division or committee members.
- Missed by not addressing the extended Archery issue, Lifetime License issues. Chasm between General Season and Limited Entry and we're too scared to move a unit up to Limited Entry or down to a General Season unit.
- Not enough tiers in the Buck to Doe ratios. We couldn't address and debate everything that is being brought up tonight or fix them.
- Personally, let down, but understands his way to hunt is not necessarily the right way to hunt. Wants the opportunity to hunt bigger Bucks, feels we missed a lot of those marks.
- Hopeful, this works, but the weather is not going to change for us.
- **Bryant Johnson:** Almost feels we have a broken system, but no one wants it in their backyard.
- Southern Utah knows we don't have the Bucks we used too.
- Wildlife Board has been taken over by so many people up there. Increase do this, do that. They don't know what goes on in the Southern Utah area. The same way Washington doesn't know what goes on in Utah.
- We don't want to kill off Deer. We have a chance now for Deer to come back and they're doing well. Now, we are going to change this because we say 50-60 percent of 2-points will die.
- Expects this to leave hear tonight and go up to the Wildlife board to pass as the DWR wanted.
- Agrees with Troy Justensen on studies, they can be indoctrinated by people who listen to them.
- Saw chaos on the Mule Deer Committee when he went to the meeting in place of someone who couldn't go. Narrative was controlled by those who wanted to drop the Buck to Doe ratio and increase permits.

- For opportunity, but not if we have to drop our Buck to Doe ratios so far that we can't have mature Deer to go around and not if we can't keep our Does bred in the Fall.
- Wants to see good Deer, doesn't want to tell people they can't harvest a 2-point. If they draw a permit, they should be able to harvest whatever Buck they want.
- It takes three years to draw a Dedicated Hunter permit, no one wants to look at that. Spreading out Lifetime license holders and their permits.
- Listen to the Southern Utah when we say we don't have the same numbers and quality of Bucks. This is where people from up North want to come to hunt.
- **Riley Roberts:** Doesn't agree with a lot of this. Most of this information deserves its own agenda item.
- Not very excited about plan. The committee and the Division tried, but not sure it can be summed up in one part.
- Trying to make everyone happy is not success.
- People in his area, there are a lot of test units and proposed changes.
- Leave the Buck to Doe ratio where it is.
- Hard to monitor and differentiate what is working, what isn't, when we are throwing so much at one particular unit, whether it's the Boulder, Pine Valley, or whatever unit?
- Doesn't agree with 30%, advocate of RAC and public input.
- Encourages the RAC leave the Buck to Doe ratio as is until we can get some years behind us and see where we are at with the studies.
- **Austin Atkinson:** To be clear, he Statewide Mule Deer Plan keeps the Buck to Doe ratio at 18-20 on the Pine Valley, but lowers other units in our region.
- **Bart Battista:** Thanked the Mule Deer Committee, it's tough. Can't satisfy everyone.
- Sure the meetings were probably more contentious than we have had here, they had to come up with a plan.
- The Plan probably isn't perfect. They say "Perfect is the enemy of good enough."
- Not comfortable reducing the Buck to Doe ratios.
- Non-consummative representative, not trying to reduce hunting.
- Co-worker asked him why there aren't any Bucks around. Has only seen 2-point Bucks on this year on the Paunsaugunt. We usually see four, five point Bucks running around the Best Friends Sanctuary. That influences him. He hasn't seen nearly as many Deer this year either.

Questions on the Motion:

- **Bart Battista:** So, basically up to 30%, plus or minus? They can make those changes, but don't have to come to us anyway with permit number recommendations?
- **Kevin Bunnell:** They would no longer come before the RAC that is the recommendation.
- **Bryant Johnson:** Has a problem with all the yearling Bucks and saying they're going to die and we need to increase permits because there are this many Bucks. Doesn't feel all yearling Bucks should be included when deciding how many permits.
- They take that into account when they recommend permit numbers, the yearling Bucks. Maybe they should only take half of the numbers they think are there.
- **Austin Atkinson:** It would be impossible to tell if someone took a yearling Buck. You've got antler spread and amount of points, etc.
- Permit numbers would be talked about in the spring.
- We've talked about adding a higher tier for General Season Buck to Doe ratios, so we don't have to fight this every year. Like 21-25 or somewhere in there. So that we could pick a unit and other regions could pick a unit, rather than bump it up all the way to a Limited Entry unit.
- **Russell Gardner:** So, we are asking to leave the ratio as is on the Limited Entry and Premium Limited Entry?
- Leaving hunting opportunity there that is unnecessary.
- **Mike Grant:** I would agree. I feel we should leave it the way the plan is to help take some of those bigger Bucks off the landscape those Premium Limited Entry units.
- **Bryant Johnson:** No problem with the recommendations on the Buck to Doe ratios on the Premium and Limited Entry units, but if they shouldn't be able to change it without bringing that 30% to the RAC's.
- **Riley Roberts:** Didn't we already just pass this agenda item? In the last motion?
- Thought it was accepted as presented with the exception of General Season units.
- **Kevin Bunnell:** No, the last Motion was just for the General Season. We are now dealing with Premium Limited Entry and Limited Entry units.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chuck Chamberlain: Reason he seconded was because we currently have five units that are not Limited Entry units, which are General Season units. • They're in the category of 25-31. • Feels we don't have a Limited Entry if we go down to 25-30, it's becoming a General Season unit. • The Boulder Mountain is above that so we should make it a Limited Entry base on those numbers.
<p>08:00:00</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 plan as presented for General Season units with the exception of changing the Buck to Doe ratio for units in the Southern Region and not allowing a 30% change without going through the public process.</p> <p>Motion passed 11-0.</p> <p>The following motion was made by Bart Battista, seconded by Chuck Chamberlain.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we approved Limited Entry and Premium Limited Entry as presented with the exception of reducing the Buck to Doe ratio.</p> <p>Motion fails 8-3.</p> <p>The following motion was made by Bryant Johnson, seconded by Russell Gardner.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we accept the plan as proposed for Limited Entry and Premium Limited Entry units, with the exception of allowing the 30% change without going through the public process.</p> <p>Motion passed: 8-3.</p>
<p>08:32:14</p>	<p>6) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (Action) (Definition of 4 point or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting) Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator</p> <p>Presented the Division's recommendations and answered questions from the RAC and public members</p>

	<p>Clarification on why we are presenting this and is it different from last fall. We did look at something similar last fall. The direction that was given was to present to deer committee, this is what came out of that meeting.</p> <p>A youth being mentored on the Pine Valley would have to follow the restrictions that related to the tag holder, essentially making 4 point or better the requirement for that mentored youth.</p>
<p>08:33:44</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chuck Chamberlain: How are the units chosen, what criteria was used? How are you going to measure illegal kill on limited weapons and 4-point or better? • Kent Hersey: It was discussed by the committee, there was only one unit that had interest and that was the Pine Valley. Other units were discussed. Cache unit was chosen to see a unit outside of the Southern Region. For the Limited Entry on Thousand Lakes, and Beaver West, a lot of comments regarding three weapons, smaller units. Opportunity to see how they would respond to the traditional weapons. Illegal kill, Law Enforcement records, we are hoping a lot of that gets reported. Transects, still not specific on the methods for that but is something we are looking at. • Bryant Johnson: We have something similar on our management units, how often do we see illegal kill in those hunts? Could there be a difference because that is more into the rut? • Paul Washburn: Not very common and most people self-report because they couldn't see it well or took a bad shot. Certainly could be different, doesn't have specific data, different population hunting as well. • Austin Atkinson: How do we expect to do a research study when we are constantly changing the dynamics of the study? Changing buck to doe ratios. • Austin Atkinson: It would be a different survey that would be sent out? • Kent Hersey: Ideally, everything would be constant. Not possible with wildlife. If we are at objective and we maintain objective, can we access how that impacts buck doe population? As long as we are within that buck to doe ratio we can access how that impacts mature buck population. The social side will become a bit convoluted. Does it create crowding issues, less satisfaction, etc? Change is what we are trying to do. Can we provide additional opportunity while also providing increased quality for mature bucks? • Austin Atkinson: Hunters satisfaction, how would that be measured? Is there anything else besides 1-5? • Kent Hersey: Yes, you are talking about the Harvest Survey, where you get the 1-5. Satisfaction can be judged in different ways. • Austin Atkinson: It would be a different survey that would be sent out?

- **Kent Hersey:** Yes, a separate survey sent out to those who have permits on those units.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** How will you maintain Buck to Doe ratios when you've limited success?
- **Kent Hersey:** Ultimately depends on what the population will allow. In 2020, we were cutting tags. In a good pattern right now and hope it continues, would require permit increases which we can adjust those between seasons. But yes, it would require increases in permits.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** Was there any discussion on what to do about Dedicated Hunters who are one to two years in on the Boulder unit and now they have to buy a new gun to continue to hunt?
- **Kent Hersey:** Dedicated Hunters would have to follow unit restrictions, they could pull out of the program but wouldn't be reimbursed for hours already paid for or worked.
- **Bryant Johnson:** What is the expectation if the buck to doe ratio rises on Pine Valley? Didn't we see that all of the Lifetime License Holders took that, won't it get worse with this?
- **Kent Hersey:** You are assuming LLH would want to hunt somewhere they have traditionally not hunted and have to be under these restrictions. We don't know the answers to these questions.

- **Riley Roberts:** In the State of Utah we have done point restrictions, what were the results of those studies?
- **Kent Hersey:** Yes, 3 point or better restrictions on the Book Cliffs in the 80's. The data showed that after the hunt was over you actually had fewer mature bucks that you did without that restriction in place, increase in illegal kill, lower success rates. Overall wasn't successful. That is why we are proposing 4 point or better, hunting has changed since then, technology has increased for both hunters and researchers.
- **Riley Roberts:** There are no point restrictions on youth correct? What is the percentage for the youth?
- **Kent Hersey:** 20% for youth. Last year 640 permits.
- **Riley Roberts:** How does that affect the outcome of the study?
- **Kent Hersey:** We can split out the youth from the study. Obviously, less pure. The committee felt that without that condition for youth, the point restriction wouldn't pass.

Additional RAC questions after Public Questions.

- **Austin Atkinson:** How do you measure quality?
- **Kent Hersey:** Through harvest survey we get number of points and spread. During classification we keep data on if it's a little two point or a giant old two point. Be able to see if that is changing.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tammy Pearson: On the Beaver West, as far as research what is the data collecting? Success rate, counting mature bucks, young bucks? Tag numbers? Will you do a number of winter kill? ● Kent Hersey: Yes. Permit numbers would be discussed in the spring. Proposes a new unit, we will have to guess. We can come up with a ratio, rough guess on permit. ● Mike Wardle: Last years data was divided out East and West so we will have a bit of data to work with. ● Bart Battista: Do you think it's a good idea to limit the study to two years? You'll have push back the first 2-3 years. You'll have to wait to get sufficient data. ● Kent Hersey: Proposing a 4 year study. If it was an absolute disaster it could be revisited.
<p>08:47:55</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Russell Todd: If we do a point restriction on Pine Valley, will this affect the Muzzleloader hunters? Because they would be wasting their points. As far as Pine Valley, has there ever been a study of how many hunters can be on the landscape? ● Kent Hersey: No study on that. ● Bryan Johnson: Have you considered a late season Management Hunt on the Pine Valley? It might be advantageous to move people through the point system. ● Kent Hersey: For the purposes of research, we are not considering this. ● Paul Marshall: Restricted Weapons hunt, when are the season dates? How many archery, rifle and muzzleloaders would be in each of those? Would that be considered a General Season hunt? ● Kent Hersey: Follow the same season dates as proposed for all other hunts. Trying to determine will this limit success or limit selectivity of the top end bucks so you can manage for a Buck to Doe ratio, provide greater number of tags, and opportunity for more mature bucks on the landscape. ● Paul Marshall: Would that be considered a limited entry or General Season hunt? ● Kent Hersey: General Season, except Thousand Lakes. ● Garth Jensen: Why were the test regions so heavily in the Southern Region? ● Kent Hersey: Most of the comments were made through the Southern RAC ● Garth Jensen: So, there were other units discussed, but no support for it? Aside from the Cache. What does success look like after they've run their course, what is the committee looking for? ● Kent Hersey: What the committee wanted was to increase both opportunity and quality.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Garth Jensen: So it would be maintaining or increasing tags depending on how everything looked with population levels? If you got to a spot where it looked like your buck to doe ratio was increasing based off the regulations and rules but then you see harvest surveys that said overcrowding, is that the threshold when you say we are going to have an ever increasing buck to doe ratio because we can't put more hunters on the field due to overcrowding? ● Kent Hersey: That is part of the study, it's a 4 year study if it is an absolute disaster after 2 years maybe we can revisit it. We want to see what is done biologically but also from a social side. ● unknown? How did you come up with the 4-point definition, a drop tine with count, but a brow tine will not? ● Kent Hersey: You can have a lower point off the main beam, but can't be the eye guard. Standard definition for management hunts. ● Brian Johnson: If the point is to have bigger deer on the landscape that aren't being harvested. Wouldn't it be counterproductive if the bigger deer that don't get harvested are 2 and 3 point? Really believes a Management hunt should be considered. ● Kent Hersey: With this study, the objective is to determine how many of those are running around. Classification data will be collected ● Brian Johnson: How long is the study? ● Kent Hersey: Four years. 2025-2028
<p>09:01:30</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kevin Bunnell (Online comments/Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5) ● Question #2: Which best describes your position regarding the proposed deer hunt strategies research project? ● Strongly agree: 10 (26%) ● Somewhat agree: 8 (21%) ● Neither agree nor disagree: 2 (5.1%) ● Somewhat disagree: 4 (10%) ● Strongly disagree: 15 (38%) ● Total votes: 39 ● Weighted average: $[(15 * 1) + (4 * 2) + (2 * 3) + (8 * 4) + (10 * 5)] / 39 = 2.85$ <p>Public Comment (in person)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brayden Richmond: On the RAC for 8 years. Every year people would come before the RAC and express a desire for a point restriction, we asked for this as a region but now saying not in our backyard, right? Generally speaking, agrees with Austin. Like to see the point restriction in someone else's backyard, not his, but understands it needs to be in someone backyard. If we are going to do an experiment, let's leave the

controls alone. No kids shooting 2 points, no change to the Buck to Doe ratio. Everyone on that unit hunts 4-point or better.

- **Paul Marshall:** Vice chair Beaver SFW. Most voted against weapon restrictions on the Beaver West. Reasons: wounded mortality rate. Beaver West is a good unit for people with health problems – great road access. Choosing permit numbers on the Beaver West will be difficult. Beaver West is the Winter range for the Beaver East, that needs to be figured in when collecting those numbers.
- **Russell Todd:** Representing himself. Pine Valley, there needs to be some type of classification on permit numbers. If we limit people from shooting smaller Bucks, the Buck to Doe ratio will go very high. Grew up on the Book Cliffs when he was younger. Overrun with people, in a couple years you'll have 20-25,000 people applying. Changes of drawing that permit will go from 5 years to 10 years. Everyone wants opportunity, but you'll have a harder time drawing a permit. More in-depth study on the actual deer numbers on Pine Valley.
- **Kevin Norman:** Representing SFW. Not in support of 4-point or better on the Pine Valley. Would like to see restricted weapons on the Cache split between North and South, the North being the restricted area. South staying as is. Strongly support the restricted weapons units. Will be difficult, but will be fun to see good bucks again.
- **Garth Jensen:** Overall in support of test units, likes that we are trying something different. Would rather have a controlled unit, a controlled unit. If a youth wants to shoot a 2-point, have them go to a different unit. Would like to see a set permit number on primitive weapons permit and 4 pt. or better, don't adjust permit numbers for a better test case.
- **Jeremy Anderson:** Mule Deer Foundation, MDC member. Gives opportunity, maybe a lower success ratio. Supports plan in full.
- **Troy Justensen:** Member of MDC. What we are experiencing here is exactly what we experienced on the committee. Support point restriction Reason we are here tonight is to decrease tags opportunity. We are good at cutting back, but not giving back. Rather hunt with a lesser chance of harvesting a Buck, hunt with a lesser weapon and still be out there with my family hunting. Support the MDC's recommendations.
- **Bryan Johnson:** Brayden brought up some good points. People have wanted change for so long, but Son was mentored on his grandfather's permit and he was able to harvest a good buck, great experience. We need to try other things. Understands the social side of things

	<p>Loves weapons restrictions. If you do this, maybe 50 youth management tags in November that allow 2 point. We are really effective at killing stuff, if this flops we will be right back to where we are now within a year if you lift the restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kenion Powell: Doesn't agree with point restriction. Experienced this on the Book Cliffs. What are they going to do in four years if this is successful, make it a Limited Entry unit? Shot a small Buck on the Pine Valley only because he was with his grandkids. Got to do something different. ● John Anderson: Changed from Pine Valley to Panguitch Lake, wasn't seeing big bucks on Pine Valley. Don't muddy up the study, 4 point or better for all hunters. Can we use the Colorado 4 point study to help figure this out?
<p>09:21:51</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chuck Chamberlain: Supports weapon restriction, but not point restriction. Looked at studies that show point restrictions do not work. Believes new data will support this. ● Austin Atkinson: Feels like the Division saying we don't know what will happen, but we will go ahead and see. We will never live this down if the 4 point or better goes through. If we are going to do this, we need to control the variables. If not, we are being set up to fail. We hear about this every year. Would like to see one unit in every region. If this is what we are going to have to do to put this to bed, then do it. Have to keep tag numbers the same or we might as well sell over the counter Deer permits for 4 points or better on the Pine Valley. Restricted weapons, the idea was not to totally shut people out of the units they were used to hunting. ● Mike Grant: Agrees with Austin. We do not need a lot of variables. Some of us have long-range guns, a lot of money spent, alot of conversation with this. We need to restrict ourselves at some point when it comes to bucks and how we hunt. We aren't there just to kill, we are out there to harvest an animal. Hunting is a tradition with family. People are going to be out there having to actually hunt. We'll have to teach our youth how to hunt. If we are going to have a 4-point or better, then that needs to be across the board for all hunters on that unit. ● Riley Roberts: Grew up in Antimony and hunted the Boulder, Monroe, Mt. Dutton. Not excited to go out and buy a new weapon, but is in support of restrictive weapons. Not opposed to trying a point restriction, but doesn't believe there's a benefit to it. But, feels the youth should be held to 4 point or better as well. He is fully in support of youth hunting opportunities. We don't always know what the winter will hold, environmental impacts. We have the opportunity to make some changes that could affect us in a positive way.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bryant Johnson: Been on both sides of these issues. Believes the Board did the right thing with removing the scopes on Muzzleloaders. There might be some options on the restricted weapons for splitting seasons? He's been against the 4-point or better in the past, but has changed his mind. ● Russell Gardner: Last year, the Division set permit numbers at 3,000. By the second year, the Buck to Doe ratio will be very high. Believes we need to set a number of permit numbers. Believes there should be a smaller increase. ● Austin Atkinson: Agrees with Russell. I think we have to do the research them think going forward. What happens to this unit in 4 years if it works? There's big bucks everywhere and everybody gets a great deer. Are you going to stick us with that permit number forever then it's just a limited entry hunt. ● Russell Gardner: The Pine Valley is in his backyard. Deer come through his backyard and the hunters follow. Someone shot one of his cows with an arrow this year. We are turning this into a Limited Entry unit and everyone will start applying. Think the youth need something even if it is a management hunt.
<p>09:37:37</p>	<p>MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Bart Battista seconded by Chad Utlely.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we approved the proposal as presented, exempt no variance for youth hunters.</p> <p>Motion passed 7-4. Opposed Chuck Chamberlain, Brooklynn Cox, Russell Gardner, Rachel Bolus</p>
<p>09:41:17</p>	<p>7) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action) Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator</p> <p>Presented the Division's recommendation and answered questions from the RAC and public.</p>
<p>09:41:38</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: Is there any reason we can't separate Paunsaugunt to having not overlapping hunt dates? Push management and cactus buck completely from overlapping. Just referring to rifle. ● Dax Mangus: In the past we have kept dates similar. Premium permits did not have management hunters on top of them. No overlap, this year they did; however, that has been changed. There is no overlap between the premium limited entry, any legal weapon hunt and the management buck rifle hunt.

<p>09:44:03</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brayden Richmond: What are the dates of the Cactus Hunt and how many days? ● Dax Mangus: November 10-23 ● Brayden Richmond: So 13 days. How long is the Management Rifle hunt? ● Dax Mangus: 10 days. November 1-9. ● Brayden Richmond: Why can't they align and both be the same amount of days? ● Austin Atkinson: The overlap is gone but they are not targeting the same deer. ● Dax Mangus: Paunsaugunt has a set ending date of October 31. We don't open hunts on Sundays. ● Austin Atkinson: Still not doing an archery general season on Paunsaugunt? And no point in the next three years? Same with the West Desert, that will also be revisited? ● Dax Mangus: Direction from the board was to bring this up in the mid-plan review for the elk plan which would occur a couple years from now, along with the West Desert. ● Mike Grant: Just to make sure, you want to align those hunts or make sure there is no overlap? ● Austin Atkinson: No overlap. Then talk about aligning the archery and muzzleloader to match the same dates to not give preferential treatment to the big buck hunters over the management. <p>Additional RAC questions after Public Comments from Kevin Bunnell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: To be clear, when the spoke hunt overlaps do we have any restricted weapon seasons that are going to overlap regular weapon? Would someone have to carry two weapons? ● Dax Mangus: That came into discussion when we decided what units to try restricted weapon hunts on. We didn't choose any units that had that early rifle deer hunt because you would have the potential for that conflict.
<p>09:46:57</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kevin Bunnell (Online comments/Hunt Tables and Dates) ● Question #3: Which best describes your position regarding the recommended big game season dates? ● Strongly agree: 9 (28%) ● Somewhat agree: 8 (25%) ● Neither agree nor disagree: 0 (0%) ● Somewhat disagree: 6 (19%) ● Strongly disagree: 9 (28%)

<p>09:48:30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total votes: 32 ● Weighted average: $[(9 * 1) + (6 * 2) + (0 * 3) + (8 * 4) + (9 * 5)] / 32 = 3.06$ ● Split almost evenly ● Very few written comments. ● Email from Jake Huber. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kevin Norman: Representing himself. Aligning Management archery hunt with the same dates as the big buck hunt as well as muzzleloader. Also aligning Cactus Buck hunt with the rifle management buck hunt to give longer dates. Impression is that these management hunts are for success. Would like to see alignment so that you could hunt with family and friends. Doesn't see the point in pushing management tags aside. They still deserve the same opportunity with long dates. Align the archery management buck with the big buck dates. So that all the archery buck dates would be the same. Then the ALW management buck tags would align with the cactus buck tags after the premium. ● Austin Atkinson: You would match those for the same amount of days? ● Kevin Norman: Yes. ● Brayden Richmond: I had the opportunity to go on rifle management hunt this year, Mom drew with 1 point, and Brother-in-law drew with 17 points. Brother in law killed a 3 point buck because he was stressed he wouldn't find a good enough buck. Ran into another hunter that killed a nice Buck, but stated he felt like with five (5) days he had to take the first good buck he found. Management buck hunters and Cactus buck hunters, hunting totally different bucks. Let them hunt, watch Bucks rut, but not be able to hunt them. Supports alignment of archery and muzzleloader. ● Austin Atkinson: Is there a cutoff date we are trying to hit in November? ● Dax Mangus: The first 15-20 days of November, that's a pretty long season. You don't want to run into a lot of hunters during classification.
<p>09:53:48</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tammy Pearson: Likes the idea of aligning the season dates of these hunt. Makes sense to align instead of back to back to back hunts. ● Austin Atkinson: Paunsaugunt changes only affects a few hunters. Doesn't feel the Oak Creek should have an early hunt in addition to general season. I believe they are quoting just crowding as a reason for the split.
<p>09:55:38</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 proposals as presented with the addition of aligning the with the Paunsaugunt hunts as proposed, which is have the same date for Archery Limited Entry and Management Buck hunts, the same dates for the Muzzleloader, Limited Entry and Management Buck Deer hunts. And, align the Any Legal Weapon Management Buck and Cactus Buck hunts with an ending date of November 20th. Keep one single Any Legal Weapon hunt on the Oak Creek unit.</p> <p>MOTION: Passed unanimously</p>
<p>10:00:23</p>	<p>8) Once-In-A Lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action) Rusty Robinson, Once-In-A-Lifetime Species Coordinator</p> <p>Presented the Division’s recommendations and answered questions from the RAC and public members.</p>
<p>10:00:45</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: Our RAC brought up the December 31st Conservation tags, they always get a special exceptions so they can hunt their sheep until December 31st. Then you recommend this year to align those dates. Why allow the exemption for conservation tags? ● Rusty Robinson: We just asked for that to be put in the rule so we don’t have to ask every year. Trying to follow the direction of the board. Open to reopening conservation permit. Major concerns with going to the end of the year with that many hunters on the landscape. ● Austin Atkinson: Is that simply quantity? A permit holder could be out there watching a helicopter mess up his hunt? ● Rusty Robinson: It’s one hunter, not on every unit. ● Austin Atkinson: Do have a ballpark on harvest data? How many kill in the first 10 days? ● Rusty Robinson: Looking at Escalante recently, it was like 12 days. ● Austin Atkinson: Do we manage for 100% harvest on all our shee hunt in Utah? ● Rusty Robinson: We don’t manage for 100% harvest but people take this hunt very seriously and the success rates are very high. ● Austin Atkinson: What is the deadline for harvest reporting? Potentially you have no idea is you have an outstanding hunter on a unit? ● Rusty Robinson: We wouldn’t have an official harvest report at that time, we could call each hunter but may not get an answer. Deadline is 30 days after hunt. ● Verland King: We took the checking in sheep away? ● Austin Atkinson: Correct, take it home measure it yourself and complete the survey.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Riley Roberts: For clarification, the recommended changes for the conservation permit date changes take place in 2027 or 2026? ● Kevin Bunnell: Should be 2026 ● Rusty Robinson: This year would be an exception and you are recommending that the board reopen the conservation permit rule to rein in the conservation permit date to match the earlier hunt dates. ● Riley Roberts: So this would be for 2026 for conservation dates? ● Rusty Robinson: Correct. First year of the cycle would have to stick with what we have in rule approved right now.
<p>10:04:15</p>	<p>Public Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None
<p>10:04:20</p>	<p>Public Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kevin Bunnell (Online Comments/OIAL 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates) ● Question #4: Which best describes your position regarding the proposed once-in-a-lifetime hunts? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strongly agree: 11 (55%) ● Somewhat agree: 4 (20%) ● Neither agree nor disagree: 5 (25%) ● Somewhat disagree: 0 (0%) ● Strongly disagree: 0 (0%) ● Total votes: 20 ● Weighted average: $[(0 * 1) + (0 * 2) + (5 * 3) + (4 * 4) + (11 * 5)] / 20 = 4.3$ ● Troy Justensen: Representing SFW recommends that the dates on the conservation hunts be brought back in line with the public hunter dates.
<p>10:05:45</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: This was brought up before, we asked to not have hunts for once in a lifetime only have one permit, at least give us two resident permits. Can we look at a three year season dates on a hunt and say there will be resident and non-resident permits on this hunt for 3 years for sure? ● Rusty Robinson: We looked at it, what units we give non-resident permits on. We tried to focus on units that have historically had a large number of tags.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: It's still the secret permit setting meeting before the permit meeting. ● Rusty Robinson: Going off of historical numbers we tried to focus on hunts that have given a large number of permits that we could give 2 or 3 non-resident permits instead of ones that historically have 5. Now all 5 can go to residents. ● Austin Atkinson: Will all resident hunts have at least 2 permits? ● Rusty Robinson: That is the goal, Big Horn may be an exception if things aren't going well. ● Austin Atkinson: Trying to understand the three year season set, you could set the number to zero but you can't because people have already applied. So three years, means we are getting three years of permits in that hunt? ● Rusty Robinson: Yes, unless something crazy happens. There could be die off and we would have to revise everything.
<p>10:09:07</p>	<p>MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Bryant Johnson.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we pass as proposed except for extending the Big Horn Sheep draw dates to December 31 and recommend that the Conservation Permit rule be changed so that Big Horn Sheep hunt dates match the draw dates after 2025.</p> <p>MOTION: Passed unanimously</p>
<p>10:17:37</p>	<p>9) R657-62 Amendments – General Season/Dedicated Hunter (Action) Applications and Youth Allocations Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator</p> <p>Presented the Division's recommendations and answered questions from the RAC and public members.</p>
<p>10:17:55</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Chad Utley: The youth would get a permit the first time they draw? The first year they draw automatically get a permit, not a permit, a point. ● Lindy Varney: Yes, they get a point, would increase their draw odds not guarantee the permit. ● Austin Atkinson: Have you run the analysis on this, how many more permits do you see putting in the hands of youth? ● Lindy Varney: First time applicants only, give the first time youth a leg up. 3,400 new youth applicants this year. ● Austin Atkinson: Youth, under 18? ● Lindy Varney: 17 and under. Never applied for general season deer

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: The 20% youth allocation, why not just have them all apply for any legal weapon instead of muzzleloader or archery? ● Lindy Varney: We don't have enough permits for ALW, 20% allocation and within that 20% it is divided 60/20/20. Usually archery and muzzleloader draw out quicker because there are not as many applying for it. If they all go for ALW your draw odds are going to get way worse because we only have so many permits. ● Austin Atkinson: Any unused youth allocation in archery and muzzleloader convert to ALW? ● Lindy Varney: Yes, they would be converted to youth ALW and we would rerun the youth draw. All by unit. ● Austin Atkinson: Dedicated Hunter, you tried this before? Similar or exactly the same? It was shot down entirely wasn't it? ● Lindy Varney: 2019, exact same proposal. Yes it was.
<p>10:24:30</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None.
<p>10:24:35</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public Comments ● Kevin Bunnell (Online comments/R657-62 Amendments – General Season/Dedicated Hunter Applications and Youth Allocations) ● Question #5: Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to youth hunting and deer hunting applications? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strongly agree: 10 (34%) ● Somewhat agree: 4 (14%) ● Neither agree nor disagree: 7 (24%) ● Somewhat disagree: 3 (10%) ● Strongly disagree: 5 (17%) ● Total votes: 29 ● Weighted average: $[(5 * 1) + (3 * 2) + (7 * 3) + (4 * 4) + (10 * 5)] / 29 = 3.38$ ● Troy Justensen: SFW likes the options to be able to accrue points on both of them, so we accept the recommendation as presented except leave dedicated hunter the way it is. ● Troy Justensen: Mule Deer Committee supports the change to making dedicated hunter choose.
<p>10:27:00</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tammy Pearson: Non-residents, would they have to choose or be able to apply both.

- **Lindy Varney:** Restriction across the board, non-residents would have to choose.
- **Austin Atkinson:** Did the committee provide you with any ideas of moving dedicated hunter to a limited entry hunt?
- **Lindy Varney:** They talked about removing it completely, turning it into a single year multi-season tag. Doing away with the program but not moving it to a limited entry.
- **Bart Battista:** Seems like there is a lot of Dedicated Hunter bashing, this seems to follow along those same lines, will this adversely affect the DH program? Are we trying to disincentivize the DH program?
- **Kevin Bunnell:** We appreciate the DH program, and yes we get a lot of benefit from it.
- **Lindy Varney:** 13,000 hunters that have applied to the DH program. 11,000 apply for both. Will we lose applicants? Yes. It will help the draw odds in both pools. We do support the DH program.
- **Bart Battista:** You don't see this as being detrimental to the program?
- **Lindy Varney:** No I don't.
- **Chuck Chamberlain:** (Inaudible)
- **Lindy Varney:** Depends on the part of the state. Only 15% allocation.
- **Mike Grant:** How many permits do you believe will go back into the general fund?
- **Lindy Varney:** None, it's the same amount of permits.
- **Bryant Johnson:** How did the conversation go about maybe doing the DH for one year?
- **Lindy Varney:** It was a good conversation, how many hours would they have to do and it's hard to get the hours completed prior to the hunt. That is why we cut the hours last year for the first year to six.
- **Bryant Johnson:** Do you benefit more from the money or the manpower?
- **Lindy Varney:** From what I have heard, it is what is on the field.
- **Kevin Bunnell:** Remember we doubled the price to buy the hours, we would rather have people interacting with staff than buying hours.
- **Bryant Johnson:** DH for 1 year, don't like the 3 years

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Austin Atkinson: We already approved the DH program earlier tonight. Youth preference point is just a drop in the bucket that complicates things. If we want youth to get a permit the first year I would have looked at the 20% and up that to 30% or 40% rather than try to plan a very messy complicated draw system. The hunters pick between DH and General Season is again just a drop in the bucket, a step in the right direction. It is literally just double dipping from the same permit pool.
<p>10:35:28</p>	<p>MOTIONS The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain seconded by Bart Battista.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we approve as presented.</p> <p>MOTION: Passed unanimously</p>
<p>10:36:10</p>	<p>10) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's With Public Land LOA Renewals (Action) Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator</p> <p>Presented the Division's recommendations and answered questions.</p>
<p>10:36:50</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None
<p>10:37:13</p>	<p>Public Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None
<p>10:37:18</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Kevin Bunnell (Online Comments/CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with Public Land LOA Renewals) ● Question #6: Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU and LOA recommendations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strongly agree: 5 (25%) ● Somewhat agree: 4 (20%) ● Neither agree nor disagree: 6 (30%) ● Somewhat disagree: 1 (5%) ● Strongly disagree: 4 (20%) ● Total votes: 20 ● Weighted average: $[(4 * 1) + (1 * 2) + (6 * 3) + (4 * 4) + (5 * 5)] / 20 = 3.25$

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bob Ott: Utah LOA, we support as presented and hope you will pass it
10:39:15	RAC Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None
10:39:19	MOTIONS The following motion was made by Bryant Johnson seconded by Bart Battista. MOTION: I move that we pass as presented. MOTION: Passed unanimously
10:39:58	Additional RAC comments: Austin Atkinson: Concludes meeting, thanks all for participation. Wildlife Board Meeting will be December 12 th in Farmington. UT where final decisions will be made. NEXT SR RAC MEETING: December 17, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. in Richfield, Utah covering bear, cougar and waterfowl.
10:40:27	Meeting adjourned.

RAC AGENDA – November 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. Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator
6. Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 **ACTION**
(definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)
- Kent Hersey, Big Game Projects Coordinator
7. Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Dax Mangus, Big Game Program Coordinator
8. Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **ACTION**
- Rusty Robinson, Once-in-a-lifetime Species Coordinator
9. R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations **ACTION**
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator
10. CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals **ACTION**
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Meeting Locations

NR RAC – Nov. 6th 6:00 PM
Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden
<https://youtube.com/live/M0qeAT4OuJE>

CR RAC – Thursday Nov. 6th 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resource Conference Room
1115 N. Main Street, Springville
https://youtube.com/live/Dnsj1WcF_n0

SR RAC – Nov. 12th 6:00 PM
Southern Utah University
Hunter Conf. Center, Charles R Hunter Room
<https://youtube.com/live/dnJhkeznJDQ>

SER RAC – Nov. 13th 5:30 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River
<https://youtube.com/live/WhQ4Rx7M0N4>

NER RAC – Nov. 14th 6:00 PM
Uintah Conference Center
313 East 200 South, Vernal
https://youtube.com/live/gnzO2Je_3pU

Board Meeting – Dec. 12th 9:00 AM
Eccles Wildlife Education Center, Farmington Bay
<https://youtube.com/live/nJIwj-iFevI>

Southeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

November 13, 2024

Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Brad Richman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes.

2) Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Dana Truman, seconded by Sunshine Brosi and passed 8-1.

MOTION: Accept the Division's proposal as presented with one change – the wording regarding mule deer research should be broadened to include all research topics needed for population management.

3) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Brad Richman, seconded by Charles Fischer and passed 7-2.

MOTION: Accept the proposal as presented.

4) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **(Action)**

The following motion was made by Cash Stallings, seconded by Tyler Gilson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with the change that we align the management hunts on the Paunsaugunt with the archery and the muzzleloader management hunts, and for the rifle hunt to line up with the cactus buck hunts.

5) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates **(Action)**

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

MOTION: To accept Division's proposal as presented, except that we do not extend the sheep hunt dates to the end of the year. Instead, make a recommendation to the board that they direct the Division to make the conservation permit hunt dates line up with the public hunt dates.

6) R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Cash Stallings, seconded by Tyler Gilson and passed 6-5.

MOTION: To accept the Division proposal as presented, except that we do not accept the Dedicated Hunter portion of the proposal. And instead, we ask the Division to figure out a way where an applicant either ears a tag or a point, but not both

7) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Sunshine Brosi, seconded by Cash Stallings and failed 5-4.

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented.

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Steven Duke and passed 5-4.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendation as presented, except for the denial of the JB Ranch.

Southeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

November 13, 2024

Attendance

RAC Members

Eric Luke – Chair
Dana Truman – Vice Chair
Chris Wood – Exec. Secretary
Darren Olsen

Sunshine Brosi
Charles Fischer
Tyler Gilson
Cash Stallings

Steven Duke
Scoot Flannery
Brad Richman
Kirk Player

Board Members

Kent Johnson

Paula Richmond

Gary Nielson

RAC Excused

Jack Cantsee Jr.
Justin Ivins

Joe Sacco

Lynn Sitterud

Division Personnel

Dax Mangus
J. Shirley
Kent Hersey
Mike Christensen
Ian Montgomery
Dustin Mitchell
Devin Shirley

Chad Wilson
Makeda Hansen
Brandon Behling
Brad Crompton
Kyler Stilson
Lindy Varney

Covy Jones
Chris Wood
TJ Cook
JD Abbott
Wade Paskett
Ashley Kennedy

**Southeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
November 13, 2024
Minutes**

00:00:00 1) Chairman Eric Luke Called the meeting to order, welcomed everyone and thanked the public for their attendance and comments. All RAC members introduced themselves.

00:05:07 2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Brad Richman and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes.

00:05:31 3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update by Eric Luke (Informational)**

Link on website to view.

00:07:33 4) **Regional Update – Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**

Chris Wood did not update the RAC on Regional Activities due to time constraint.

00:08:08 5) **Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (Action)**

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

Dax Mangum noted one correction about buck to doe ratios being correct on the memo and PowerPoint presentation, but not the actual plan document. The objective for premium limited entry hunts in the plan document is listed as 35-40 and the actual recommendation is 40-45.

00:09:34 **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Possibility of staging out the increase over a longer period. San Juan Abajo coming up in the 18-20 range discussion. Habitat management strategies and addition mitigation for disturbance to deer habitats. CWD unit boundary decisions. Plans to implement doe hunts. Higher prevalence for CWD in town. Region's commitment to follow the new plan. Accuracy of recommendations without adjustments from the RAC and Board. Geographic focus and efficiency of coyote bounty and funds. Possibility of limiting access for certain areas and hunts. Buck to doe ratio recommendations being driven by productivity data and definition of productivity. Difference between the 15-17 ratio vs 18-20. Data with regards to weather changes. Studies directed by the new plan including anything other than restricted weapons and point restrictions. Clarification regarding the Pine Valley unit ratio remaining the same.

00:40:56 **Public Questions**

None

00:41:14 **Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor**

Chris Wood summarized the public comments received.

00:42:58 Public Comment

Jeremy Anderson, Mule Deer Foundation – Part of the mule deer committee. Reviewed comments and surveys from the public are taken very seriously. Strategies provide more opportunity and growth. Mule Deer Foundation supports the plan

Troy Jensen, Mule Deer Committee – Feels like a good plan and the committee worked to address the loss of opportunity and hopes to increase quality. Supports the plan.

Kevin Norman, SFW – SFW supports the plan in whole. Thanking the division and deer committee.

00:46:09 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Possibility of doing better regarding receiving more public comments. Would like to see a big section on CWD and appreciation for the attention it's received. Plan is heading in the right direction. Appreciation for the committee members and the division along with the opportunity to collaborate. Happy with the plan and efforts to try something new. Concern with the comments about supporting the mutual research being too restrictive and suggestion to broaden the language. Definition most often used for opportunity. Difference made by cutting tags in the past. Ability for 30% increase or decrease to allow flexibility. Possibility for a smaller percentage. Flexibility needed for data driven decision making.

00:57:36 The following motion was made by Dana Truman, seconded by Sunshine Brosi and passed 8-1.

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal as presented with one change – the wording regarding mule deer research should be broadened to include all other research studies needed for population management.

00:59:45 6) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (Action)

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

Kent Hersey made clarifications regarding confusion about this proposal after the proposal given last fall. With the mule deer committee being convened and the plan update, the board requested the proposal be reviewed and addressed through the committee. The antler point restriction had some confusion regarding youth being able to take any buck if hunting under the mentor program. The youth would then need to follow the restrictions of the mentor tag.

01:01:01 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Four-point restriction on one side tried in other areas and results. Possibility for research proposal pertaining to single units eventually being implemented statewide or unit by unit. Possibility of studies done on yearling survival and harvest opportunities. Discussion on the decision for which units the study would implement. Compounding effects of both weapons restrictions and antler point restrictions. Thoughts on this hunt strategy regarding CWD and older age class for buck deer. Commitment of the committee and division to manage units to the agreed upon ratios while research proposals will occur. What point will be considered successful

and implement the research proposal in other areas. Concern about starting out too small with restricted weapons units. Interest in applications changing with weapons restricted units.

01:17:32 Public Questions

None

01:17:34 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood summarized the public comments received.

01:19:03 Public Comment

Jeremy Anderson, Mule Deer Foundation – Looked at this as some opportunities. The committee supports the proposal in full.

Kevin Norman, SFW – Supports the recommendations with exceptions being the Pine Valley antler point restriction with the potential to raise the buck to doe ratio. They would propose that the Cache be split and that only the North Cache would have weapons restrictions. Overall SFW supports the weapons restriction idea. The thought of being able to see big bucks is exciting.

Troy Justesen, Mule Deer Committee – Antler point restriction was voted on several times. Supports the recommendations.

01:24:04 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

The future is not precluded regarding on changes happening to all units. Not in favor of antler restrictions and the possibility of losing opportunity. Does like the diversity of opportunities in the state. Dislike for the four-point rule. Four-point or better rule being more of a social experiment. Previous studies done by WAFWA regarding four-point or better strategies showing that it does not work. Consider focusing research on weapon strategies and habitat instead. Support for weapons restriction opportunities. Point restriction not applying to youth. Public comments supported the antler point restrictions. Research has not been done under these parameters. Percentage of youth hunters. Potential impact of CWD with point restriction research.

01:35:20 The following motion was made by Brad Richman, seconded by Charles Fischer and passed 7-2.

MOTION: To accept the proposal as presented.

01:37:56 7) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

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

01:38:27 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Oquirrh Stansbury discussion. Discussion to change the name of any bull permits. Reason for dates on Morgan South Rich and Delores Triangle. Committee discussion regarding season dates. Overlap between mid-season limited entry bull and spike seasons. CWD hunt permits

being allocated from general units and general season tags allowing hunting in those units. CWD hunts being limited entry.

01:53:40 Public Questions

None

01:53:49 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood summarized the public comments received.

01:55:01 Public Comment

Troy Justesen, SFW – Supports the recommendation with one exception regarding the Oak Creek early hunt. Proposing that it stays the same for limited entry deer.

Kevin Norman – Proposal to align dates for the Paunsaugunt premium and management hunts on the archery and muzzleloader and then to align the rifle management and cactus buck hunts in the first 3 weeks of November due to opportunity lost if hunting with friends and family.

01:58:33 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Proposal to make CWD hunts a general unit, unfair to use limited entry points. Use of CWD permits not drawn. Season dates and season durations are a very useful tool and could play a large part in deer management. Support for changing the hunt dates for Paunsaugunt management hunts.

02:04:02 The following motion was made by Cash Stallings, seconded by Tyler Gilson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the division's proposal as presented with the change that we align the archery and muzzleloader Paunsaugunt management hunts and align the rifle and cactus buck hunts.

02:06:08 8) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

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

02:07:13 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Reason for extensions being conservation permits.

02:09:19 Public Questions

None

02:09:25 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood Summarized the public comments received.

02:09:41 Public Comment

Troy Justesen, SFW – Supports the recommendation with one exception being the dates extended for conservation permits. Possibility of helicopters influencing hunts and pressure on animals. Asked that the conservation dates be moved back to the traditional public end date.

Christine Sheeter – Bighorn sheep water her property near the mouth of desolation canyon they seem to be pushed more because of public activity. Land sales and parceled properties. Dry hatchery area could be reopened. Hoping to help bighorn and pollinators.

02:12:50 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Appreciation for engaging the broader public. Support for SFW proposal to align with public dates. Variances should not be used repeatedly. Sportsman permit dates. Possible project delays with hunts.

02:18:54 The following motion was made by Cash Stallings, seconded by Charles Fischer and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division’s proposal as presented, except that we do not extend the sheep hut dates to the end of the year. Instead, make a recommendation to the board that they direct the division to make the conservation permit dates line up with the public dates.

02:22:01 9) R657-62 Amendments – GS/DH applications and youth allocations (Action)

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

02:22:15 Questions from RAC Members/Public

First time youth general season preference points not effecting Pine Valley antler point restriction. Solutions for dedicated hunters acquiring points and getting tags also. Possibility to only earn a point or draw rather than both. Number of first year applicants. Possibility for all first-year hunters to receive a permit. Conversion of leftover permits to youth rifle permits.

02:34:44 Public Questions

None

02:34:49 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood Summarized the public comments received.

02:35:38 Public Comment

Kevin Norman, SFW – Supports with the exception to keep the dedicated hunter and general season draw as is.

Troy Justesen, Mule Deer Committee – Wanted to be able to put a tag in each kid’s hand. Importance of getting youth out there. Supports the recommendations.

02:36:49 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Concerns about a shift in success rates with the conversion to youth rifle permits. Opportunity for youth in the state. Earning a point or drawing a tag instead of both. Dedicated hunter volunteer hours/service.

02:43:52 The following motion was made by Cash Stallings, seconded by Tyler Gilson and passed 6-5.

MOTION: To accept the Division’s proposal as presented except that we do not accept the dedicated hunter portion of the proposal. Instead, we ask the division to find a way for an applicant to either earn a point or draw a tag, but not both.

02:58:05 10) CWMU Renewals and CWMU’s with public land LOA Renewals (Action)

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

03:58:38 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Rule regarding operating a CWMU when convicted of a wildlife violation and time frames. Ability to talk about such violations. Reasons for denial. Option for 1-year probationary period. Possibility of other operators with wildlife violations. What to expect pressure wise with elk finding safe harbor on the property. Old woman plateau renewal and concern with the public fairness. Junction Valley not hitting harvest on limited entry bull. Concern that the deer counts on CWMU are going towards counts on the public land. Influence that CWMU’s may have on general season permit allocations. Increase in acreage on a CWMU listed but no additional tags. Interest in more elk CWMU’s on the Box Elder unit.

03:18:18 Public Questions

None

03:18:27 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Chris Wood Summarized the public comments received.

03:19:44 Public Comment

Steve Deering, Attorney representing Robert Eichenauer after the purchase of JB Ranch – Mr. Eichenauer has been operating for 2 months already and has a 40-year career as an operator. Felony from 2006. Has since operated for 18 years and abided by all rules. Texas, New Mexico and Colorado have all appreciated him as an operator of the various ranches owned. The division and board have the authority to suspend or revoke. We would appreciate the recommendation for his application for renewal to be approved.

Tony Gallogly, Former operator of JB Ranch and guide. Brother formerly owned the property. Without the public hunter, there wouldn't be any private tags. Bucks are not very big. CWMU of the year last year only 4 people were not successful. 4.9 or 5 satisfaction rates. Robert has been congratulatory to hunters. Aspen and mastication projects. Robert is open to more habitat projects. They've worked hard with DNR and can only expect that Robert will do the same. They discussed the CWMU program prior to the sale.

Robert Eichenauer, New owner of the JB Ranch. Previously owned and operated a high fence ranch in Texas known as the Circle E for nearly 40 years with whitetail the largest elk heard in Texas. Due to my 2006 conviction the division's proposal is to deny the JB Ranch from entering the CWMU program this year. I hope the division will allow me to stay in the program with the same cooperation as previous owners. I look forward to cooperating with biologists and will strictly adhere to all the rules and las associated with the Utah wildlife. Would not be opposed to probation. Has asked Tony if he would stay on as an operator

03:30:55 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Appreciation for sharing. Would hate to see the ranch leave the program because of past indiscretion and would like to continue relationship. Timing of recommendations from CWMU advisory committee. Possibility of high fence. A lot of privileges are handed out in the CWMU program for some amount of return. It takes a lot to get in and should take a lot to stay in. Possibility of a new discussion next year if denied today. A more cautious approach should be taken for all applications. Possibility for this application to go through the advisory committee next year. Understanding of the rushed choice. The CWMU program is valuable for Utah. Appreciation for the high standards.

03:43:19 The following motion was made by Sunshine Brosi, seconded by Cash Stallings and failed 5-4.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendation as presented.

The following motion was made by Charles Fischer, seconded by Steven Duke and passed 5-4.

MOTION: To accept the Division's proposal except the denial of the JB Ranch.

03:46:19 Motion to adjourn: Charles Fischer/Darren Olsen

**Northeast Region RAC Meeting
November 14, 2024
Vernal, Utah
Summary of Motions**

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

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

MOTION: To approve the Agenda and Minutes as presented.

Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030

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

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R357-5

The following motion was made by Jake Huber and seconded by Nathan Crapo and passed 5-3.

MOTION: To accept the Hunt Structure research proposal for R657-5 as presented by the Division but ask the Wildlife Board direct the Division to add a general season antler restricted Mule Deer Hunt unit in the Northeastern Region

Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and dates

The following motion was made by Jake Huber, seconded by Eric Major, and passed 7-1.

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to direct the Division look into the season date structure of the 3 Corners elk hunt.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded by Jake and passed 7-1

MOTION: To accept the rest of the proposal as presented by the Division with the amendment to change the Eastern boundary of the private land bull elk hunt from the White River and Colorado State line to the Green River, following the extended season boundary.

Once-In-A-Lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt tables and Dates

The following motion was made by Richard Buhler and seconded by Nathan Crapo and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and Youth Allocations

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded by Eric Major and passed 6-2.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with Public Land, LOA Renewals

The following motion was made by Eric Major and seconded by Jake Huber and passed 7-1.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division with the exception of JB Ranch, and allow them to become a CWMU.

MOTION: To adjourn.

Northeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
November 14, 2024
Attendance

RAC Members

Grizz Oleen - Chair
Miles Hanberg – Regional
Supervisor

Eric Major
Richard Buhler
Mark Chynoweth
Natasha Hadden

Nathan Crapo
Renee Arce (BLM acting)
Jake Huber
Dwayne Davies

Board Member

Gary Nielson
Paula Richmond
Kent Johnson

RAC Excused

Ritchie Anderson
Rebekah Jones
Brad Horrocks

RAC Not Present

Tim Ignacio (Ute Tribe)

Division Personnel

J. Shirley
Chad Wilson
Dax Mangus
Pat Rainbolt
Kent Hersey
Covy Jones
Clint Sampson
Levi Watkins
Derrick Ewell

Lindy Varney
Anthony Christianson
Tonya Selby
Matt Fackerell
Dallon Christensen
Randall Thacker
Torrey Christopherson

**Regional Advisory
Council Meeting**

November 14, 2024

- 00:00:12** **1) Welcome and Introductions by Chairman Oleen**
- 00:03:00** **2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jake Huber and passed unanimous.
MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.
- 00:03:30** **3) Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Grizz Oleen**
Link on website to view.
- 00:05:45** **4) Regional Update – Miles Hanberg (Informational)**
Miles Hanberg updated the RAC on regional activities.
- 00:19:10** **5) Statewide Mule Deer Plan 2025-2030 (Action)**
Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>
Dax Mangus summarized the presentation for the RAC.
- 00:22:36** **Questions from RAC Members/Public**
A number of questions were asked regarding lowering of buck to doe ratios and how that may influence population growth. Questions were asked if lower population growth is being experienced on limited entry units where buck to doe ratios are higher.
RAC members also had questions on the 30% threshold for permit number adjustments
Has lowering mature deer numbers helped lower CWD prevalence in Colorado?
How have mountain lion changes impacted deer populations?

Public Questions

Did we lower B:D ratios and population objectives in the last plan?

How did you come up with the 30% tag change threshold?

Has there been any consideration in making Blue Mountain a LE deer unit?

Did DWR do away with the Myton CWD hunt?

Has there been an increase in CWD in the Ashley Valley?

00:50:00 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

Lowering objectives is like expecting less. We are sacrificing herds for permits.

The plan is focused on opportunity. Not in favor of the 30% threshold. Would feel better with 15%. Public had concerns with less than 30% in the past.

Extended archery can create lots of opportunities. Should go unlimited on extended archery tags where CWD is an issue.

00:57:50 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Diverse committee from throughout the State. Not everybody got what they wanted. Plan worked to grow deer population. Good place to start. Lots of give and take.

Thanks to the mule deer plan committee, solid plan. Supports plan.

Goals are well thought out and would like to allow biologists to manage to the goals.

01:03:25 MOTION: I move that we accept Statewide Mule Deer Plan as presented by the Division of Wildlife.

01:04:10 6) Mule Deer Hunt Structure/Research Proposal and R657-5 (Action) (definition of 4 pt or better and GPS/Radio collars and hunting)

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

Kent Hersey summarized the presentation for the RAC.

01:06:00 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Why was 4 point or better chosen instead of 3 point or better?

Will the point restriction inflate the B:D ratio?

What is the estimate of different age structure in current management?

Is there a difference between southern Utah vs. northern Utah in terms of yearling buck survival?

Why was there only one unit for 4 point or better?

Does the Division have an estimate on the number of permits to be increased on restricted weapons hunts?

Are there currently a lot of big 2 and 3 point bucks on Pine Valley?

Will youth shooting any buck on Pine Valley distort the data of the study?

Was there any talk about having the early hunt any buck and the late hunt 4 point or better?

Public Questions

Why are we trying the 4 point or better on just one unit? Why not go all in?

What is the current state of the Pine Valley? Has it been rebounding?

Does the Pine Valley have a lot of private or refuge areas?

Could we set the Pine Valley up unit for a false success?

What will lifetime license holders do to permit availability?

Was there any consideration for youth to help with managing B:D ratios by harvesting yearlings and allowing them to take yearlings that may otherwise die?

Would the state implement 4 point or better statewide in the future?

Does the Pine Valley see winter survival issues?

01:28:10 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

In favor of the new proposals and recommendations

Lets look at other units as well for 4 point or better

Lets keep youth involved.

We need to study more places and environments than just Pine Valley. We should implement antler point restriction measures statewide.

Worried about a false success at Pine Valley.

01:36:10 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Wanted to see the point restriction study to just put the question to rest for good.

The committee made a compromise to try these hunts out to see how they go.

Would like to try antler point restrictions (APR) now that we have more tools to assess what happens.

People need to be better hunters with restricted weapons.

Would still like to try APR, would like to try a northern unit as well.

Excited to see some weapons restrictions

Want to try a APR unit in the NER.

Let the Division choose a potential 4 point or better unit in the NER

The following motion was made by Jake Huber and seconded by Nathan Crapo and passed 5-3.

01:51:40 MOTION: To accept the Hunt Structure research proposal for R657-5 as presented by the Division but ask the Wildlife Board direct the Division to add a general season antler restricted Mule Deer Hunt unit in the Northeastern Region

02:10:30

7) Buck and Bull 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

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

Dax Mangus summarized the presentation for the RAC.

02:11:45

Questions from RAC Members/Public

Why was the private lands elk hunt boundary extended to Colorado and including a large area without agricultural lands?

Would like more tags for landowners to compensate for their damage.

How many permits would be offered on the private lands elk hunt?

Did the any bull elk tags stay available through the hunt?

How are you proposing to distribute the tags for the private lands elk hunt?

Are there concerns in Hanna and Tabiona with killing Wasatch bulls on the general season private lands elk hunt?

Are there concerns about killing Book Cliffs bulls on the White River?

Will the private lands only tag be available on all private lands?

Can we get rid of all elk in the Arcadia area?

Why is the hunt structure on the 3 corners different than other units?

Would the Division be willing to use the archery for the month of September on 3-corners?

Has Utah explored landowner coupons?

Public Questions

Are the private lands general season elk tags going to cut back on depredation tags?

Is there some ability to limit the spike hunters on mid-season limited entry elk permits?

02:37:00

Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

Supportive of private lands elk hunt

Would like to see the 3 corners be more consistent with more LE elk hunts

Conflict between youth elk hunt and archers. Does not support overlapping with muzzleloader deer hunt. Go back to archery the way it was.

Please consider delaying spike hunt on mid-season elk hunt

Concerned about becoming tolerant of cow elk by implementing bull hunt.

Does not agree with White River boundary.

02:45:05

RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Has an issue with private lands elk boundary on the White River. Should use the Green River or extended archery boundary on the east side

Look to help landowners first when it comes to elk.

Will open up more opportunities on public lands by private lands elk hunt.

Would like to follow extended archery boundary.

Is there an issue with the Tabby and Hanna areas?

Has it been discussed to rotate spike elk hunts?

Private lands tags are good—can it be tweaked in a few years?

The following motion was made by Jake Huber, seconded by Eric Major, and passed 7-1.

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to direct the Division look into the season date structure of the 3 Corners elk hunt.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded by Jake and passed 7-1

MOTION: To accept the rest of the proposal as presented by the Division with the amendment to change the Eastern boundary of the private land bull elk hunt from the White River and Colorado State line to the Green River, following the extended archery boundary on the east side.

03:00:05 8) Once-in-a-lifetime 2025-2027 Hunt Tables and Dates (Action)

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

Covy Jones summarized the presentation for the RAC.

03:02:30 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Do bighorn sheep surveys with helicopters significantly displace bighorn sheep?

Questions about bighorn sheep hunt dates

Public Questions

None

03:07:00 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

None

03:07:35 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Discussion about making sure hunters know that there may be conflicts during their hunts due to surveys and captures.

The following motion was made by Richard Buhler and seconded by Nathan Crapo and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept as OIL season and hunt structure as presented.

03:11:45 9) R657-62 Amendments-GS/DH applications and youth allocations (Action)

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

Lindy Varney summarized the presentation for the RAC.

03:12:14 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Won't giving a youth an extra point just compound the problem?

Is it gaining anything to give youth an extra point?

Is the youth hunter pool changing over time?

How many people apply for both DH and GS deer at the same time?

Is there a way to determine the amount of point creep that GS/DH applicants create?

Why can't we merge GS and DH into one draw?

How do the leftover youth tags work?

How many units are not selling all the youth tags?

How are archery permits after the draw handled?

Public Questions

If youth permits get reallocated, will they be available to hunt all 3 seasons.

Would changing the age back to 14 for youth improve draw odds?

Why are people coming after DHers?

03:30:38 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

None

03:31:35 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Existing mentoring opportunities are great, the Division does not need to guarantee youth a tag. There are lots of opportunities to get youth hunting by understanding the system.

Not fond of giving an extra point to youth, it will only be effective for the first year applicants on the first year of the change. Do not see how the extra point will help anything.

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded by Eric Major and passed 6-2.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division.

03:36:35 10) CWMU Renewals and CWMU's with public land LOA Renewals

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

Chad Wilson summarized the presentation for the RAC.

03:37:20 Questions from RAC Members/Public

Was the denial of the JB Ranch CWMU discussed at other RACs?

Has there been a probationary period for CWMU's?

What was the denial of the JB Ranch CWMU based on?

How long is the COR for a CWMU?

Has JB Ranch been a successful CWMU in the past?

Has the attitude of the owner of the JB Ranch improved?

Public Questions

Does the Division have the ability to revoke a COR in the mid-term?

Is a wildlife violation an automatic revocation of the COR?

03:47:45 Electronic/ Public Comment Report by Miles Hanberg, Regional Supervisor

Miles Hanberg summarized the public comments received from the online presentation.

Public Comment

None

03:48:46 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Would hate to see the JB Ranch CWMU go away. It has been successful.

The following motion was made by Eric Major and seconded by Jake Huber and passed 7-1.

MOTION: To accept as presented by the Division with the exception of JB Ranch, and allow them to become a CWMU.

03:52:17 Adjourn.