

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

I'm concerned with the weapon percentage on the parker. They want to try a higher split. giving 60 archery permits is not a good thing. You bow hunt antelope different than any other species. Have that many permit holders fighting for water holes will be a nightmare. Going from 14 archery permits last year to 60 this year is definitely not a good thing for archery antelope hunting on that unit.

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

I vehemently opposed pulling the Cedar mountains from the West Desert West. The Cedars are FAR different than the Stansbury mountains. The deer populations on the Cedars are minuscule compared to the Stansbury mountains. There aren't 1150 total deer, including does, on the Cedars. To take the overall total number of hunters that could potentially hunt that range from 450 to 1150 is absolutely idiotic, and I feel like it will lead to irreparable harm to that deer population. All of the units that were affected by these boundary changes had combined permit numbers of 2757 for 2024. Deducting the Cedars from the West Desert took 50 total permits away from that unit. By that logic, there were actually 2357 total tags allocated to the Cedar/Stansbury/Oquirrh/Tintic cluster. There are 3600 total for the Cedar/Stans and Oquirrh/Tintic hunts now. Anyone that's spent any amount of time on any of those units knows that deer numbers haven't rebounded enough to justify a 1300 permit increase. I get that the rhetoric coming out now is that buck numbers don't drive population numbers. That's fine. I do want to point out that you do actually need a few bucks to make sure all the available does are actually bred, though.

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Anyone that's been out on any pronghorn unit in the state can tell you guys that you're dead wrong if you think pronghorn bucks achieve full growth within 3 years of age. You guys need to up the age objective to 4-5 and allow some bucks to actually achieve some age class. I won't apply for a pronghorn permit in the state of Utah until there are changes. The west desert units have suffered, between overharvest of bucks and winter kill. The majority of bucks that I've seen since these changes have happened are 10" bucks and under.

**Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)**

DEER - There should not be a single doe deer hunt until the entire state is at or above population objectives. Period. If there are agricultural issues, focus on deer proof fencing rather than harvest. It's fine to say that there are only 340 doe permits. How many additional depredation/mitigation permits are issued on top of that, though? These animals belong to the people of the State of Utah. If landowners are having issues with them, the emphasis should be put on fencing and nonlethal management instead of letting landowners, their family or employees just shooting them.

ELK - The units I elk hunt in, elk numbers are down. Period. We've been killing way too many cows for way too long. A big herd of elk on the Manti is 10 elk. Growing up, there were herds of 100s. Private-lands only permits should NOT have seasons that are as long as they are. Season dates should correlate with dates for the archery, general season and muzzleloader elk hunts. In no way, shape or form should dates go until the end of January.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Hunting is turning more and more into a rich man's sport. Every where I look prices keep going up, on tags and licenses, on ammo and anything related to hunting. The auctioned tags are incomprehensible to me, I can't even imagine paying that for a hunt. I am just a regular guy that hopes every year that he might draw an amazing hunt for \$5. PLEASE keep the tags at \$5 and don't raise them.  
Thank you

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

The reasoning for limiting the Cache Limited Entry Muzzleloader deer tags doesn't make sense when taking in the context of all tags on the unit. The reasoning for keeping the number of muzzleloader tags low was to let the animals have a chance to recover from the previous winters. It doesn't make sense when you look at adding several hundred tags to the general hunt only 10 days earlier. In order to keep the reasoning consistent and fair, I recommend either cutting the number of general tags (goes against why they wanted restricted weapons) or increasing the number of limited entry muzzleloader tags to levels consistent with other general units and give more opportunity for limited entry hunts.

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the bull elk permit recommendations?**

The diamond elk unit has a lot of elk on it. The problem is that you have private property which consolidates the access points and increases hunter crowding. There are a recommended 100 tags to be given out on this unit. This is one of the smallest units in the state and has 100 tags on it! That's almost as many tags as the Boulder unit and three times more than the Cache unit! I've hunted this unit my entire life and believe you're going to reach a saturation point with hunters/hunting parties where bulls will still be taken and the age objective may always be over what's recommended. My recommendation is to raise the age objective by one classification so that the current average age of bulls is within that classification or close to it and limit hunter crowding.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

I highly support removal of antlerless big game animals inside the Alton high fence. Please allow the DWR to authorize depredation permits to the fullest extent of the law.

---

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

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)**

170 elk culled on deseret! Until you publicly address what you did, your mistakes (corrupt or incompetent biologist and staff for years, keeping it secret) and how to fix going forward, you will NEVER get my support again. Get an independent investigation. Discipline staff and deseret publicly admit what they did and should pay damages to public in form of public hunting opportunities.

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

I dont care what you want to recommend. I will always oppose until you fix your mistakes. Sfw gives 30% of funds to dwr vs rme foundation 100%, yet they still won/win the contract. We all know why. We will never forget. Expose and remove Swf and the corruption if you ever want support. We dont forget so the best u can do is fix your mistakes.

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

The Wasatch East Current Creek, Strawberry, and Red creek general season permit numbers should be reduced even more. Hunted 2024 on Tabyona Mountain and the Red Creek area above Reid Ranch. The last three years deer numbers and elk numbers have seen a significant decrease in total population. While deer from those areas winter on Taby Mountain it is an inaccurate picture of the unit numbers. Where we used to see 60 or more deer on the opening weekend we are seeing numbers below 20. Some hunters in the area above Reid Ranch saw 0 buck deer on the opener. This is a significant change for this unit. We spoke with the rancher who has the grazing permits in this area and he also confirmed that numbers were way below what the unit held prior to the winter of 2022.

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Utah should move to a draw for the General season Rifle and mirror the Deer general season units. It only make sense to have more control over each unit. With the past few years Northern Utah's elk herd was decimated. The herd size in Northern Utah is much smaller then in the past years.. Many hunters I have spoken with support a return to the two week hunt and better management thru a draw system. I have hunted Northern Utah for over 50 years. The last three years my group went from passing on bulls to seeing no elk on the opening day of the early hunt. We hunt the Spirt Lake area of Flaming Gorge and have been in this same area for over 35 years.



**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

My comment is directed towards the tag proposals on the beaver east unit. I've hunted that unit a lot of years in my life and there's no way it can support the amount of tags proposed. They have proposed a 55% increase on this unit as its first year being split off from the beaver west unit. There is no data yet to support how many deer are taken from each side and the amount of pressure each side gets. For the first year of being split before just killing off the buck population it would be wise to start off with lower amounts of tags to see what the data provides. The proposal has 200 more tags on the beaver east unit than the entire two units put together last year. Please be smart in what you're doing to manage the wildlife. This unit cannot support a 55% tag increase.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

In regards to harvest reporting. They way it's set for dedicated hunters reporting. We can lie and report no harvest. Allowing us to harvest a deer every year. It should go back to turning unused tag back in

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Can we please give more tags on southern units. I would like to hunt more then once every five year's. Sure seems like the southern people have to much influence on permit numbers.

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

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

Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Neither agree nor disagree

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Little Montes Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Willow Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Upper San Rafael WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Cinnamon Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Swan Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Timpanogos WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Spencer Fork WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed South Sanpete Valley WMAs Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

I support the plan that was passed last winter and would like to let the biologists use their expertise to make recommendations. A little feedback to the Southern RAC after watching their meeting: facts don't care about feelings. Please take time to study the data and research presented to you, take the time to understand. In the same breath you recommend lowering the number of tags on Beaver because you claim there is not enough data, then go off telling some story about how you used to go hunting with your grandma and there were deer herds as far as the eye could see. All your recommendations and comments are anecdotal. You wonder why the rest of the state doesn't listen to what you have to say, it is because you cannot be taken seriously. Every RAC cycle you fight tag increases with no merit. There was not even a discussion on the LE Fillmore and San Juan, you did not ask the biologist why the recommended increase - just wanted it to stay the same just because. Allow the plan to work, allow 20% tag increases when the data calls for it and trust the division to also cut when needed. Perhaps if they had listened to the biologists these last couple years and taken some more bucks, the fawn mortality would not be so bad this year. We will never know for sure because of your unwillingness to make data driven decisions and try something different. The one member alluding to some sort of southern uprising is laughable and continues to discredit the feedback coming from that region. I say this as someone who grew up in southern Utah and will always consider it home.

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?**

Please but some more specific criteria in here that will benefit the public. I would prefer you just to stand up to the state legislature on behalf of the public and issue 0 vouchers, but I know that will not happen.

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?**

Why do we need it in rule that the Admin percent that the group gets to keep is 20%? What if they want to do it for less, even 0%? This rule just sounds like it is tailored for SFW to get the bid again. If that is the case, please save the money and avoid the dog and pony show of an RFP process.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

I watched this and nothing was shared about the Boulder General Season Buck Deer permit numbers for Dedicated hunters and General Season tags. Is that information going to be released to the public? I was curious with the new hunting restrictions, how many permits will be issued for that unit.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

I 100% support the general buck deer permit recommendations.  
Thank you to the biologists and the division for doing their job.

**Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

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

Somewhat agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?**

Somewhat disagree

<b>Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?</b>	If Private landowners receive private land deer or elk permits on Limited entry units, they should be losing their points for that species. The division and wildlife board consistently make changes so that the public doesn't "double dip". The sentiment with the change that made it so you had to choose between dedicated hunter or the general season draw was "you get to hunt, or you get points, but you don't get both". That principal should be applied to private landowner tags as well when it comes to bucks and bulls on LE units.
---	---

---

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?</b>	Somewhat agree
---	----------------

---

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Little Montes Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Somewhat agree
---	----------------

---

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Willow Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?</b>	Somewhat agree
--	----------------

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

I'm in support of the proposed changes, especially the change for bringing back skulled heads from other states. This does help us as hunters who do hunt out of state. I do however think that education should be done to teach hunters about CWD. Even an animal killed within the state if disposed of improperly could cause issues. You wouldn't want to be disposing of a head killed in the Lasal mountains on the wintering grounds of the Wasatch for example, so education to hunters is key.

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

I am very impressed at the results of the Collar and tracking data that was shared in the Wildlife board working session. Amazed at how much we've learned in a short period of time about what is driving our deer populations and learning how to fill the holes in the leaky bucket. The data they are getting is undeniable and very valuable. We need to continue getting this data and following the data as has been said many times. I support the recommendations as presented.

**Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

As a lifetime resident of the Beaver unit, specifically the Beaver East I would like to provide some important information concerning increasing tags by over 50 percent.

The Beaver East is made up of Canyons, slopes, draws and flats all full of sage brush and bitter brush a favorite food of the mule deer. Also scattered in different locations are necessary ponds for the deer to get water.

Increasing tags of this magnitude is a recipe for disaster for the buck population in this area. The area already has too many small deer harvested each year because of its open sage brush landscape, which does not allow any mature deer to survive. The open country is easy pickings for the long range rifles, optics and ability to go anywhere on an ATV. No deer are safe under these conditions. With total deer numbers down, it is important that we try and allow as many deer as possible survive.

Weather on the Beaver unit was as dry as I have ever seen it. For the first time in my 60 years I was able to drive a pickup into areas that have never been possible in other years. I was also able to get out and hike these canyons with out any snow at all during December and January. One thing I did observe is that the deer numbers just do not match that of the divisions. I was able to walk everywhere and there just is not the deer population that is being presented in these meetings. It is just not so. I know your hear this everyday from sportsman on the ground, and I can tell you that I spent almost everyday for 2 months on the Beaver East and the numbers just do not add up. The same is going to be stated on the Beaver west. So if they are not in either place it would be interesting to know just where they really are, The reason the Zion and the Pinevalley did not receive tag increases was stated it was because of weather, yet the driest I have ever seen it on the Beaver and they are going to increase it over 50 percent. Does this make any sense?

The Southern rac also recognizes and sees what we are seeing and voted on a much smaller number on both the Beaver East and Beaver West. This rac knows the current reality of our deer herds.

If local racs are not listened to, then why do we have them. How many times have you heard racs say that they know the current reality in their own area, but know nothing in other rac areas. That is the reason for the different racs. they know there area and they are willing to stand up and say what they know in their areas. Please listen to the local rac areas,

I would encourage this board to listen to your current rac

members and use them as a great resource in each of the areas. There is no reason they would lead you astray. They want what's best for the deer herd in their respective areas. Please listen to them.

Thanks for your time.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Please approve all recommended increases. The new deer plan has a lot of support and will do great things for deer hunting in Utah if we let it.

**Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)**

I know it's too late to make a change for this season, but I'm very frustrated that some of our OIAL hunts offer a large percentage of tags to nonresidents this year. The most extreme example is the bison hunt BI6537, Book Cliffs Little Creek/South. The Division is recommending 10 total permits on the hunt, with 5 of those allocated to nonresidents and 5 allocated to residents. With 50% of permits on the hunt being allocated to nonresidents, the odds of residents who apply for that hunt are greatly impacted.

I do think we should shoot for the true 90/10 split but I would rather see the nonresident allocation more evenly split among hunt codes, rather than see them all offered on a few random hunt codes with large shares of the tags reserved for nonresidents.

**Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?**

Strongly agree

<b>Do you have any comments about the antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)</b>	<p>Overall I think the recommendations make a lot of sense. I have a few questions on the proposed hunts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the antlerless elk hunt EA1282, Ogden North (season dates December 16 - January 31) really intended to be an archery hunt? That seems like an unusual and very difficult time of year to successfully hunt cow elk with a bow.</li> <li>2. Why is the doe deer hunt DA1002, Box Elder, West Bear River (November 24 - 29) being shortened to 6 days? This is a tight timeframe especially considering Thanksgiving is on the 27th. This same hunt ran until December 31 last year. If there's a need for doe harvest, I think we ought to give people some time to accomplish it.</li> </ol>
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations?</b>	Somewhat agree
<b>Do you have any comments about the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)</b>	I don't think deer CWMUs that offer no doe tags should get a 90/10 private/public split for the buck tags.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?</b>	Somewhat agree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?</b>	Somewhat agree
<b>Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?</b>	<p>The recommended changes are improvements as compared to the current rule. I'm not happy to see the cost go up from \$5 and I doubt it will bring in a lot of extra money. I personally set a budget and apply until the budget is gone. With more expensive applications, I won't spend any more money but will just get fewer chances at permits.</p> <p>I'd like to have info available that helps us understand the cost/benefit ratio of expo permits. How many more animals do we have because of them? How many more tags do we issue because of them? And does that offset the thousands of tags we've taken out of the public draw to raffle off at the expo?</p>

**Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?**

If we want to see a better deer population on the Cache, why are we adding more and more tags. Seems completely backwards. What is the increase in tags on the Cache unit as well. I've watched all these RAC meetings and its never talked about. What will the increase be broken down, (Archery tag increase, Muzzy increase, and rifle increase). Thank you.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?** Strongly agree

---



**Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?** 22 April 2025

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources  
C/O Taking Big Game Rule 2025, R657-5  
Main Office  
Box 146301  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6301

Re: Taking Big Game Rule 2025, R657-5

Dear Wildlife Board Members and Director Peck:

On behalf of Safari Club International, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Taking Big Game Rule 2025, contained in R657-5.

The proposed Taking Big Game Rule 2025, contained in R657-5, generally demonstrates responsible and sustainable management of wildlife while maintaining high levels of opportunity for hunters. SCI supports the additional flexibility proposed in allowing youth hunters who obtain a restricted rifle permit to hunt in all applicable general seasons in their unit as well as allowing the importation of big game skulls from states with chronic wasting disease as the risk of CWD transmission through that method is low but the current restriction can be burdensome.

SCI believes that sound science-based conservation involving hunting as the primary management tool, while maximizing opportunities for all huntable species is necessary to the long-term health of wildlife. Hunters have long paid the way for conservation, both game and non-game wildlife, and maximizing opportunity for hunting is also key to long-term funding for all conservation. Hunting benefits wildlife conservation.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Taking Big Game Rule 2025, contained in R657-5. SCI is dedicated to protecting the freedom to hunt and we appreciate the continued partnership with the Division and the Wildlife Board. SCI is always first for hunters.

Sincerely,  
W. Laird Hamberlin  
Chief Executive Officer  
Safari Club International

---