

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
October 2, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised September 29, 2008
AGENDA

Thursday, October 2, 2008

1. Approval of Agenda
 -Paul Niemeyer, Chairman
ACTION
2. Approval of Minutes
 -Paul Niemeyer
ACTION
3. Old Business/Action Log
 -Rick Woodard, Vice-Chair
CONTINGENT
4. DWR Update
 -Jim Karpowitz
INFORMATION
5. Mule Deer Management Plan Update
 -Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator
INFORMATION
6. AIS – Infested Waters Amendment Rule R657-60
 -Walt Donaldson, Aquatics Section Chief
ACTION
7. Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13
 -Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator
ACTION
8. Paunsaugunt Antlerless Deer Hunt Season Extension **SRO ONLY**
 -Regional Wildlife Program Coordinator
ACTION
9. Swan Creek Treatment Plan **NRO ONLY**
 -Scott Tolentino, Aquatic Program Coordinator
ACTION
10. Bear Lake Management Plan **NRO ONLY**
 -Scott Tolentino, Aquatic Program Coordinator
INFORMATION
11. Other Business
 -Chairman Niemeyer
CONTINGENT

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MOTIONS
October 2, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised September 29, 2008

Thursday, October 2, 2008

1. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as presented.

Passed unanimously

2. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 28, 2008 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.

Passed unanimously

3. AIS – Infested Waters Amendment Rule R657-60

MOTION: I move that we designate Grand Lake, Shadow Mountain and Willow Creek reservoirs as infested waters.

Passed unanimously

4. Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13

MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13 as presented with the exception that the slot restriction apply only to cutthroat and tiger trout species on Panguitch Lake in line with the regulations on Strawberry and Scofield Reservoir.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we support the issue of a committee being formed to discuss fishery management on Kolob Reservoir and this be placed on the action log.

Passed unanimously

5. Other Business – Stipulations and Orders

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation and order for Janko Tomic.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation and order for Ty Sanders.

Passed unanimously

5. Paunsaugunt Antlerless Deer Hunt Season Extension **SRO ONLY**

MOTION: I move that we approve the Paunsaugunt Antlerless Deer Hunt Season Extension.

Passed unanimously

6. Swan Creek Treatment Plan **NRO ONLY**

MOTION: I move that we approve the Swan Creek Treatment Plan as presented.

Passed unanimously

7. Bear Lake Management Plan **NRO ONLY (Information)**

8. Other Business (**Contingent**)

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
October 2, 2008, 9:00 a.m., DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Revised September 29, 2008

Board Members Present

Paul Niemeyer – Chair
Rick Woodard – Vice Chair
Ernie Perkins
Lee Howard
Jim Karpowitz (excused)
Alan Clark - Exec Sec (sub)
Keele Johnson
Tom Hatch
Del Brady

RAC Chairs Present

Amy Torres – Northeastern
Brad Slater – Northern
Jake Albrecht – Southern
Fred Oswald – Central
Bill Bates - Southeastern

Public Present

none

Division of Wildlife Resources

Staci Coons
LuAnn Petrovich
Walt Donaldson
Judi Tutorow
Kevin Bunnell
Ron Hodson
John Fairchild
Craig Schaugaard
Paul Birdsey
Doug Messerly
Rhianna Christopher
Cindee Jensen
Lacy Welch
Brian Christensen
Suzette Fowlks
Anita Candelaria
Mark Hadley
Marty Bushman
Anis Aoude
Kenny Johnson
Greg Evans
Bill Bates
Kent Hersey

Chairman Niemeyer welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board members and RAC Chairs.

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

Mr. Clark said under “other business,” we need to discuss Board attendance at winter WAFWA, the Wildlife Board meeting schedule changes for 2009, approval of two stipulations on license suspensions- to be done right after lunch and the upcoming event at Little Hole.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the agenda as presented.

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

On p. 7, after the 6th paragraph add “Director Karpowitz said the Division will do that.”
On p. 11, 3rd paragraph from bottom, change “tournaments” to “licenses.” On p. 20, 3rd paragraph, add after “youth hunt” on the second line “by the Delta Waterfowlers Club.”

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Lee Howard and passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 28, 2008 Wildlife Board meeting with the noted corrections.

3) Old Business/Action Log (**Contingent**)

Rick Woodard presented this item. He thanked Division for adding in the completion dates on the action log items. On Sage and Sharp-tailed grouse group applications, would it be okay to add this to the group applications for swans and cranes, or would the Board like a separate action item? They said that was all right. We will have a presentation on bonus point options by Mr. Clark.

Mr. Niemeyer said there needs to be some clarification on coyote hunting. In the big game proclamation under trespassing, we have declared hunting units for bull elk, moose, and goats and called them temporary game preserves. If you do not have a permit, the only legal firearm on those units -if you are not a livestock person- would be a shotgun that fits the criteria of an upland game gun. The problem is they want to go hunt coyotes and all elk units, with the way the boundaries run with the highways, if someone has a gun in their car they are under violation. We might need to look at revamping some of these temporary game preserves and the boundaries.

Mike Fowlks said this does create a conflict. We have been looking at all those recommendations and are looking to bring some proposals to the Board. It is a conflict if somebody is out there hunting coyotes and they are unaware that there is a big game hunt going on.

Mr. Hatch said he heard an ad on a Richfield radio station where some concealed carry instructor was advertising if you come and get your permit, you can carry a weapon when bow hunting. It seemed odd that they would advertise that fact.

Mr. Fowlks said that is true. That has become one of the main advertising points for a concealed carry permit. We put stipulations in the proclamation a few years ago that said if you have a concealed carry, all bets are off. We do not trump State statute with our rule.

Mr. Woodard said we should add this to the action log.

Mr. Clark then gave a presentation on bonus points, per the action log. Mr. Clark is filling in for Mr. Sheehan. Any changes will go through the bucks and bulls RAC meeting. This is considered a preliminary discussion of options for future drawings. He

gave some history of this information item. Bonus and/or preference points have been used in the Division's drawings for the past 16 years. Many applicants have become vested in the accrued points and many do not want to see any changes. The Wildlife Board asked the Division to conduct some research about possible alternatives. With additional guidance of the Board this could be conducted and formally presented at the next round of RAC meetings.

It would be advised to meet with the major sportsmen's groups before presenting these to the public.

Some of the options that the Board members felt had merit are listed for further consideration.

Optional ways of addressing big game draws in the future:

Possible changes for Limited-Entry:

1. Do nothing.
2. Create more hunting opportunity by increasing permit numbers.
3. Hunters can apply for all Limited-Entry and Once-in-a-Lifetime species every year.
4. Cap the number of bonus points at 16, or 17 or any given number. This will help the people in middle, hurt those at top and will not help new people.
5. Eliminate bonus points from anyone that has not applied in the last two years, perhaps with a one-year notice.
6. Allocate 5% of permits to holders of 1-5 points (from where?).
7. Eliminate groups for deer/elk/pronghorn (eliminate de facto selling points).
8. If a person surrenders a permit they would not earn a bonus point that year but would retain all points that they had going into the draw (same).
9. Give youth a preference point for completing hunter education.

Possible Changes for General Season:

1. If you surrender a general season deer permit you will not accrue a new point for that year but will keep what points you had going into the draw.
2. If you apply in the general season deer draw and are not successful at your first choice then you would accumulate a point for your 2-5 choices.
3. Give youth a preference point for completing hunter education.

He then asked for any recommendations from the Board. We can take all these recommendations out to the RAC meetings, or a few of them. If we want changes for next year, this has to be done at the next round of RAC meetings. Are there any questions?

Mr. Johnson said in Colorado, you have to apply three years, and then your name goes in to the draw on the fourth year on certain species. You just get points the first three years.

Mr. Woodard asked if there has been any thought to changing the 50/50 to a 75/25 and clip off those top preference point holders at a little quicker pace, and everybody else would still get a shot at the remaining 25%.

Mr. Clark said that is an option. It will not change the success rate. It will hurt the lower applicant level and help the higher applicant level. That is why this is hard.

Mr. Johnson said option two suggests giving more permits, However, there are other ways to accomplish this, as we do habitat projects we could increase the herd numbers. New Mexico has lots of hunts, but they are only five days long. Maybe we could put more hunts in and make them shorter. This would lower success rate, but give more opportunity. How obligated are we to pretty much guarantee success with the longer hunts? We are offering a premium rifle hunt in the middle of the rut.

Mr. Clark said we tried this idea on the Elk Committee and it was not very well received.

Chairman Niemeyer said at some point we should look at giving more tags on some units, and not force everyone to keep putting in for that one monster bull.

Mr. Clark said if they look at all limited entry elk permits and eliminate all those who are no longer applying, overall it is about a one in 20. Presently it takes 20 years to draw out on limited entry elk. After that it is a five-year waiting period before you could start again.

Mr. Howard asked if we eliminate the people who have not put in for two years, wouldn't that help overall?

Mr. Clark said if everybody who is out never plans to come back in, it would not change anything, but it depends on the individuals. Some might apply every few years. Many of those have quit completely.

Mr. Johnson said if you change the time of the hunt, for example on Desert bighorn, if you move the hunt back 2-3 weeks and pull it out of the rut, it becomes a much more difficult hunt. You could triple the number of Desert bighorn tags if you did that. That is the way it used to be. The success rate was running around 8% without a guide. That is another possibility.

Mr. Hatch said that is the point we need to consider. Do we want people to be successful or do you want them to go out and pay \$20,000 and hire a guide? This must be balanced.

Mr. Clark said we would hear from people on the top end and they would be upset that the hunt they were looking at was changed. He then asked what the Board wants to do with this list.

Chairman Niemeyer said he would like to add one. Let them put in for a hunt, but let them buy bonus points for the other species, and not necessarily put in for them. We are

getting into a situation where you can only get one Once-in-a-Lifetime tag in your lifetime.

Mr. Clark said based on the numbers we looked at, starting out now, you could draw an elk in 20 years. Unless you are talking about the Henry's or the Paunsaugunt, you could draw a deer in about six years and then a pronghorn in almost any unit but Deseret in about three to four years.

Mr. Hatch said if everybody buys bonus points, the odds do not change. He hears complaints that we have already made this a rich man's sport and this might contribute to that.

Mr. Clark said anything you do, short of adding tags or eliminating people who are applying, you are just moving things around and nothing changes. He gave an example of creating situations where people have to make a choice on what they put in for. Which would be those hunts that they really want.

Mr. Albrecht said another thing people are doing if they do not see the deer they want, like on the Paunsaugunt, they turn the tag back. Those people should not accumulate points in this situation.

Mr. Perkins said he thought there was one more option and that was to eliminate or change the reservation of 50% of the permits going to the holders of max bonus points, such as a person with 16 points has a 16 times better chance of drawing than a person with one point. We have discussed that at least twice that he remembers.

Mr. Clark said we could add that. Mr. Clark indicated that Greg Sheehan had composed this list based on the ones that received support from Board members. Still any options can be added. Mr. Niemeyer suggested modifying option #3, that you cannot apply for every hunt every year, but you can apply for a bonus point for everything, every year.

Chairman Niemeyer said we need to keep option #2. We have made every elk unit in Utah some type of trophy unit in drawing these tags. On some of the units we should look at lowering the age objective. If a hunter just wants to kill a nice bull, he would be able to.

Mr. Clark said that would be a change in the management plan and we couldn't do that. We first need to look at getting to objectives.

Mr. Howard said we should eliminate option #1 on the list and #2 should be kept.

The Board went down the list as follows. Option #3 – modify as suggested by Chairman Niemeyer, #4 and #5 keep, #6 keep but not totally happy with it. Chairman Niemeyer said you like to have them have some buy in, but there is confusion when the percentages are posted. Mr. Hatch said he thinks it is all right to discuss it. The Board said keep Option #7 and eliminate #8, and keep #9.

Mr. Clark said on preference points there are fewer options. The Board wanted to keep all general season permit change options for discussion. These various options will be presented at the RAC meetings.

Mr. Perkins asked if they are going to get all the major sportsmen's groups together.

Mr. Clark said Mr. Sheehan is planning on doing that.

Mr. Woodard said it was brought up in the Mule Deer Working Group and was discussed somewhat. They looked to the Board and Division to decide on these options.

Mr. Johnson said since the legislature passed a bill last year in October with more flexibility on the mule deer hunt, we need to look at when we have our hunts and weapon allocation. It gets back to increasing the number of people who can draw out even though it will decrease success.

Mr. Clark said these are really management plan issues and they will look at it again in 2010 when the management plan is up.

4) DWR Update (**Information**)

Mr. Clark said that Director Karpowitz is at a White House conference on North American Wildlife Policy in Reno, NV. It comes out of an executive order that President Bush passed a year ago. Mr. Clark then gave the update. We had our first Division wide meeting since 1991 the first week of September. It was a great success and over 300 employees attended. We gave our service pins out and recognized those who received them. We did an employee survey with a new type of technology. We got feedback from employees and it did reflect that 50% of them have worked for the Division for five years or less.

We are going to have the dedication for Midway Hatchery on November 6th and Board members are invited. This is a great new hatchery upgrade.

Over the last few weeks, there has been some excitement over quagga mussels in Utah. We did have some suspect tests, so far no confirmation. We are still running our prevention program. It is amazing the number of boaters we have talked to with education as our main focus.

Relative to the budget reduction, we identified some places to make reduction in the general fund money and \$244,000 was our reduction amount. We expect more money to be cut in the next fiscal year. Out of state travel is high on the list for reduction. At this point Mr. Clark turned some time over to Mr. Bushman to address the Conaster Ruling, that dealt with access to streams.

Mr. Bushman said on July 18th, the Supreme Court entered a decision holding that the public has a right of access in waters overlying privately owned beds. They can utilize these waters for recreational purposes such as fishing, swimming, floating. This does not apply to navigable rivers. If an individual can gain lawful access to the bed, they can float the survey, walk the bed and engage in any lawful recreational activity. It cannot be used as an access corridor. We have had a lot of questions and the Supreme Court did not give us a lot of details. In the last week the Division put an informational on their website answering questions such as what is the bed, what does it constitute, etc. This decision applies to only natural streams, rivers, lakes and creeks. Any kind of impounded water or canals, the access right does not exist. This caught the attention of the legislature and many private landowners and the Farm Bureau are not happy with it. There are three bill files opened up on this matter. There is a committee that has been organized by the Governor's Office to bring some resolution that will allow for legislation that allows this easement to continue to operate, but narrow it some. The Division is more of a neutral party on this issue. The hope is to mediate some legislation to allow public use, but not overburden landowners and such.

Mr. Howard asked if on a stream that is navigable and there is an island, can it be privately owned?

Mr. Bushman said there is a federal navigation test, which states that if a body of water was commercially navigated or capable of commercial navigation at statehood, that is sovereign land and it belongs to the state, regardless of who might have title to it now.

Mr. Howard said he was wondering about the Green River.

Mr. Bushman said what is going to happen is the question if the island is within the ordinary high water mark. That is how you determine what is sovereign.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if you shoot a duck and it falls to the side of the creek on private land, can you go get the duck?

Mr. Bushman said you cannot get out of the creek. Looking at what other courts have done, they have said the ordinary high water mark is where the public right of access is. Our court did not say anything one way or another about that. If you are hunting you need to make sure you drop you bird in the water and keep control of your dog. Hunting issues are going to be pretty difficult.

Mr. Perkins asked about the Wildlife Task Force.

Mr. Clark said nothing has changed on that.

Mr. Hatch said there will be a meeting on October 11. They are taking a tour of Deseret and up to Rich County. The last meeting was canceled.

Ten minute break.

5) Mule Deer Management Plan Update (**Information**)

Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented the Statewide Deer Plan update. We started this process about two months ago and formed a committee to help the DWR revise the statewide deer plan. It was informative and we did come up with some regulations to help us move forward on the plan. The committee was advisory and included representation from land management agencies, sportsmen groups, non consumptive interests, regional RACs, a Wildlife Board member and agricultural interests. The Committee met 6 times. The few initial meetings identified issues. Later meetings identified goals and objectives, and specified strategies to achieve those goals and objectives.

The Committee came up with the following recommendations. On the population objective by 2013, increase the statewide mule deer population by 50,000 to an estimated post season herd size of 350,000. If conditions are good and with average fawn/doe ratios this could happen.

Habitat objective 1: To maintain mule deer habitat throughout the state by protecting and enhancing existing crucial habitat and mitigating for losses due to natural or human impacts.

Habitat objective 2: To improve the quality and quantity of vegetation for mule deer on a minimum of 500,000 acres of crucial range by 2013. We looked at what has been done in the last 5 years and we will push to do more in the next.

Recreation objective 1: To maintain a hunting program for mule deer that encourages a variety of quality hunting opportunity while maintaining population objectives. The primary strategy to achieve recreation objective 1 is to continue to provide three hunt unit categories: General season objective with a 15-25 bucks per 100 does, Limited-Entry objective with a 25-35 bucks per 100 does and maintaining our two current premium Limited-Entry units with objective of 30-40% of the harvested deer being 5 yrs or older. A secondary objective of 40-50 bucks per 100 does will be achieved using management buck hunts.

Recreation objective 2: To increase opportunity for viewing of mule deer while educating the public concerning the needs of deer and the importance of habitat.

Other committee recommendations outside the scope of the plan are to award a general season preference point to those who complete hunter education, to flip flop the general any weapon deer and elk season dates, and create a late season (during the rut) limited entry hunt on general season units with 100 or less permits per region. This concluded the presentation. These would not cause a lot of changes as far as structure, but a few on specific ways such as with adding a management buck hunt on premium limited entry.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if there was much discussion on going to the smaller units.

Mr. Aoude said there was initially, but they backed off as the discussion moved along, because of feedback from their constituents. People want to be able to hunt more often and not be restricted to a specific unit.

Chairman Niemeyer asked about modifying seasons with 3-5 day hunts.

Mr. Aoude said he brought that up, but the committee did not want to go in that direction.

Mr. Perkins asked what would go to the RAC meetings on conversion and creation of archery permits.

Mr. Aoude said he is waiting to hear back from the archers. The committee brought it up but it was not agreed on. What they suggested was to take 3-5 thousand out of the Northern region cap and put it into the archery cap. Archers would have to draw a region for the first two weeks of the hunt, then the rest of the time would be statewide. There would be more archery permits, but limited the first two weeks. That may come as a recommendation from the archers, but the Division might go ahead either way and see how it comes out.

Mr. Woodard said on the unit-by-unit, he felt the committee had more of a discussion on it. Relative to buck/doe ratios, if a specific unit and a region got really distressed, the hunt could be reduced to a three-day hunt.

Mr. Aoude said he did not go into all the specifics on the committee's discussion, but there is a way to deal with unit by unit within a region. If a unit within a region falls below the buck to doe ratios, the first option is to reduce the season length. The second option if it falls below ten bucks per 100 does is to reduce numbers on that specific unit per region. If one unit falls below 15 bucks per 100 does in a region, we would not average it in like before, but make the specific changes as necessary on shorter general season. It will not make the whole state a unit-by-unit. Currently we have 5 units that fall under that management option with being below objective.

Mr. Perkins said that would be specified separate from general season.

Mr. Aoude said yes it would become a general season limited entry. We would have to come up with a separate specific permit.

Mr. Hatch said he is trying to determine the process. We have these recommendations that will be taken out to the RAC meetings. He is concerned that we still need to go to smaller units. Are we limiting what we are taking out to the RACs with just what the committee came up with or is it still wide open for discussion as we go out to the RACs?

Mr. Aoude said this is just an informational item, so we will still take any ideas and input.

Mr. Woodard said he likes Mr. Hatch's idea that the Board should have a lot of input of what goes out to the RACs. We have these recommendations and then the input from the public.

Mr. Hatch said his concern is if we go out with just these ideas, that is what will come back.

Mr. Aoude said we did put a survey out there and the majority of people did not want to go to smaller units. They want general season and more flexibility. It went out to a random sample of all people who put in for the deer hunt last year and all who bought over the counter for the 2007 season. It was an e-mail survey.

Mr. Clark said because we set up the deer committee it does not mean that it is the only option. If people go to this effort we do feel obligated to take their recommendations, but there can be others.

Mr. Aoude said we will take all or some of these recommendations, but it is still wide open.

Mr. Clark said the Board could take any of the options out.

Mr. Hatch said it should be taken to the RACs in the light that these are some options, but if there are any others, it is open.

Chairman Niemeyer said there seems to be some obligation when these committees come up with recommendations that we have to go with them.

Mr. Aoude said the committee knows their position is advisory and we might take some, none, or all of their recommendations.

Mr. Johnson said there are a number of Board members that have strong feelings on going back to smaller management. Their regions are just too big to handle the biological things we need to be looking at. When we had smaller units, our deer herd was better managed. We respect the committee and the RACs, but we always need to be open to other ideas.

Mr. Aoude said they come up with an innovative way to deal with the unit-by-unit, without going to that program totally. He then explained it as before. We will be managing those units that go below objective in a different manner. It does get to that point without actually splitting up the state into 25-30 units.

Mr. Perkins said Mr. Aoude has hit the main points from the committee as opposed to all recommendations that could be taken out. The committee concluded that we should look for other opportunities for limited types of hunts like the buck/bull combo hunt that was started in the Northern region and some other opportunities statewide.

Mr. Woodard said the Board would like to take the unit-by-unit idea out to the RACs and public.

Chairman Niemeyer said when we throw some of these ideas out without pointing out benefits, hunters immediately feel restricted. We need to talk to people and explain the benefits of the recommendations.

Mr. Aoude said we do manage on a unit level, but we hunt them on a regional level. Where the change came in is how we hunt them. Now we can pull out the units that fall below and hunt them differently.

Chairman Niemeyer said he is concerned with the size of the units. In a huge unit, it might be totally different from one end to the other.

Mr. Aoude said we need to keep in mind that between now and November to come up with different units than we have now and recommend different hunts on those units would be a huge task. We can still bring the idea out as a recommendation.

Mr. Clark said these types of change would have to be for next year, if we went that directions. It would be impossible to get it into effect for the 2009 hunts.

Mr. Aoude said the majority of input from the public is against unit-by-unit.

Mr. Johnson said the general public does not have time to keep up with the issues. They vote for their legislators and send them to keep up on these issues. The general public is not educated and do not pay attention to the issues. The general public does not understand it all. You want to listen to them, but they are not always right. In his opinion this unit-by-unit needs to be looked at more closely. Managing a whole region is too much.

Mr. Perkins asked that the results of the survey and the survey methodology be brought to the Board as an information item as soon as possible.

Chairman Niemeyer said this committee has worked hard to get this done so we could deal with it by this fall. We could carry it another year and not rush into it.

Mr. Clark said the Division's intent was to take recommendations to the RACs in November and then the Board in December. Should we not take anything out to the RACs or should we take all the options that have been discussed, or what? We have been working toward this and it would make sense to take out what we have so far. What would the Board have them do?

Mr. Perkins said we should take it out and we could act or not act when it comes back.

Mr. Hatch said he has no problem with taking it out and fleshing it out.

Chairman Niemeyer said that is key. We do not know exactly what will come back. Do not take it out like it is a done deal, because we need the flexibility to accommodate whatever might develop.

Mr. Clark said we will prepare our recommendations based on our current region system for this year. Even if the Board adopts a unit-by-unit, we would ask them to stipulate that it would not start until 2010.

Mr. Aoude asked how we can make a recommendation if there are 3-4 options.

Mr. Clark said we will make recommendations as if the region system remains in tact.

Mr. McLaughlin said what we are looking at now is delaying whatever happens for one year. For the coming year our recommendations are based as business as usual.

Mr. Clark said recommendations will be based on the concept of maintaining the region's system, but incorporating the recommendations the deer committee had that operate on that. If the Board does not approve, then we will implement the new system in 2010.

Mr. Woodard said anything that is a major change, such as unit-by-unit would be delayed a year.

Mr. Johnson said we are looking at passing the management plan, with the stipulation that we will look at unit-by-unit and it would be implemented a year later.

Mr. Aoude said keep in mind there is a lot more than general season in this plan and there are some big changes in premium limited entry and other things. Are we going to recommend those or not?

Mr. Perkins said yes. The survey was a huge piece of this and it is very important. The Board and the public needs to hear the survey results.

Mr. Clark said we are actually past informational, but it could be a brief presentation before the recommendations.

Mr. Aoude said we could do that presentation, but it would not be totally comprehensive. We wanted to use that information to make recommendations.

Mr. Perkins said there was a lot of input in that survey and it was very important to the deer committee.

6) AIS – Infested Waters Amendment Rule R657-60 (**Action**)

Walt Donaldson, Aquatics Section Chief presented this amendment and gave some history on the issue. As part of this rule we had a list of invested waters that were designated where all boats that come from those waters had to be certified that they have

been cleaned, drained and dried. Our compliance people make sure that they have been cleaned before they enter the water. Last week, we received notification from Colorado Division of Wildlife Resources that through their testing over the last few months, three lakes at the head of the Colorado River, Grand Lake, Shadow Mountain and Willow Creek Reservoirs are infested with quagga and zebra, three with quagga and one with zebra. The water exchange system in these reservoirs can, by way of pumping, either be directed toward the Platte River east of the divide, or into the Colorado drainage, west of the divide. Because of this increased threat we need to add these reservoirs to our Utah list of infested waters. We have already added all waters east of the 100th meridian, all of the lower Colorado River main stem reservoirs and some of the delivery systems that they go to, such as the Los Angeles Basin in Colorado and the Phoenix area in Arizona.

Mr. Johnson asked if any of these reservoirs are for storage and irrigation, or do they dump right back into the spill way and go into the Colorado River.

Mr. Donaldson said all of the reservoirs we are discussing are either culinary, and or municipal and irrigation storage reservoirs. Still, they do overflow back into the Colorado River.

Mr. Hatch said when we designate these waters, what are the impacts?

Mr. Donaldson said what we are trying to do in Utah is to stop or reduce the amount of potential infection that can come. The primary way is recreational boating. Another vector is irrigation. With education, we can control recreational boating. If we can slow it down, maybe science can catch up.

Mr. Hatch said designation by our state does not affect anyone's right to use the water.

Mr. Donaldson said that is correct.

Mr. Perkins said our designation does allow our law enforcement to take unique and separate actions, after that designation has been made.

Mr. Donaldson said what it does allow is if someone comes and wants to launch, and does not want to decontaminate their boat it gives us the ability to insist boats are decontaminated before they are launched. We did not have that authority before January 2008.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if there was any RAC or public comment.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we designate Grand Lake, Shadow Mountain and Willow Creek reservoirs as infested waters.

Mr. Brady asked what he is hearing about Red Fleet and Pelican.

Mr. Donaldson said several weeks ago, as part of our effort, we are looking for three ways to slow down quagga mussel infestation in the State. The biggest is public education, second is monitoring and third is compliance through law enforcement. As part of the second component we have been submitting samples from key waters in the State to the Bureau of Reclamation lab in Colorado. They currently do the screening test, which is using polarized microscopy where they try to identify the larval stages of the quagga, which is a veliger. If they see something that looks suspicious they notify us and we immediately have them send those samples to two separate, independent labs to run confirmation PCR. To date on those three reservoirs, we have seen suspicious samples that look like veligers. Pelican Lake seems to have the highest density of the three, between Red Fleet, Midview and Pelican. We are currently waiting for results from the two independent labs.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if these can be carried by birds.

Mr. Donaldson said that would be extremely rare.

7) Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13 (**Action**)

Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator presented the recommendations and changes to the 2009 fishing rule and guide. Most of these were brought before the Board in the spring. We have four biologists from different parts of the state here today and they are available for question or comment. He gave a summary of the objectives/direction of the Division. They are looking to simplify, clarify, and standardize regulations. Some examples include standardization of language in rules for specific waters, adjusting the fee schedule for fishing contests, standardizing the bass limit at Hyrum Reservoir, to continue refinement of user friendly “fishing guide” format, updating informational articles and to provide a wide variety of opportunities to the angler.

These new community fishing waters include Millrace Pond and Sandy Pond-Salt Lake County, Manila Pond in Utah County, Steed’s Pond in Davis County and the Carbon County Community Fishery will be on line this coming year.

A few other additions include allowance for the use of up to 6 lines for ice fishing at Flaming Gorge, allowance for nighttime spearfishing for burbot at Flaming Gorge and to liberalize the limit at Joe’s Valley.

To protect aquatic resources of the state they are proposing to close tiger muskie harvest at Pineview and Newton reservoirs due to import problems. We are looking to stock tiger muskies at our warm water hatchery at the Lee Kay Center. We are about three years out on this. We are introducing Bear Lake cutthroat into Scofield, and hope to implement a protective slot limit. We are proposing a slight modification to the Panguitch Lake slot limit.

There are basically three main topics of change with specifics throughout the rule. Those three are spearfishing allowance, using multiple lines through the ice at Flaming Gorge and the changes at Scofield. These changes affect a number of places throughout the rule and so we had to make those changes. Mr. Wilson went on to review those changes. (See Powerpoint for details)

R657-13-7

Fishing with more than one pole (second pole permits). We made changes to be consistent with Wyoming regulations. A person may use up to six lines without a second pole permit when fishing at Flaming Gorge through the ice. When using more than two lines at Flaming Gorge reservoir, the angler's name shall be attached to each line, pole or tip up.

R657-13-9

They are opening Flaming Gorge for underwater spearfishing 24 hours a day – only for burbot with artificial light.

Mr. Wilson then went over specific water provisions by region and county.

On Flaming Gorge they are proposing the take of burbot with the six line proposal only through the ice. Spearfishing around the clock with artificial light only for burbot and can be done nowhere else in the state.

They are removing all specific date references. The date references will be general such as the second Saturday of December. This will just carry year to year and simplify the guidebook.

On Panguitch Lake they have some concerns with the loading up of rainbows and other fish in the slot. The vast majority of fish early on in the summer were in the slot and they had some complaints from anglers that they could not keep any fish. We still felt like we wanted to continue our general direction as an experiment if nothing else. We wanted to continue with the slot that is not species specific and we do not require anglers to identify fish like in other waters. The region thought this was very important and education might be a little more problematic when people come in for just one weekend. We are proposing to continue this concept, but allow one trout in the slot to be kept. Another issue is that the regions recently updated the creel data and were looked at gill netting. This showed that we have a major portion of fish under the slot right now. 60% of the fish they took were under the slot on the gill netting.

On Pineview there is a proposal for closure on tiger muskees. The walleye are expanding at Red Fleet. There was an emergency change this year to remove the limit for catch and kill. That will be continued in 2009. They are considering other options there also, including a possible kill treatment. On Scofield Reservoir a predator management plan was introduced, similar to Strawberry. It is a unique opportunity to test the impact of tiger muskees and Bear Lake cutthroats on chubs. All cutthroat and tiger trout from 15 to

22 inches must be immediately released. They will focus on education for species identification. There will be two kinds of cutthroat in Scofield. Trout may not be filleted there or in transit. If it is a rainbow you can keep it. Most anglers can identify a rainbow. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Woodard asked about the possible kill on Red Fleet. Would that take out any possible veligers?

Mr. Wilson said no.

Mr. Hatch said he still has problems with the slot at Panguitch Lake. If they really want to make rules more consistent throughout the state Scofield and Strawberry are being managed differently than Panguitch because we have a different clientele. The Division's surveys said that people can identify the rainbow trout. We are prohibiting them from keeping rainbows and trying to protect the cutthroat.

Mr. Wilson said the anglers do have a problem identifying cutthroat at about 62%. Rainbow identification was at about 94%. The region wanted to give the slot another year. After another year, if this does not help solve the problem, we will look at the option of a slot limit like at Strawberry.

Mr. Hatch said the vast majority of people he talks to would like to keep the rainbows. It seems like they have been singled out.

Mike Ottenbacher said this is something they struggled within the region. When they put the committee together to develop a management plan for Panguitch Lake, originally we were looking at species specific regulations like Strawberry. Again, looking at the clientele we knew there might be some resistance. . On the last creel in 2001 over 60% of our anglers were from Nevada. That is holding true in the creel survey we are doing this year also. There are anglers that come once a year and there is not a lot of opportunity for education. Based on information we had from our previous creel survey, we saw there was a differential harvest between the rainbows and the cutthroats.

Mr. Hatch said they are catching the rainbow and releasing them and a lot of them are dying. Are we going to lose more than if we allow some take.

Mr. Ottenbacher said we are going to have some hooking mortality in whatever regulation we have. If we are going to have a biological control maintaining that base of predator, we are going to have to put fish back. We are going to have some angling mortality. One of our difficult spots at Panguitch was getting that big cohort or fish into that slot limit to start with. Within a year or two we are not going to see the large number of rainbows in the slot.

Mr. Hatch asked if the objective is to keep the large cutthroat.

Mr. Ottenbacher said that is right and they think they can do that potentially without having a species specific regulation based on what people have been able to catch and harvest in the past, and what has moved into the slot limit in a more stable situation. In the future we would anticipate that there would not be that many rainbows moving into the slot. In a more stable system where we are not having rapid growth of particularly rainbow trout into the slot, most of those fish will be harvested before they get into the 15-16 inch size.

Mr. Hatch said then we will go back to the chubs and not continue to have the condition to grow big fish in a hurry.

Mr. Ottenbacher said we will be able to grow big fish and hopefully a higher proportion of cutthroat will move into the slot and most of the rainbow will be harvested before they get into the slot.

Mr. Woodard asked if they have the signage at Panguitch, like they do at Strawberry.

Mr. Ottenbacher said they have the crew at Strawberry to manage the resource and outreach effort. They do not have the manpower at Panguitch.

Mr. Hatch said he cannot support the recommendation as is. It should be the same as Strawberry and Scofield.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if there was any public comment and there was none.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern – Mr. Bates said they passed the proposal with the addition that the recommendation for Scofield be implemented as soon as possible, preferably as soon as guide comes out.

Southern – Mr. Albrecht said first off, on Kolob Reservoir, Steve Cox had a petition of 2,093 people, a lot from Las Vegas and Mosquite, requesting that Kolob be changed back to a general fishery. The RAC decided to set up a committee to look at that and come back with recommendations next year. Next, on Panguitch Lake a man who owns a business there, came to the meeting and was in favor of the proposal. Norm McKee sent a letter that requested letting them catch and keep rainbows regardless of size on Panguitch. Third, Mr. Albrecht asked the businessman from Panguitch Lake how business was going in the area. The fourth item was Mr. Albrecht asked Commissioner LaFevre if the motion was okay. He did not have any other comments. They made a MOTION: To accept the fishing guidebook as presented and to set up a working committee for the Kolob Reservoir. The motion passed.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they passed the fishing guidebook and rule unanimously.

Northeastern – Ms. Torres said they had some general discussion on burbot fishing on Flaming Gorge. The local spearfishing community was excited about the proposal. They accepted the proposal unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Slater said they accepted the proposal unanimously.

Board Discussion

Chairman Niemeyer summarized RAC comment.

Mr. Clark said all these changes take effect January 1, 2009. If they want Scofield changes sooner, it would have to be amended.

Mr. Donaldson said the Director could have Scofield's changes put in place with the emergency change order.

Mr. Wilson said they have some concerns with immediate implementation. They need to promote the proposal with identification education. They don't see a problem if it just goes into effect the first of the year.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Fishing Guidebook & Rule R657-13 as presented with the exception that the slot restriction apply only to cutthroat and tiger trout species on Panguitch Lake in line with the regulations on Strawberry and Scofield Reservoir.

Mr. Perkins said he would like to hear from the Division as to what is the potential guess for loss on wild cutthroat if the board went with the motion. Do you have any quantification at all? We are talking about incidental mortality on cutthroat because people keep the wrong species. Is there anything from Strawberry or anywhere else that would indicate how many fish are lost?

Mr. Donaldson said that under predatory slot limit they would be pretty much the same. The numbers are fairly low.

Mr. Wilson said we did look at that when we proposed the previous regulation. It was a little different scenario because most of the fish were being harvested directly out of the reservoir, but at that time the total fishing induced mortality, only 12% was hooking loss. We have gotten the biological response at Strawberry. We had a major increase in the cutthroat population and despite hooking mortality and illegal harvest, we still moved the way we wanted to go. I see that happening at Panguitch and Scofield also.

Mr. Donaldson said we understand that hooking mortality is all part of a slot limit so the compensatory issue is to stock additional fish to make sure we do not drop below where we want to be to control the chub.

Mr. Messerly said as they discussed at the RAC meeting, they are going to convene a committee to discuss Kolob Reservoir. They intend to do that regardless.

Mr. Hatch asked if we have to vote on this, or is it going to be done anyway.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we support the issue of a committee being formed to discuss fishery management on Kolob Reservoir and this be placed on the action log.

8) Other Business (**Action**)

Marty Bushman said we have two stipulations on appeals from Division suspension orders to bring to the Board. The first is for Janko Tomic who was observed at Lost Creek Reservoir, caught one fish over the limit and continued to fish for some time, was unsuccessful and was cited with a Class B Misdemeanor. The Division had a suspension hearing and he was suspended for two years, principally because he had a previous violation. In looking at that, the conservation officer was comfortable with reducing it to one year.

The following motion was made by Keele Johnson, seconded Lee Howard and passed unanimously

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation and order for Janko Tomic.

The second stipulation is for Ty Sanders who went hunting with four companions on his father's property with four mitigation permits for cow elk. Mr. Sanders did not have a permit, and friends did. They saw some elk on the property and went onto the neighboring landowner's property, where upon they got their four elk. Mr. Sanders, who did not have a permit, shot two of the elk for his friends. He was cited and pled guilty to a Class A Misdemeanor and received a suspension for five years, which really turns out to be six years with the timing. In speaking with law enforcement, we can reduce by one year and two months, which suspends him effectively for four years, because he is out of the drawing in the fourth year, but allows him back in a bit earlier. Mr. Bushman asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Niemeyer asked if he was charged for being off the property and for not having a permit.

Mr. Bushman said he was charged for trespass and was convicted of a Class B Misdemeanor as well.

Mr. Perkins said really there were two separate violations, each of which could have drawn a five-year suspension.

Mr. Bushman said not the trespass. We have authority separate outside R23-19-9, but under the trespass statute it does give the Division authority to suspend. We have historically interpreted that on a first time offense as no more than one year. That was not raised with the hearing officer.

Mr. Howard asked if he asked for this review.

Mr. Bushman said he did appeal it and he talked with John Pratt and the conservation officer investigated the case to say is there anything less, rather than take this to a hearing, to offer a settlement.

The following motion was made by Lee Howard, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation and order for Ty Sanders.

8) Paunsaugunt Antlerless Deer Hunt Season Extension SRO ONLY (**Action**)

Doug Messerly said the background on this hunt is that the Paunsaugunt deer herd, by our calculations is slightly over objective. We determined that we had a need to do some antlerless harvest and as usual we try to harvest problem animals first. We focus on depredation situations or specific habitat problem areas as a general rule, rather than have unit wide hunts. In this case we proposed a harvest of 50 antlerless deer in the Johnson Canyon area during the month of August. Our intent was to remove animals that were there on those fields and relieve a depredation problem on one hand and also achieve our population reduction on the other. The problem is the deer did not cooperate and were not present for the hunt. We need to achieve the harvest in any event and are asking to extend the season to include the dates Nov 7- 17, 2008 with the same boundaries that were in place. We are confident that the deer will have moved back to that area and there will be some success.

Mr. Woodard said he heard the habitat is in poor condition in that area, even though the herd is up to population objective. Because of this, they are not seeing the great big bucks because of the lack of nutrients.

Mr. Messerly said nutrients do have some effect on antler growth and range is a problem. We intend to incorporate that into our management in the future on three veins. The first is to increase the available habitat to animals on the winter range by distributing some guzzlers across the area know as Buckskin Mountain. Secondly we are doing habitat

improvement projects on those critical deer winter ranges and thirdly we intend to engage the Forest Service on doing some habitat improvement projects on the summer range. In addition we plan to manage the deer herd to objective, and in the future you will see some more significant antlerless removals, aimed at habitat areas where we are suffering these problems.

Mr. Howard asked if the season will be long enough to accomplish what is needed.

Mr. Messerly said it is only 50 permits and it will be a short hunt to get this done.

Mr. Perkins said as a follow on to Mr. Woodard's question, there is apparently a lot of education that needs to be done with some of the people that are close to the Paunsaugunt on the condition of the ranges so they understand where the DWR is trying to head on deer management in that area.

Mr. Messerly said one of the benefits of the Paunsaugunt deer working committee is that we are able to achieve just that. We are in the process of doing that to overcome the existing paradigms.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Albrecht said accessibility to the property was discussed at the meeting to make sure people were going to have a successful hunt. We approved the proposal 6 to 2.

Chairman Niemeyer asked when the muzzleloader hunt is in Southern region.

Mr. Messerly said we missed it with these proposed dates. He thinks it is just prior to this hunt. We intentionally avoided any overlap.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Rick Woodard and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Paunsaugunt Antlerless Deer Hunt Season Extension.

9) Swan Creek Treatment Plan NRO ONLY (**Action**)

Scott Tolentino, Aquatic Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. Swan Creek is the most important tributary on Bear Lake for cutthroat spawning. It is less than one mile long, but has consistent flows and is accessible by cutthroat at all lake elevations. The Division operates a cutthroat trout trap where eggs are taken to restock Bear Lake. It contains rainbow trout and CT/BLCT trout hybrids. The problem we have is the genetic introgression of pure Bear Lake (Bonneville) cutthroat trout with rainbow trout. The proposal is to remove the CT/rainbow trout hybrids to prevent genetic introgression that can occur with the genetically pure BLCT trout that ascend Swan Creek to spawn. The

method is to treat Swan Creek with rotenone at 3 pm for 8 hours after the irrigation season is over in October 2009. The entire treatment should take less than one day, and no detox is necessary.

The post-treatment plan is to restock with Bear Lake cutthroat trout. We are beginning the NEPA process in winter of 2008. The Division is partnered with Utah Trout Unlimited and have applied for funding through the Western Native Trout Initiative. As of a few days ago he found out this project has ranked number one in the state. He then showed a picture of the Swan Creek cutthroat trout trap and explained how it is used. It is a main source of eggs for Bear Lake stocking and is operated from April-July each year.

Rotenone use is governed by strict standards and they will follow the Rotenone use protocol as it is used in fisheries management. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Johnson asked if there would be a lot of cutthroat in the stream after the treatment.

Mr. Tolentino said most of the fish in the upper part are the hybrid fish. Most of the Bear Lake cutthroats come up into the stream to spawn. When the eggs hatch most of them leave the stream, with that fall or they trickle out in the spring. We will end up killing some BLCT trout, but overall it will remove the hybridization that exists up there.

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Hodson said they voted to approve unanimously.

The following motion was made by Rick Woodard, seconded by Keele Johnson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Swan Creek Treatment Plan as presented.

10) Bear Lake Management Plan NRO ONLY (**Information**)

Scott Tolentino presented this information. We are working on a cooperative fisheries management plan with Idaho. It is in a draft stage presently and have held a few scoping meetings to receive public input. We will be back at the Wildlife Board meeting once the plan is finalized sometime in December or January.

He went over the history of Bear Lake fish management. They have been stocked with just about every kind of fish known to mankind over the years with the goal of developing fisheries. As time went on we have developed the Bear Lake Cutthroat enhancement project. In the late 80s and 90s they started working with endemic fish research with USU. We have been doing habitat work on the streams for CT trout improvement and also a little bit of work in the lake with rock habitat. The management of the lake revolves around annual coordination meetings held each spring between the

two state agencies. This has worked well, but we would like to have something on paper, similar to what we have on Flaming Gorge Reservoir.

Mr. Tolentino went on to discuss the proposed management objectives. He showed a chart on the fish stocking from 1890 to 2000. Right now the only two fish that are being stocked in the lake are Bonneville CT trout and sterile Lake trout. The Cutthroat trout Enhancement project ran from 1973-1992 and at that point the name changed to the Bear Lake Project, focusing more on a holistic approach to management. The goals of that project were to determine if the native BLCT trout still existed in “pure” form and if BLCT were present, to develop methods to enhance the population. It is looking at different kinds of stocking and sizes of stocked fish to maximize return.

In trap they take eggs, measure, tag, and weigh them, and use them to restock the next year.

The endemic species research began in the 80s-90s with predation studies through Utah State University. They looked at the food web at Bear Lake through monitoring methods. The summary from USU Research showed that nutrients are controlling the number of plankton and then down the chain. “Increases in gill net catches of lake and CT trout did not result in declines in forage fish population.” He went on to discuss lake levels, predation, trends in native prey species and the fact that peak fish numbers during good water years related to availability of spawning habitat.

It is the Division’s responsibility to manage conservation of native species and provide angling opportunities for the public. He then went into specific information on the four endemic fish, Cisco, Bear Lake Sculpin, Bonneville and Bear Lake Whitefish. He discussed options that could be used if they drop to low population levels.

The conservation goal for CT trout is to restore wild fish production in Bear Lake tributaries by focusing on habitat improvement projects. As a sport fishing goal, they look to maintain a CT trout catch rate of 0.15 fish/angler hr and maintain an average size of 17 inches total length or greater.

On Lake trout the sport fishing goal is to continue to provide trophy lake trout fishery by stocking conservative numbers of sterile Lake trout. Lake trout stocking will be suspended if crayfish drop below the conservation management objectives.

We are looking to improve shoreline fishing opportunities on Bear Lake and are proposing to experimentally stock 20,000 catchable 10 inch sterile rainbow trout for two consecutive years. They strive for an angler catch of 50% or comparable catch to other waters and will monitor that by angler creel survey. He showed some graphs showing the history of stocking rainbows through the years. Since 1986 no rainbow trout have been stocked and in the summer the shore fishery is almost non-existent.

In summary both management agencies, the Division and Idaho Fish and Game are dedicated to developing a fish management plan that attempts to balance the sport fishing opportunities with conservation of native fish. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Perkins asked a question on the stocking and harvest of rainbows, does that include Idaho data?

Mr. Tolentino said yes. Utah is the only one stocking the lake with BLCT trout. Most of Idaho's stocking was stream stocking in St. Charles Creek.

Mr. Perkins asked if we could get an update on the threat of invasive and illegally stocked species in the upper Bear River and what is being done. Is that in the management plan and does it need to be?

Mr. Tolentino said they are considering putting this in the management plan. Walleye have been stocked in Sulfur Creek reservoir illegally in Wyoming and those fish have shown up in the Bear River below Sulfur Creek Reservoir, but above Woodruff Narrows Reservoir. There is no hope of getting those fish out presently. We are monitoring Bear Lake every spring for walleye and small mouth bass. They both pose a threat to Bear Lake, mostly walleye. He sees no way to stop it right now. We need to be concerned about this.

Mr. Perkins asked if there were any thoughts on a barrier.

Mr. Tolentino said in order to screen enough water that would come in the spring, the manager at the Bear Lake wildlife refuge on the north end of Bear Lake did some investigating to look at fish screens on the inlet canal coming into Mud Lake. It is such an interconnected system, there is really no where they would be able to install a fish screen. The screen would have to handle about 4,000 CFS on a flood year and no screens can handle that. We have been monitoring for quagga this year and they are not there. We have a good interdiction program up there with detox sprayer etc. Idaho is participating and doing the same thing on the other side of the lake.

Mr. Perkins asked if walleye got into the lake they might go after the Cisco, which are unique, and we could be into endangered species in short order.

Mr. Tolentino said that is possible, but presently we have not seen any walleye in the lake.

Mr. Donaldson said on the action log for Bear Lake, Mr. Tolentino has taken care of that today.

11) Other Business (**Contingent**)

- a) Winter WAFWA – San Francisco

Mr. Clark said the budget cuts are a concern for out of state travel. Director Karpowitz said two Board members would be good for attendance at Winter WAFWA.

Chairman Niemeyer asked who wants to go.

Mr. Howard said he would like to go.

Mr. Perkins said he would like to go.

Mr. Johnson said he wants to go. He said maybe we could double up on a room, drive, cut back on meals or such and then all we would need is registration fees.

Mr. Clark said they do not look as much at cost, as numbers of how many attend. We could get an order that would freeze out of state travel, or a soft freeze with only one person for out of state travel.

Chairman Niemeyer asked Ms. Coons to get a hold of Mr. Hatch and see if he is interested. After that, put the names in a hat and draw out two. That is the only fair way to do it.

Mr. Perkins said we have a Board meeting on January 7-8 and that could complicate things.

b) 2009 Wildlife Board/RAC Schedule

Dec 4th meeting – at Capitol building at 8 am / Room 445

Jan 7 – Board appeals – at DNR in Room 1010

Jan 8 – Board meeting at 10 am at BYU

Combine July and August RACs together / August 19, 2009 – Board Recognition dinner
August 20 – Wildlife Board meeting with new members in attendance.

c) Little Hole – November 11-12, 2008 – these dates are fine

d) Meeting on Condors

Mr. Howard reported on this meeting. We met with the people on the condors, including folks from Arizona and California. We discussed having a meeting perhaps in St. George with both boards and they were all in favor of that. The California Fish and Game gave us a list of recommended non lead bullets that are being produced today. There are quite a few of those. We as a Division can be commended. Mr. Fowlks, Mr. Donaldson, and Mr. Clark were all in attendance and were commended. It was very worthwhile. We can be very proud of Utah as the leader in about everything we do. Many of the States want

Wildlife Board Meeting
October 2, 2008

to know what Utah is doing and this is thanks to our Division people and our conservation groups. We are working well as a team along with the Board.

The meeting was then adjourned.