

**Utah Wildlife Board Work Session**  
December 2-3, 2009, DNR Auditorium  
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, December 02, 2009, 2:00 pm-6:00 pm

1. Approval of Agenda ACTION

-Rick Woodard, Chairman

Chairman Woodard welcomed the Board members and explained the format for today's meeting.

The following motion was made by Tom Hatch, seconded by Del Brady and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move we approve the agenda.

Items of discussion – NOTE: The Wildlife Board will not be taking action on any of the following items. This meeting is discussion only. The meeting is open to the public however no public comment will be accepted.

- **Summer WAFWA – Jim Karpowitz – 15 min.**

Director Karpowitz said it is questionable as to who will be able to go to the Summer WAFWA, due to budget cuts in the state overall. We are not going to send in a request at this time because of the timing. We will look to send in our out of state travel requests sometime in the future. We need to get through this legislative session first.

- **E-mail protocol and laptop computers – Jim Karpowitz – 15 min.**

Director Karpowitz said we are in the same situation on budget with the issue of laptop computers. We need to defer this at this time. We do pay for partial internet connection for some of our employees around the state and we can do it for the Board members. Relative to e-mails, part of the problem is we all get e-mails that the others are not aware of. We try to forward this information to the Board members. It would be good to designate one person on the Wildlife Board as the point person on e-mails. They could forward e-mails to the Division and receive them from the Division in an effort to keep everyone informed. This individual could decide which e-mails need to be responded to and who is most capable to respond. No one Board member should respond for the entire Board. This should not curtail the Board members from responding to their constituents. This might help in keeping things from falling through the cracks. Mr. Perkins is the vice chair and Director Karpowitz would like to see him be in charge of the e-mails.

Mr. Albrecht said he has been very hesitant to respond to e-mails as to not be mis-interpreted.

Mr. Fenimore said he does respond to e-mails in a general way, thanking for input and forwarding it to the Board.

Director Karpowitz said he is afraid there are some questions that might be going unanswered. It is difficult to deal with the sheer volume of e-mails.

Mr. Perkins said that many e-mails are more region specific and he would like to be able to forward them to the appropriate person. He is getting as many e-mails to his personal account as to his state account. If the e-mails come from inside the Division, they are only forwarded to his state account and not his personal account.

Director Karpowitz said he will e-mail a link so the Board will have Group Wise. It helps manage e-mail. The Division is going to forward any e-mails they receive to the Wildlife Board and the Board will forward any e-mails to the Division that they receive. The Board will be careful to not represent the entire Board in their e-mail responses. The Board members need to archive the e-mails they receive and not delete them.

- **Board Agenda and Action Log Items – Alan Clark – 15 min.**

Mr. Clark said if it is an action item that does not tie to the agenda, we would like to report as they review the action log. It will be very brief. If it is something to be incorporated into the proclamation, we will say it will be addressed in the recommendations.

We have been discussing what things go to the Board and what goes to the RACs. We will not take everything around to the RACs unless the Board directs it. One thing we are not sure about is what happens when a motion is passed and the Division is asked to review it. If we think it is just fine as is, what do you want to hear from the Division?

Mr. Hatch said they need to come back and report during the action log section of the meeting and have the rest of the Board come to agreement.

Mr. Clark said any action log items will be reported on, or it will be incorporated into an action item that is part of the agenda.

Mr. Perkins said during the action log time, the Board will direct to close, continue or act on the item. Those that are acted on need to be so indicated in the verbiage.

Mr. Aoude said that under the action log items there could be a bullet to indicate that it will be covered on that specific agenda item.

- **Budget Presentation – Greg Sheehan – 20 min.**

Mr. Sheehan said that the Conservation Permit Audits will be handed out today. We will cover this tomorrow during the Board meeting.

Mr. Hatch asked if the legislature did some budget cuts last year.

Mr. Sheehan said in the division we had about an 18% cut last year, which is about 1.4 million. Stimulus money did carry us through last year, but it is beginning to fall off. The governor's office told us to prepare for a general fund cut this year. The governor's budget will be out next week. Reference was made to handout (Historical Revenue, Restricted Fund 1171, Fiscal Months July thru November 2010). If fee adjustments are seen as a tax increase, they might be overruled. He then went over handout (General Fund History and Expenditures for a period of years).

Director Karpowitz said the 2010 bar could go down on the graph, as well as 2011. The reason for the jump in expenditures since 2005 is because there were some pay increases that were quite substantial and also increase in some health programs, most in personal services.

Mr. Hatch asked how you cut these budgets without letting personnel go.

Director Karpowitz said luckily we do not have a lot of general fund, but agencies that function mainly on general fund will have to let people go. We carry a surplus in our budget to carry us during the tough times. It is good we have license revenues. We have taken our share of budget cuts and will continue to do so.

Mr. Sheehan said about 120 of our 500 employees are on some type of a temporary basis, so we have some room.

Director Karpowitz said it is good that we have a conservative legislature and because of the way we are structured, we are not being as impacted as other states. The Wildlife Divisions in other states are really struggling.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they are tied to a percentage that can be carried in surplus.

Director Karpowitz said we can't carry any general fund dollars. We spend federal dollars first. We have instituted a soft hiring freeze and put any big expenditures on hold until we get through the legislature that is facing a billion dollar shortfall.

- **Multi-year guidebooks – Alan Clark – 15 min.**

Mr. Clark said we have tried multi-year furbearer and upland game guidebooks. We could do this because the Board adopted a model to arrive at the number of permits on upland game. We had one multi-year guidebook for big game. It lasted one year and we vowed we would never do it again. There was a constant pressure to change it. He then asked for input from the Board on this subject.

Mr. Fenimore asked what the perceived benefits were.

Mr. Clark said RAC and Board time savings and printing costs.

Mr. Fenimore asked about printing a main section of a guidebook that does not change, then print a supplement each year on the things that change annually.

Mr. Hatch said an advantage on multi-year would be consistency. One of his frustrations in management direction is the changes that occur every six months or so. We might be better off to leave things alone and give them a chance to work for a few years.

Director Karpowitz said Colorado does big game regulations for three years and they do not change. The only problem with that is people in Utah are used to making adjustments every year and that is how they think. The two toughest guidebooks are fishing and big game as far as being relooked at every year. Other guidebooks do lend themselves to being multi-year.

Mr. Perkins said there are many employees in the state who spend the majority of their time reworking regulations. If we could do multi-year we might be able to get more pro-active, rather than reactive.

Director Karpowitz said we can try this, doing a three-year guidebook, but we all need to commit to it, no matter the complaining or whatever.

Mr. Clark said we always have to deal with law changes as well.

Mr. Albrecht asked how many brochures were printed presently, compared to the past, due to the internet.

Mr. Clark said a lot less.

Mr. Perkins said the hallmark of basic leadership is providing stable direction. This is the Board's responsibility. He is committed to trying to provide more stable governance than he has seen in the past decade. He will do whatever it takes to provide support to staff to do this.

Mr. Fenimore asked if the RAC process fuels the fire for change elements.

Mr. Clark said he thinks so. We give a lot more opportunity for the public to suggest new ideas.

Director Karpowitz said we will go to multi-year if the Board directs them to do so for 2011. We have to be committed to stick to it. Sometimes it might only take a bad deer hunt, or bad winter and then everybody wants to change things.

Mr. Hatch said the Director still has the ability to take emergency action if necessary.

Director Karpowitz said he can open and close seasons. The Board can always amend an action also.

Mr. Bunnell said from the furbearer multi-year guidebook, we did make one change on year two. We only lifted one little section to prepare for otter transplants on the Provo. We did not open up the entire rule.

Mr. Aoude said the proclamation could run for three years, because we set permit numbers annually. It would be workable if the Board will commit to it.

Chairman Woodard said on the guidebooks, the Guides and Outfitters were adamant about being able to change the tests each year.

Mr. Perkins said when the Wildlife Section has to deal with changes in big game every year, they have to give a lot of time to RAC process, Board meetings and putting together the proclamations.

Mr. Fenimore said the agendas could be balanced out, if changes were not being made every year.

Mr. Albrecht said with the deer changes that are being proposed tomorrow, it would be difficult to have them go for three years.

Director Karpowitz said we might have to look to 2011 on those issues.

Mr. Bunnell said some of the species lend themselves to a three-year guidebook better than others.

Mr. Clark said he thinks it is a good idea to work toward the three-year guidebook.

Director Karpowitz said he would like to see the Board make a motion to direct the Division to go to a three-year rule on big game.

- **Condor Project Update – Jimmy Parrish – 15 min.**

Mr. Parrish handed out a timeline on the condor project. There will be a one page article on this issue in the big game guidebook that comes out next month. See handout for specifics. The target to have coupons for redemption for free ammunition is May 2010. They are going to follow Arizona's program on the non-lead ammunition. The DWR will reimburse the vendors for the ammo.

Mr. Albrecht asked if anyone who sells bullets will have the opportunity to sell this ammo.

Mr. Parrish said whoever bids on the contract. The level of inventory for 1,800 hunters, eliminates the smaller vendors. Cabela's would offer an online option. There are a lot of calibers available in non-lead. This is a voluntary program.

Mr. Brady asked what we are anticipating on price per box.

Mr. Parrish said \$55 a box.

A discussion on the specifics of the bidding took place.

Mr. Parrish said we are working as partners with the foundation on this.

Director Karpowitz said we can identify hunters on the Paunsaugunt and the Zion's, also antlerless elk. General elk will be more difficult. We can also get vouchers to landowners who allow hunters on their property. We have sent out a letter to all of these permittees making them aware of the issue. Displays need to be put in the various stores.

Mr. Hatch said there is a misconception that this is going to be mandatory. When they find out it is not, things will be better.

Director Karpowitz said we need to stress that this is voluntary.

Mr. Fenimore said they should key into the various conservation organizations, looking to gain their support. Is there any merit in trying to do some type of conservation tag to raise money for this project?

Director Karpowitz said we already have money from FWS, ESMF, and a one-time bump in federal aide to use as a match. We have also challenged UWIN to come up with a match. We need to take advantage of every source possible, including the conservation organizations, hoping to gain local support. Hunters have always stepped up and been conservationists. There is getting to be more information relative to human health and hunters are looking toward converting over for these reasons.

Mr. Brady said the non lead bullets have a propensity for pass through. Any guide in Africa or Alaska will recommend the non lead bullets.

Mr. Perkins said it might be helpful to document positive information and get to the core of how it will benefit the sportsmen.

Director Karpowitz said we do not need to be twisting any arms, just keep stressing that this is voluntary.

Mr. Clark said the difficult thing for the national groups is California made it mandatory.

Mr. Fenimore said he saw an article that said Wyoming is beginning a study of impacts on bald eagles and other raptors that feed on carrion.

Director Karpowitz said he sees this as similar to when we went to steel shot on waterfowl. Over time those issues went away.

- **Hunter Orange Changes – Mike Fowlks – 15 min.**

Mr. Fowlks said he will talk about HB92 which passed during the last legislative session and had to deal with the hunter orange clothing requirements. The bison and moose hunts have been exempted from hunter orange. We should be okay with the density on the OIAL hunts. If they choose to wear camouflage with the hunter orange, they must wear 400 square inches, front, back and on the head. It gave the Board authority to set areas, in addition, that would not require hunter orange. Representative Sandstrom wanted to include his limited entry hunt in the hunter orange free area and that's why he ran the bill. It became apparent we could not get the recommendations ready for this round of RACs and we contacted the representative to let him know this. The analysis turned out to be much more complicated than we anticipated and that is why it is taking us longer to make this proposal.

Mr. Hatch asked if we have had any accidents.

Mr. Fowlks said we have had accidents, but not relative to hunter orange. Only the hunter is required to wear the hunter orange.

Director Karpowitz said we are going to put a statement in the guidebook that says we recommend the wearing of orange for the best safety.

- **Species Management Plans – Alan Clark – 15 min.**

Mr. Clark said that this is a follow up to why we do plans and what drives the order of those plans. There are two sections of Utah Code that requires plans. There is another section that is relative to transplants, asking for a species plan. We use these plans as a legal alternative to the proposal for an endangered species. The intent of the plan is to short circuit listing. Another reason for plans is for long term direction. Many times plans act as fund raising opportunities from a variety of places. Finally, it helps us prioritize our time and funds.

Relative to priority on when plans are addressed, we look at those required by law. We also try to anticipate endangered species listings. For instance, the sage grouse plan was in place before the petition for listing. So far, we have not had any species listed in the last four years, because we have things in place. Species that are hunted, fished or controversial also need plans.

Director Karpowitz said this is the vehicle we use to help the Board set policy.

Mr. Clark said every question that comes along is evaluated on whether it is consistent with the plan.

- **2011 Big Game Process and Schedule – Rick Larson / Greg Sheehan – 30 min.**

Chairman Woodard said after the RAC meetings, he stopped in and asked Director Karpowitz about various things that might happen if this proposal is passed.

Mr. Sheehan went over combining the big game draw into one. One proposal is to do nothing, another is to combine antlerless and have it run into the summer and this would cut down on RAC and Board meetings. We would save dollars on reminder postcards, and simplify some issues in the draw. Disadvantages are that people do not want to draw for antlerless too soon, internally we would not have a lot of time to take care of credit card issues, and compressing everything puts more demand on the Division. A third approach is to use the spring data, and instead of putting it into a draw that would occur April/May, we put it into the proclamation that would be done presently, print the hunt numbers and quotas within it for both antlerless and antlered species for the next round. We would leave the application period and the draw where it is now. Right now you would be taking last spring's data and making all the hunt recommendations, based on that. There would be one round of RACs and Boards, one proclamation, all permit numbers in the proclamation. The disadvantage would be not foreseeing a bad winter and the changes it would bring, older harvest data, and more public service time. Advantages are fewer proclamations to print, more time to prepare hunt number recommendations, saving dollars on postcards and results letters, simplify the two elk permit issue and people would know earlier in the year if they drew their antlerless.

Director Karpowitz said there are three options, one to do nothing, do all at one time, including permit numbers, using previous data and do all at one time including permit numbers using current data. A fourth option would be to do the guidebook for bucks, bulls, OIAL and antlerless, minus the permit numbers, adding them in later.

Mr. Aoude said it would save one RAC meeting.

Mr. Larsen said elk are not affected by winter too much and using previous data is not that risky. There could be issues with deer.

Mr. Perkins said there are really only two rounds of RACs.

Mr. Sheehan said it is really three rounds of preparation.

Mr. Aoude said the workload is before the meeting for at least a month.

Mr. Sheehan said an advantage would be people could see hunt numbers they are applying for.

With option two there would be no January/February application period. Application period in May for big game and antlerless with the draw in May. We would move antlered into antlerless.

Mr. Aoude said for this season's RAC, we were setting seasons without a lot of our classification data. It would be beneficial to move the proclamation to when we have the data.

A discussion took place relative to winter elk flights and counts.

Mr. Perkins said with option 3, we fly unit 5 this year, would it be out two years to use this data for implementation?

Mr. Aoude said you use whatever data is available from the previous year, one year to implement.

Mr. Perkins said every time we use this data and indicate the need to up the permits, we get response that the flight numbers are not right and there are not that many elk. If we have to delay another year to implement, we might have to take elk on an emergency hunt.

Mr. Sheehan said they caveat the proclamation with "we can adjust these numbers up or down on an as needed basis."

Mr. Larsen said his concern is when we have a terrible winter and set too many permits.

Mr. Hatch asked how they take it all into the modeling when the elk move back and forth.

Mr. Aoude said you start with the population on the unit. It is a winter count and a winter model. They use the same grounds all the time. We try not to fly in open winters, and fly when we have good conditions.

Director Karpowitz said when we changed things years ago, the Bucks/Bulls drawing is moving backwards somewhat. We are right up against the wall in getting data. To accommodate a drawing process that is extremely customer friendly, it seems if we push the draw a little later, we would have most of what we need including tooth data, post season deer classification, most of what we know about antlerless. If we had an application process a little bit later and shorten the process, we can still get results to people by the end of April. This would give the wildlife section time to get the information.

Mr. Sheehan, this would give the results the end of May.

Mr. Albrecht said the hunters could find out in May where they draw out, but later than that would be pushing it. The longer we could keep the hunters out of the hills, the better.

Mr. Perkins does not like the July results, too late.

Mr. Sheehan asked if public could live with a May 30<sup>th</sup> results, instead of April.

Director Karpowitz said the end of May would be helpful for the Division.

Chairman Woodard asked if we want a motion on this tomorrow. It would go into effect 2011.

Director Karpowitz said they would like a motion to combine the three meetings into one with a notification date of no later than the end of May. We can come back with a solid proposal.

Mr. Sheehan discussed some things to help make this schedule work.

Director Karpowitz said perhaps we need to draw a line as to calling on credit cards and being customer friendly. This might be hurting us biologically.

Mr. Sheehan said relative to other possible issues with the new hunt proposal. They talked about putting general season elk onto the draw. It might create quite a run on the elk permits. For the first year, we could sell those permits over the counter.

Relative to dedicated hunters, we can make that work for the split hunts. We might have to cap them if necessary. These are the kinds of things we will have to work on over the next 8-9 months.

Chairman Woodard said there is a possibility of this hunt structure throwing the cow hunts into the general season one or two. Maybe we should issue more cow tags and try to get the public with still a family outing.

Mr. Larsen said he has been surprised that there have not been any really negative reactions to the proposed hunt structure. There needs to be some tweaking to it. With the five-day hunt and delayed opener, people are not happy with it. He would offer up a caution, it seems there is some good support for it, but do not try to do too much at one time. There will be a lot of options to be worked with. Give the new structure a chance to work.

Mr. Aoude said on antlerless during the general season, there is a proposal that we are going to put out during antlerless for folks who draw antlerless. They can use their permit during the general season, realizing that the success rate might not be as high. If they do not get the antlerless animal during the general season, they could still use it during the late season hunt. We could still have late season hunts, but allow us to get the harvest we need.

Chairman Woodard said if the Board feels this proposal needs some tweaking, we need to give that input tomorrow.

Mr. Larsen said we can accommodate these concerns as input is given.

Mr. Aoude said there is a slide in the presentation on comments and concerns that have been given. The muzzleloader community and the Farm Bureau were upset because of the proposal of an early rifle hunt. We could put the muzzleloader before the general season and this might help this complaint. There are multiple options.

Chairman Woodard said this will still be handled as an informational item tomorrow.

The discussion continued relative to the time frame for working on this proposal. The Board can give informal direction to the Division to continue working on the new hunt schedule at the Board meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Fenimore suggested that an Internet survey might be done in January incorporating what has been done so far.

Mr. Aoude said they are planning on doing a survey in January and we will tweak it according to what we have heard so far.

Mr. Perkins asked if the Division's recommendations for 2010 with regards to five-day/nine-day, or smaller unit hunt management, is the Division making any different recommendation than what we heard at the RAC meetings?

Mr. Aoude said they are making one different recommendation, which is the delayed starter, mostly to deal with all the social issues and the pressure put on the adjacent units.

Mr. Perkins said as a Board we still need to deal with these.

Mr. Aoude said we have handouts on the five-day / nine-day discussion.



Director Karpowitz said at this point we are starting to discuss some of tomorrow's agenda and we can do that then. Tomorrow will really be about, what are we going to do about deer? We are looking at some big changes in 2011 and it would be nice if 2010 mirrored what would be coming up in 2011.

Mr. Larsen said he looks at next year as a bridge and 2011 is when it is really going to happen.

- **Review of Thursday Agenda Items 5-12 – Alan Clark – 30 min.**

Chairman Woodard said he feels a Board member should attend the RAC meeting in his own region.

Ms. Jensen said there is really nothing written, but it has always been implied that they should.

Mr. Albrecht said Board members need to attend some of the other RAC meetings other than their own. You can really learn a lot by going to a different one.

Mr. Perkins said he thought the Board members are to attend the RAC meeting in their area. He would like to see the Board make this official.

Ms. Jensen said if Board members submit expenses for attending RAC meetings, the Division will reimburse them.

Mr. Perkins said he feels for Mr. Johnson who has to drive two hours to attend a RAC meeting. He definitely needs to be reimbursed.

Director Karpowitz said they will reimburse for attending the RAC in their own region.

The discussion continued around RAC attendance.

Mr. Bushman said it is important that Board members do not try to influence the outcomes at the RAC meetings and be careful on any questions or comments.

Chairman Woodard said a Board member should not comment at a RAC.

Mr. Albrecht asked about mis-information.

Director Karpowitz said it is helpful if a Board member can clarify, as long as they do not try to move the RAC in any direction.

### **Report on 5-day hunt structure**

Mr. Hersey presented data on nine-day and five-day hunts – see handout. Cutting the season to five days, only shortened the season by ½ a day. That is total days hunted. The biological data does not seem to indicate that there is that much difference between the harvest and days hunted in the five or nine day hunts.

Mr. Hatch said he thinks we are sending a mixed message with switching to a five-day hunt. Everybody in southern region wants a five-day hunt.

Mr. Hersey said the fact that they are seeing more bucks in southern is when they incorporated the five-day hunts, it is when we started coming out of the drought.

Director Karpowitz said it is a social issue and the Board is charged to balance the biological with the social. The public perception is that the five-day hunt saves bucks, but the data says it really does not. What we might be seeing is discontent with 15 bucks per 100 does. Colorado went to three-day seasons and it did not change their buck/doe ratios. The only thing that changed it is they cut their permits in half. The decision the Board makes short term is to balance the social issue with it. We will have to come to

terms whether 15 bucks per 100 does is socially acceptable. If not, we will have to look at cutting tags. We should not kid ourselves that five-day hunts are going to solve the problem.

Mr. Fenimore said going with a split hunt and increasing the odds of harvesting an animal will create enthusiasm.

Director Karpowitz said there is the issue of what to do with the units below objectives on the five-day hunt.

Mr. Aoude said the only way to deal with the units below objective is to go with five-day hunts, since the deer committee wanted this. I told them it really won't accomplish anything, but they wanted to try that first.

Mr. Hatch said we are sending mixed messages. The average hunter cannot understand why we advocate one plan then another. He feels the Board should address the issue.

Mr. Hersey said that is why we looked at the late opener.

Mr. Hatch said we could have a statewide as good as the Henry Mountain hunt. All we would have to do is reduce permits by about 80% statewide and in a few years we might be there. There is a growing number of hunters that would prefer to do that and pay big dollars.

Mr. Brady said that is what he heard in Northeast region, cut the permits and double the price.

Mr. Perkins said in the best social data we have in the 2008 survey says the main point was the hunters wanted the opportunity to hunt.

Mr. Albrecht said the main thing we have to do is build the deer resource back. Hunters have plenty of opportunity. We have not done anything to help the resource.

Director Karpowitz said we have done a lot of habitat work and he went on to discuss that.

Mr. Albrecht said the bucks that are left after the hunts do not take care of the does and the fawns are too small to make it through the winter.

Director Karpowitz said you have several different scenarios which may or may not be related. There is no impact on the number of does that are bred when buck/doe ratios are above 10. When they are below 10, there is the potential that the does are not getting bred. Some of our best buck/doe ratio units are some of our worst producing units. The Henry Mountains is a poor producing unit and 50 bucks per 100 does did not make it go up. Colorado has found with recent studies, that as the buck/doe ratios went up, fawn survival went down, especially on units with limited resources.

Mr. Aoude said he has a handout on the last 30 years with no correlation between the year prior buck/doe ratio and the fawn/doe ratio. He went on to explain the handout. Fawn/doe ratios are very dependent on precipitation.

Director Karpowitz said early on they were keeping track of road kill and the number of fetuses. We are weather and habitat dependant and that is where we need to focus our efforts. If hunters want more bucks, we need to lower permit numbers.

Mr. Albrecht said even if we go to a nine-day hunt, but at some point it will not give two weekends.

Mr. Perkins said back to five-day verses nine-day. Can we go to two five-day hunts and accommodate that by 2011? How about a compromise of seven days and that will guarantee a weekend.

Mr. Brady said he likes the five-day hunt starting on a Saturday, so the kids can be there, but let the youth hunt nine days. To me, it is a family hunt for two weekends, since most dads would like to see their son take a deer.

Mr. Perkins said that gets us to the major objection heard at the RACs in that they do not want to hunt deer for 28 days straight.

Mr. Fenimore said the elk herd growth over time, has had an impact on the deer winter ranges. Could you give more elk permits and potentially increase deer herds?

Director Karpowitz said we think it is a social decision on the 9 or 5-day hunt and that decision should more appropriately be made by the Board. We want to make it clear that it is not going to significantly effect buck/doe ratio or the productivity of the herd.

Mr. Aoude said in the plan, it says we will do something about units that are under objective. We would like to go to a three-day hunt on those, if we have five-day hunts.

Mr. Brady said what he hears is we must have rain to increase the herd and if we want to increase the bucks, cut permits.

### **Disabled Hunter**

Mr. Sheehan said one year ago, through the RAC and Board process, we had the wheelchair bound hunters group who wanted special consideration for limited entry permits and general season extensions on general season deer permits. We worked with that group and came up with a rule for an additional experimental hunt for November 7-8, one time rule. They surveyed the hunters to see what kind of experience they were having. The Division met with them and told them some of the concerns we have, especially that it might introduce a lot of other groups wanting permits. For now they are okay with that. On the general season, on the harvest survey, they had a very successful hunt. The number of applicants went up to get the CORs, 550 applied and 310 were granted. In the field 62% were successful with an average spread of 18" and three and one half points on both sides. We gave them a five-day period before the hunt opened and November 7-8.

Mr. Hatch asked if there is data on where the harvest took place.

Mr. Johnson explained the table. See handout.

Mr. Sheehan said November 13-14 would be the extra days granted for next year. The Board needs to look at this, since last year was a one time proposal. Unless the Board acts they will get the five days before this upcoming weekend, but not these two days.

Mr. Johnson said there were a lot of wonderful comments on the success of their experiences. On the comments page, these hunters expressed a lot of gratitude for giving them this chance this year. Time and again, they wrote that they had not gotten close to a four point for twelve years, fifteen years, twenty years. This meant a lot to these people.

Mr. Brady said he is glad they had success, but there are a lot of hunters that have not seen many four points. He does not know if we can go to the well every year for these hunters.

Mr. Perkins said right now this is an action item and they will not get to hunt in the rut this next year.

Mr. Clark said this does not have to be an action item tomorrow. If the Board wants a proposal to do the weekend thing again for this year, it will have to be taken back out to the RACs. The only reason it is being discussed today is the Board could act on this tomorrow, or hold off.

Mr. Sheehan said the reason for today's discussion is they have a lot of applications for these hunters with disabilities and need to know the guidelines.

Mr. Perkins said kick this down the road to spring of 2010.

Director Karpowitz said we can extend the action log to spring 2010 and the Division will have a recommendation ready.

Mr. Johnson said this opportunity is becoming well known and the applications are going to increase exponentially.

Mr. Hatch asked if we have criteria to limit this.

Mr. Johnson said we did tighten up the rule.

Mr. Albrecht wondered if there was a way to limit the number of hunters per year without going to a draw.

Mr. Sheehan said the Division will work on the variety of scenarios and apply it to the species, including 30 day extensions

Mr. Brady said these are people who are drawing limited entry hunts and then they want 30 day extensions.

Mr. Perkins said the Board wants something reasonable, but does not give it all away and offend the rest of our constituents. He asked if on the process for surrendering a permit on the action log, should we move it to spring 2010?

Mr. Sheehan said yes.

#### **Emigration Canyon Situation - County weapons restrictions – legal update**

Mr. Bushman said we are currently defending a disabilities complaint that was filed against us with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Kurt Bingham, who wanted a 30 day extension on his moose hunt, preseason, which would have put him into the limited entry archery elk, rifle and general archery filed a complaint. We said we would give him something post season and he did not want that. We are spending a fair amount of time dealing with that.

Mr. Bushman went on to give an update on the county weapons restrictions rule. In the big game rule, we have some special restrictions. One is that you cannot hunt big game within ½ mile of Silver Lake up Cottonwood Canyon, you cannot hunt big game within 600 feet of a road, house or other building, or discharge a rifle, muzzleloader, light ammunition within one mile of a cabin, house or other building regularly occupied by people, except west of I-15 where you can shoot within ½ mile. Those provisions are based on Salt Lake County ordinance. We mirrored their rule in our rule. An individual in Emigration Canyon who wanted a private shooting range, challenged it. Cities can make weapon restrictions, but counties cannot. So the question is, is our rule lawful and if it is, do we still want to use it? The Wildlife Board has the authority to regulate firearms if it deals with hunting.

Hunting within ½ mile of Silver Lake, that is a closed unit and we would not want a change there. That is clearly within our authority.

Mr. Hatch asked why we promulgated the rule.

Mr. Bushman said it was probably at the county's request.

Mr. Hatch asked if we should repeal the rule too and if the cities want to put something in place, they should do it.

Mr. Bushman said he recommends taking all the language out and what is left is enough.

Mr. Clark said there are going to be some people from Emigration Canyon come to the board meeting tomorrow to make the request.

Mr. Hatch said so these people are going to try to convince us to keep the rule in place, but we only have jurisdiction on hunting.

Mr. Perkins said the group came to the Central region RAC asking that we institute an educational course.

Mr. Aoude said she wants the education component, which is basically an archery course.

The discussion continued around this rule.

Salt Lake County is the only county in the state with these special provisions.

Mr. Bushman said he would strike the language that restricts the use of firearms within the county. With the ordinance being gone, strike B & C and don't push it through at this time. We could do it within a matter of one-two months. It is part of the proclamation and rule. This issue was not taken to the RACs. Mr. Bushman continued to give information about this rule and what action the Board and Division might take.

Director Karpowitz said the discussion on permit reduction can wait until spring.

Mr. Perkins said on the 5 / 9 day hunting and small unit hunting, if these things are good for one region they should be good for all and we should have a statewide program. One option might be to put together a committee and come back to us prior to the permit numbers meeting with a recommendation for small unit hunting and 5 / 9 day hunts by next March.

Chairman Woodard said we have to have something for tomorrow.

Mr. Aoude said we have several proposals in place on small unit hunting.

Director Karpowitz said we need to remember what the deer committee has recommended. We specifically did the smaller unit issue a year ago. We presented it to the public and the committee. The Board would have to go back to the deer committee and ask them to reconsider. Season length is not in the plan.

Mr. Albrecht said the reason it was brought up is because season dates are being adjusted for 2011.

Mr. Aoude said they have done it several times, but it dies.

Mr. Albrecht said we need to start over.

Mr. Hatch said during "other business" tomorrow he wants to talk about the Book Cliffs bison transplant, specifically for clarification.

The meeting was adjourned.