

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
SUMMARY OF MOTIONS
August 18, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, UT

1) Approval of Agenda (Action)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

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

2) Approval of Minutes (Action)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the June 9, 2011 Wildlife Board meeting as corrected.

3) Board Variances – Time Certain 9:30 am (Action)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Steven T Oberto to extend his 2010 LE Bull Elk Permit Central Mtns, Manti (early) to 2011.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance for Kiara Trussell to hunt starting August 19, 2011 on the Ensign CWMU.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Charles Miller to change the season from the late to the early hunt on his 2010 Limited Entry Landowner Bull Elk Panguitch Lake permit. Mr. Miller's 2010 permit was previously extended to 2011.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Eric Tycksen to convert a Mt. Dutton archery elk voucher to a Mt. Dutton any weapon elk voucher for this hunting year, 2011. Also adjust the allocation to MDF next year to one any weapon elk voucher and two archery elk vouchers.

- 4) Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (Action)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented by the Division.

- 5) Cougar Management Plan and Revised Harvest Recommendations (Action)

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we put South Slope Bonanza, Diamond Mountain, Vernal Unit back into year round harvest objective.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed 5 to 1 with John Bair opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the cougar management plan and revised harvest recommendations including the change on the South Slope Bonanza/Diamond Mountain/ Vernal Unit.

- 6) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy W1AG-04 (Action)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy W1AG-04 as presented by the Division.

- 7) Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (Action)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bobcat harvest Recommendations as presented by the Division.

- 8) Walk-In Access Rule Amendment R657- (Action)

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Walk-In Access Rule Amendment as presented and ask the Division to look at ways of adding watchable wildlife activities to the Walk In Access program.

- 9) FY 2013 Fee Schedule (Action)

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the FY 2013 Fee Schedule as presented by the Division.

- 10) Convention Permit Audit (Action)

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

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

- 11) Convention Permit Allocation (Action)

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

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

- 12) Falconry 5-day Non-Resident Meet License request (Action)

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Mike King and passed 5 to 1 with Jake Albrecht opposed.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Falconry 5-day Non-resident meet license request.

13) Other Business (Contingent)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we appoint John Bair to the DOPL Board as representative for the Wildlife Board.

Approved

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING
August 18, 2011, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, UT

Wildlife Board Present

Del Brady (Chair)
Ernie Perkins (Vice Chair)
Mike King
John Bair
Jim Karpowitz (Exec Sec)
Calvin Crandall
Bill Fenimore
Jake Albrecht

RAC Chairs Present

Steve Flinders – Southern
Derris Jones – Southeastern
Fred Oswald – Central
Floyd Briggs – Northeastern
Robert Byrnes – Northern

Public Present

Lee Howard
Byron Bateman
Wayne Hutchings
John Childs
Jordan Hasler
Chad Coburn
Ken Strong
Ryan Foutz
Josh Horrocks

Division of Wildlife Resources

Cindee Jensen
Randy Wood
Staci Coons
Dean Mitchell
LuAnn Petrovich
Justin Dolling
Mike Fowlks
Judi Tutorow
Kevin Bunnell
Bill Bates
Justin Shannon
Amy Canning
Leslie McFarlane
Greg Sheehan
Alan Clark
Jim Parrish

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

Chairman Brady welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife Board and RAC Chairs. He specifically welcomed the new Wildlife Board members, John Bair, Mike King and Calvin Crandall.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

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

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

P. 5, last motion, add “with invasive species” after infested.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the June 9, 2011 Wildlife Board meeting as corrected.

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

Ernie Perkins said there are no items coming up today.

4) DWR Update (**Information**)

Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director presented this agenda item. We are going to run a bill to change the classification of wolves to be treated the same as bears and cougars, rather than under furbearer. The only part of Utah that we have authority over wolves is a small piece of land in northeastern Utah, east of I-84. This will establish a wolf hunting permit. They have asked Senator Christensen to run this bill.

Also on the status of Mexican wolves, they are on a fast track for determination of listing. We have been participating in discussions with the Service and other states involved. Our position is Mexican wolves are not native to Utah. The DWR’s approach in these meetings is to impress on the Fish and Wildlife Service that this never was historic Mexican wolf habitat and we don’t want them here. That determination will be made in 2012 so it is on a fast track.

Mr. Fenimore asked if Wyoming has resolved their issues on the wolves.

Director Karpowitz said they have come to an agreement with the Fish and Wildlife Service and are moving forward with delisting in Wyoming.

Sage grouse are also part of this fast track determination by the USFWS. They will make a determination on Greater Sage grouse in 2015 and on Gunnison sage grouse in 2012. We have both subspecies in Utah. We are especially concerned with what is happening with Greater Sage grouse. Utah has invested a lot of money and effort to avoid listing. By 2015 the USFWS will determine if they will be listed. Right now they are warranted for listing. In the meantime, the Bureau of Land Management is developing new policy and guidelines on development of habitat for sage grouse. They are moving rapidly in developing adequate regulatory mechanisms. There will be interim guidelines in place some time next month and permanent guidelines by 2014, ahead of the time when the FWS makes final determination. Jason Robinson, DWR biologist is on the technical committee and we will be participating at local levels on this process.

We had a very wet spring. We had about \$250,000 in damage and we are working to get funding through FEMA and the legislature to help repair the damage. It was most significant in the northern region but other areas also.

Mr. Bair asked what type of damage.

Director Karpowitz said flood damage, mostly in WMAs in northern Utah, but there was also some damage where we own properties along stream courses like the Sevier River.

On big game depredation, we just closed our fiscal year and for the first time we had to pro rate depredation payments to landowners at 81 cents on the dollar. The main reason we had to do that was because feed prices are so high. This pushed us over what we had budgeted for damage. We notified the Farm Bureau and Department of Agriculture and we are asking for a building block to address this problem through the legislature.

When we closed our books we went about one million in the hole and we had to dip into our bank account. We had a good briefing on the budget yesterday.

All of our remaining deer tags sold out in less than three hours. It shut down the entire system because of the demand. We have met with people who work on the state website and told them this is not acceptable. 10,000 documents were sold on that morning.

There has been a task force studying law enforcement in both Parks and Wildlife. It is winding down and recommendations are being finalized. We do not expect to see major changes, but there will be some changes. We will see how this turns out over the next few months and it will be discussed at the legislature.

Also some personnel changes are Kevin Bunnell is our new Chief of Wildlife and Jim Davis, Kirk Enright and Ben Franklin retired.

Mr. King asked about the BLM coming up with a new set of guidelines for development.

Director Karpowitz said it is essentially all development on public lands. That primarily affects energy development, but it could affect power transmission corridors and any other development. Temporary guidelines will be out soon.

Mr. Fenimore said USA Today had a section on the beauties of Farmington Bay. Our managers are to be commended for that.

Director Karpowitz said it was listed as one of top 51 destinations to visit in the U.S. to view wildlife.

Mr. Fenimore said Director Karpowitz just received an award from the National Wildlife Association of Federal Agencies. It is an honor to see our Director receive that award.

Director Karpowitz said he would just as soon not talk about it. He does appreciate the award and it came as quite a surprise. It was a real honor from a group that he respects, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Mr. Albrecht asked for an update on the bison count.

Justin Shannon, Wildlife Manager from Southeast region, said it went well. They saw 39 of the 43 collared bison. There were just over 300 adults. Based on the permits we should be under the 350 population on the Henry Mountains.

5) Board Variances – Time Certain 9:30 am **(Action)**
(See Variance Requests in Board Packet)

Steven T Oberto – by phone

Judi Tutorow presented this information. He was diagnosed with cancer and could not hunt last year. He said he submitted paperwork to the Division last October, but we didn't get it. We did receive an application for a COR for extension of a limited entry hunt, but he did not qualify. There was some confusion on this. He must have thought the paperwork was for a variance. He contacted the Division in June wondering where the variance was and at that point it was after the 200 day deadline.

Mr. King asked about the process.

Ms. Tutorow said they have a form they would fill out and they would include medical documentation along with their original tag. Most of these requests are medically related. If we can approve them through the Division Variance committee, we do it at our level and otherwise it goes to the Board.

Mr. King asked if there is written information that explains to the hunter what they have to do with the license.

Ms. Tutorow said no. It is in the guidebook.

Mr. Fenimore said in the letter from Mr. Oberto he talks about contacting the Price Office and providing them with information. Was that done within the 200 day deadline.

Ms. Tutorow said she talked to the Price Office and they don't have any documentation from him. Where the confusion came was in applying for the COR for the extended hunt. We received that and the medical information. She thinks the confusion came where he thought the COR was a variance request form.

Mr. Fenimore said this is an example where an individual did not understand the process.

Director Karpowitz said it does get complicated when dealing with multiple rules and deadlines, but most people figure it out.

At this point Mr. Oberto was called on the phone.

Chairman Brady asked him to describe his situation.

Mr. Oberto explained the process in which they determined he has cancer. He went through radiation, chemotherapy and surgery. After that he was not to lift anything over 8 lbs for over a three month period and light duty up to 6 months. During that time the hunt came around. He and his Dad decided to go see if he could do it before the hunt with hiking and all. There was no way he could do this. He is asking for a variance to extend his hunt.

Mr. Crandall said this was in January 2010 and shortly thereafter he was drawn out for the permit. He had no idea at that point he wouldn't be able to hunt.

Mr. Oberto said that is correct. He was diagnosed with a very aggressive cancer.

Mr. Crandall asked what the date of the hunt was.

Mr. Oberto said it was in September. He has sent his license and information back to the Division.

Mr. Crandall asked if he still wasn't feeling well enough to hunt and that is why he is asking for this variance.

Mr. Oberto said doing the repetitive walking and hiking with a pack wiped him out.

Mr. Crandall asked if his health is now such that he could hunt this year.

Mr. Oberto said he is back to work and feeling well. He goes in for a check up every three months with blood work, and they will do this for the next five years.

Mr. Fenimore asked about the date when he decided he wouldn't be able to hunt and when he contacted the Price Office. Tell us about that timeframe.

Mr. Oberto said the second day of the hunt he was unable to hike and hunt. He was just too sick and weak to hunt since he had been so limited on physical activity. He told his Dad he was sorry, but he just couldn't hike and hunt. They drove around some and talked to some other hunters, but that was about it. He didn't try to go out again. Someone at his work told him about asking for a variance on his hunt because of the situation. He then went down to the Price Office 5-6 days after the hunt had ended. Within a few days they gave him information to contact Kenny at the Salt lake Office. He thought with the information he gave him, they had the ball rolling. There was a miscommunication, because he wasn't aware of the total process. He recently contacted Kenny again and was told he was past the 200 days deadline.

Mr. Fenimore asked if Mr. Oberto contacted Kenny within the 200 day window.

Ms. Tutorow said they talked in October and it was within the deadline.

Mr. King asked what the extension is exactly.

Chairman Brady said it is the same hunt for 2011.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request for Steven T Oberto to extend his 2010 LE Bull Elk Permit Central Mtns, Manti (early) to 2011.

Kiara Trussell

Mr. Bateman congratulated the new Wildlife Board members. Just after Christmas he was contacted about a little 12 year old girl who has a disease call Fredricks Attackia. It is a debilitating neurological disease that attacks the limbs. She was diagnosed six years ago. He is asking for the opportunity for Kiara to hunt a mule deer buck. This is her dream. Part of our mission at SFW is to continue and promote the family tradition of hunting. He told Kiara that they would make it happen. On the COR they are asking that she be able to hunt early on the Ensign Ranch CWMU. She passed her Hunter's Safety and is ready to hunt. This is something we have never done before. SFW has her hunting license and they are ready to go. It is all private land and will have no impact on the public.

Director Karpowitz said the Division supports this recommendation. We had another issue like this earlier in the month with a fellow who was coming to the end of his life. We granted a variance using one of our rules we had in place. It's a good thing we acted quickly because he passed away last week. We are supportive of these situations.

Mr. Bair said he knows this young lady and her family. He was able to visit with them and she has received a lot of special attention at several events this year. It has been exciting to see the build up to this hunt. He would urge the Board to approve this.

Mr. Crandall asked if she is physically able to do this.

Mr. Bateman said the folks on the CWMU will help with this. The gun will be mounted with a claw and it has no recoil. She has shot a rifle before. She said she is going to have jerky made out of this deer and has a place in the house to put the mount.

Mr. Crandall said he is in favor of this, but his concern is opening the opportunity to maybe 100s of others asking for the same thing.

Director Karpowitz said we have very few of these variances where people are in this sort of condition. He is not concerned that we will set an unmanageable precedence.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance for Kiara Trussell to hunt starting August 19, 2011 on the Ensign CWMU.

Mr. Albrecht said he thinks it's great that SFW and this CWMU provide opportunities like this.

Chairman Brady said the next variance is for Edward Peterson.

Ms. Tutorow said he has not shown up today, so we will put it off for now.

Charles Miller

Ms. Tutorow said Mr. Spinks is speaking for Mr. Miller today.

Terrason Spinks said he is here on behalf of Charles Miller. Last year they purchased tags from the SCI banquet for the Panguitch Lake Elk hunt, an early and late tag. Charles' wife went into labor earlier than expected. The request is to extend his hunt into 2011.

Mr. Crandall said the request is for a variance for the late hunt being moved to the early hunt.

Mr. Spinks said that's right.

Mr. Albrecht clarified the request.

Mr. Spinks said they had two vouchers, one for himself that he turned in for an early hunt and they saved one for the late hunt. Three days before that hunt they turned it in thinking they'd get the voucher for this year, but it was for the late hunt, rather than early.

Ms. Tutorow said when a voucher is turned into a permit, we work off of that permit. It was turned in as a permit which identified which hunt he had chosen. The variance went through the committee, but now the question is can we take that same permit and change the season date to earlier, based on this request.

Mr. Bair asked if he had requested this before he turned the permit in last year he could have gotten the early hunt, is that correct?

Ms. Tutorow said once he chose the hunt he wanted and the permit is redeemed, we can't change the hunt back to anything else. Once chosen and it is printed, that is his hunt. The committee cannot change it.

Mr. Perkins said this seems a relatively minor change in comparison with others we have done. Could this be made as an amendment to the rule? It might be something that could be looked at.

Ms. Tutorow said she would refer that to Mr. Bunnell, because once you start moving hunters around on season dates with certain quotas that has to be considered.

Mr. Perkins asked if it would be appropriate to look at this for the next time.

Mr. Spinks praised Ms. Tutorow for following through, returning phone calls and doing everything she can.

Chairman Brady said this is a landowner permit, late or early. This is ok with the landowner, right?

Mr. Spinks said this did go before the landowner committee to reissue last year's tag for this year. They are okay with it.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Charles Miller to change the season from the late to the early hunt on his 2010 Limited Entry Landowner Bull Elk Panguitch Lake permit. Mr. Miller's 2010 permit was previously extended to 2011.

Eric Tycksen

Mike Laughter of MDF is asking to approve converting a Mt. Dutton Archery Elk permit to a Mt. Dutton any weapon permit for this hunting year, 2011. MDF sold an archery tag to Lance Red whose grandson was killed in a tragic gun related accident. Nobody in that family wants to hunt this permit. They are looking to help them out by converting it to an any weapon tag they have someone who will purchase it at this time and be able to make use of it. MDF has the voucher in hand.

Chairman Brady clarified the request.

Director Karpowitz said this is similar to one the Board dealt with on mountain goats last year.

Alan Clark, Assistant Director, said he researched the Board minutes from a year ago because there was some discussion similar to this in the action that was taken. He went

over this exchange. The Division and the MDF have a lot of leeway on marketing a voucher. If they choose to do this the Division would recommend that the MDF would have one any weapon and two archery permits for next year to keep the playing field level.

Mr. Albrecht asked if this hunt could be extended to next year as an archery hunt. Can they keep the voucher and sell it next year?

Mr. Clark said the Board has other options. We don't have to extend it. Generally we like to have the hunts this year. We have not extended vouchers in the past. The limited entry archery opens this Saturday. The solution that MDF offers is something the Board could do.

Mr. King said this voucher has already been sold.

Mr. Laughter said yes it was sold to Lance Red. They will sell it to someone else and reimburse the original buyer.

Director Karpowitz said limited entry archery starts September 18.

Mr. Bair asked if they have a buyer lined up for the tag.

Mr. Laughter said yes.

Mr. Perkins said he feels this family has been through a difficult time and MDF has worked out something that will work. The Division is okay with this also.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we grant the variance request of Eric Tycksen to convert a Mt. Dutton Archery Elk voucher to a Mt. Dutton any weapon elk voucher for this hunting year, 2011. Also adjust the allocation to MDF next year to one any weapon elk voucher and two archery vouchers.

Mr. Clark clarified that it is August 20 that should be on the form.

Chairman Brady said we will not address the variance request of Mr. Peterson because he didn't attend the meeting today.

6) Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (**Action**)

Justin Dolling, Waterfowl/Upland Game Coordinator presented this agenda item. Waterfowl are a federally regulated species. The USFWS sets the outer limits for harvest and season length. As a state we can be more restrictive, but never go beyond those limits. He went over goose/swan status, May ponds, N.A. duck breeding populations,

2011 regulation decision, regulation packages on the Pacific Flyway, Scaup populations on state WMA's, 2011 season frameworks and 2011 contingency regulations. (See Powerpoint Presentation)

Mr. King asked what the rationale is for going from 2 times to 3 times on the bag limit.

Mr. Dolling said there are a few reasons, one is, lots of folks like to travel to different states to hunt and it would allow them to bring back more birds and further offer opportunity to allow them to stay in that other state for a longer period of time.

Mr. Fenimore said years ago some of the duck clubs up north were taken out of the swan area by USFWS due to concern over trumpeter swans being taken. That hasn't been a real issue as of late. Next year could the Division petition the USFWS service to expand that swan area to give more opportunity to hunters that have opportunity outside of that given area and get it expanded to where it used to be for swan hunts?

Mr. Dolling said he could try that. We almost lost our swan hunt a decade ago and as a result of that there was a lot of legal action between the USFWS and the Trumpeter Swan Society. The legal issue was surrounding the tri-state trumpeter population. As a settlement the EA spelled out that the states cannot liberalize tundra swan hunting until the tri-state population reaches an objective of 500. Currently they are at about 343. I can still petition it, but this is the background on it.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Howard asked if the 10 limit on the white geese is an effort to control the numbers.

Mr. Dolling said in part it is. There is some indication that our snow goose population is following the trends of the mid-continent population, so we increased the daily bag to 10 to get ahead of that population growth, so yes.

RAC Recommendations

All RACs voted unanimously to accept the Division's recommendations.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Bill Fenimore and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 as presented by the Division.

7) Cougar Management Plan and Revised Harvest Recommendations (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief presented this agenda item. Two things that will be presented is a proposed amendment to the cougar plan followed by harvest recommendations that would reflect that amendment. As a preface, we passed the three

year cougar recommendation last year, so in the event that we decide not to go forward with the proposed amendment there is a recommendation in place. He then went over a map of cougar habitat and a cougar mortality 1989-2011 bar graph. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The details of the cougar management plan amendment were then addressed. This came about by the Wildlife Board requesting that the Division create a closer link between deer and cougar management. The proposed amendment will create "cougar management areas" around the units where deer survival is being tracked creating the requested link. The Division is tracking adult deer survival with radio-collars on eight units throughout the State.

Mr. Fenimore asked if when there is a mortality, does somebody go in and determine cause of death.

Mr. Bunnell said we do not have the time to determine that. What we do know is adult survival is about 85%. If it drops, there is the potential that cougars are having a negative effect on that population. He went with the presentation. They will also apply the quotas on this larger cougar management scale. This will allow people to take advantage of favorable conditions and increase the overall harvest of cougars. As a safety valve a female sub-quota will be put in place to prevent over harvesting of cougar. An example of how this will work was explained. Harvest management criteria, 2011-2013 permit recommendations and season dates (unchanged) were presented.

Mr. King said the Division thinks the harvest may be increased by as much as 10% based on this new amendment. Is that an average overall of the management areas? Do you think some areas might be harvested more or less?

Mr. Bunnell said there is the potential of that if you look at it unit by unit. If you think of it in terms of cougars and the scale they use the landscape at, some cougar might cover 2-3 units. The scale we've grouped them at is appropriate particularly when you look at dispersal.

Mr. Bair said the concerns he has been hearing are units that he has hunted for years that are very popular, now under this scenario, come the end of February they could be open to quota for quite some time. Some of these units have closed in the past and even exceeded the quota that was set in as little as 2-3 days. Is there not some concern that these units will sustain the bulk of the harvest where the other side of the mountain will get very little harvest or pressure. Might this be a little counter-productive in that way?

Mr. Bunnell said there are some things we'll have to watch as we go forward. If that dynamic happened we could address it. Most of the units you are talking about are split units. Currently, there are a particular number of limited entry tags in each unit and whatever is left becomes the quota for that unit. Under this scenario, if we start seeing that, we could put more limited entry tags in the units that are going to get less attention after the transition from limited entry to harvest objective. This will force hunters with limited entry tags into the areas that we know might not get the harvest, knowing that the

quota is now at the larger management area and once we get the transition done, hunters can go into the more popular areas where we would put fewer limited entry permits.

Mr. Bair asked if we couldn't just keep the hunt quotas in the units that they are presently. Would that fit into the plan?

Mr. Bunnell said we could. If we did that we probably wouldn't increase cougar harvest. In general, that is what the Board was asking us to do, particularly in areas where we have struggling deer herds.

Mr. Bair asked if we couldn't just increase the quota.

Mr. Bunnell said you could but then you'd end up increasing quotas in the more popular areas that you're concerned about already.

Mr. Crandall asked if the cougar population is stable.

Mr. Bunnell said you cannot think of cougar populations on a unit by unit scale because they use the landscape at a broader scale. He referred to the cougar mortality graph and said the population has stabilized at the lower level over the last 5-6 years.

Mr. Crandall asked if they have people issues with cougars.

Mr. Bunnell said occasionally and we just move them on. It is not a huge issue. Compared to the other western states we are very aggressive in dealing with these problems.

Mr. Crandall asked if cougars will disperse after the pressure of the hunts.

Mr. Bunnell said yes over 2-3 years.

Mr. King asked how the relationship between cougar population and harvest relates to deer population and harvest.

Mr. Bunnell said they do not line up very well. The numbers do adjust themselves. If the deer population drops, then the cougars will move on. Studies show there is a seven year lag in the cougar's adjustment to the prey base.

Mr. Perkins said a biologist expressed concern that we are moving away from our deer population versus objective criteria that we've used in the past for predator management plans and going to the adult deer survival. He felt both triggers were important and we shouldn't abandon one. When we changed our criteria for predator management and went to the 85% adult survival trigger, what is the impact that we've seen on the units that we've got. How many come out of cougar management plans and how many go in with this change of criteria?

Mr. Bunnell said that is in his next presentation. If we use adult survival as the trigger for predator management for cougars and the 85% the level, it actually increases the number of units under predator management across the state for deer. Two drop out and six come in under the higher female sub quotas.

Mr. Perkins said we keep working the split season transition date year after year and for the benefit of our new members could you go through the history on it?

Mr. Bunnell said starting in 2004 the transition date had been about the middle of February. Two years ago at the request of some of the houndsmen, the Board moved the limited entry hunt's end to the end of February and the harvest objective season starts the first or second Saturday in March, about a two week shift. Now there's been a request to move it back to the first of February, two weeks in the opposite direction. He's not sure how much it affects it.

Mr. Perkins said the Northern region rejected changing the plan and staying with the current plan. The discussion that came from that was to stay with the current units and apply female sub quotas to those units.

Mr. Bunnell said it was to change the trigger for predator management but hunt at the reduced scale. We could do that but at that point the female sub quotas at that smaller scale doesn't work very well. The units are so small that they close down in the first day or two. It actually pressures the hunters to take an animal sooner rather than look for a better animal. It is doable, but he would stick with the straight sub-quota system.

Chairman Brady said if we do this amendment, we would need to maintain collared does. He only sees that in a part of the Book Cliffs.

Mr. Bunnell said the collars are there relative to a study looking at paving the Seep Ridge road. We thought while we have collars on the Book Cliffs let's take advantage of them and pull those out. If we lost those collars then the Book Cliffs would be attached to one of the other cougar management areas. We would look at the adult deer survival on the Book Cliffs over the time we have collars there compared to the surrounding units and see which one was most representative. At that point we would have to attach them to an other management area.

Chairman Brady asked if there were questions from the audience, not comments.

Lee Howard asked if under the present plan, is the female quota 40% of harvest?

Mr. Bunnell said it depends where you're at. For units where adult female survival is below 85%, it is between 40-50% of the overall quota. For the other units it is between 25-30% of the overall quota.

Mr. Howard said on the sheep units, these are under harvest objectives. The units are Rattlesnake, Range Creek, San Rafael and North Slope, is that right?

Mr. Bunnell said yes plus the Pilots, Stansbury, Zion, and Avinaquin. On all of those we would apply this individual minimum harvest level. They wouldn't close down with the rest of the area unless the minimum harvest had been met in the areas where we have bighorn sheep.

Mr. Howard said he is concerned with the number of lions being taken on the San Rafael. It was closed in two days and we don't have enough opportunity. Can we increase those units at this point?

Mr. Bunnell said under our proposal you would never see the San Rafael, Kaiparowitz or the Rattlesnake close.

Chairman Brady asked if the RACs had any questions. There were none and it returned to public questions.

Chad Coburn, Utah Houndsmen Association said Mr. Bunnell didn't mention the emergency order to reopen those units. What other measures were taken by the Division on this emergency situation to help those deer and sheep units? What other measures, working under the assumption that it was lions eating these deer?

Mr. Bunnell said they increased the money by tens of thousands of dollars, they spend on coyote control on every one of those units, specifically when it was a deer issue.

Jordan Hasler said in response to the question on the overlay of data on deer and cougar population and harvest. When cougars are harvested and we see the deer population increase, could you address that?

Mr. Bunnell said during the time period when we reduced the cougar population on the Monroe, we did not see an appreciable increase in the deer population.

Mr. Hasler asked if the new plan is more in response to increase cougar harvest, or what is in the best interest for the cougar population.

Mr. Bunnell said both. We are here at the direction of the Board to address this issue. If we would have had the opportunity to link cougar populations to adult deer survival at the time we wrote the cougar management plan, we would have done it. Adult survival on the Monroe is not the issue and we know that now because we have collars there. What this does is it allows us to focus our efforts rather than guessing.

Mr. Hasler said the study on the Monroe showed that harvesting lions does not increase the deer population. Why would we assume that is the case on other units?

Mr. Bunnell said because on the other units where we are applying the higher female sub quotas, the adult deer survival is below the 85% which gives us an indication that there is

something going on with that survival and there is a much greater link between adult survival and cougar predation than anything else.

Kim Payne asked what they'll do if one unit has an over harvest and the other doesn't, when they've said they would increase the limited entry to push hunters in that direction. What happens next year when you've increased the limited entry? For example, on the Monroe, if on the Thousand Lake you don't harvest any lion, then increase the limited entry the next year, when it goes to harvest objective that spring, you'll be able to kill that many more lion on the Monroe. Then you'd do that for two more years.

Mr. Bunnell said we wouldn't just increase the limited entry on the Thousand Lakes in that instance, we would shift limited entry permits, so there would be fewer limited entry permits on the other units. The overall quota would remain the same. We would just force more people into the Thousand Lakes in this example, during the limited entry season. We would not increase the overall number of permits. He then gave an example using the Fish Lake Unit.

Mr. Payne said if you do that to 2-3 units, the harvest is still coming out of the same place.

Mr. Bunnell said the overall number of tags is set on a broader scale and will not be different.

Orin Midzinski said this is a heated debate. The harvest has been maintained for quite a while but the demographic is changing. Why are we seeing more females and young cougars being taken?

Mr. Bunnell said because the population is not as high as it was 10-15 years ago. We are not changing what we will look at for permits in the future. If the adult females are above the 20% level, the plan says we will reduce the number of tags by a certain percentage. We will still do that under this scenario. If the number of females comes up, the number of tags will come down in the future.

Mr. Midzinski asked why such a jump? In the Cache area we are looking at a female sub quota at 11. We don't have that many cats up there. Why are you shooting that number so high?

Mr. Bunnell said when we set the female sub quotas, they took 15 years of data to get 15-20% adult female harvest. If you have between 25-30% overall female harvest, you have between 15-20% adult female harvest. The female sub quota is based on trying to accomplish the objectives on adult females that we have set in the plan.

Mr. Midzinski said he sees that the female sub quota has some merit to it. We are basing so much of this information on collared deer, why aren't we finding out what is killing the deer?

Mr. Bunnell said we are going to on some individual units. Statewide on these eight units we are spending \$300,000 annually determining the 85% adult survival issue.

The discussion continued on what might be killing the deer and cougar management.

RAC Recommendations

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said their motion was to keep the current plan that was passed last year. This motion passed 12 to 1. Most of the comment was from the active houndsmen. They feel their effort per cougar is up substantially and the population is down. The Board and public feel that changing to the management areas will increase the take on cougars in some areas.

Northeastern – Mr. Briggs said the motion passed 5 to 1 with some concerns from both sides. Houndsmen were concerned with over harvest and some landowners worried there might not be enough cats harvested. It was a mixed opinion. He feels this was passed because they live in an area where the deer are struggling.

Central – Mr. Oswald said they had a motion to accept the proposal and it passed 7 to 4. The 4 who were in opposition felt it was not appropriate to change the plan. We should stick with it until it is revised.

Southeastern – Mr. Jones said they passed the proposal 6 to 5. They had a lot of discussion and public comment. Most houndsmen were against it and were worried the female quota wouldn't kick in in time and all the cats would be killed. Mr. Bunnell indicated that he doubted this would happen. The reason this passed is they are tying the adult deer survival to the cougar harvest and hope this will help actually save some cougars. It will keep us from putting PMP on units where it won't do any good.

Southern – Mr. Flinders said they voted to accept the amended cougar plan with the exception that the harvest objective split season start February 1st. People want to do what they can to help the deer herds. Their meeting was well attended by SFW members in the region. During the comment period no one identified himself as a houndsman. The motion passed 10 to 1.

Public Comment

Wade Lemon said he recommends keep the existing management plan. He also recommends that Diamond Mountain stay open year round and put the statewide governor tag to year round as well. Thousand Lakes, under the new plan, will have no lion killed on it. It is difficult to hunt. In the winter the road is closed and later on still can't get in to hunt. Road closures need to be taken into account on the various lion units.

Mr. Bair asked if Diamond Mountain has been year round before?

Mr. Brady said it is a split season currently.

Josh Horrocks of Northeastern Utah Coalition and Diamond Mountain Landowners Association addressed the Board. When the 2011 season was changed to a split unit from harvest objective, they harvested one cougar on the South Slope/Bonanza/Diamond Mountain/Vernal Unit 9BCD. It should be changed to a harvest objective unit. (See Attachment #1) They have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars doing prescribed burns for the bighorn sheep in the unit and fencing off areas for the domestic livestock so they cannot get in with the bighorn sheep. FNAWS spent thousands of dollars purchasing the grazing rights from the landowners. Also in northeast region we are 22,400 below our objective. Another reason we need to stay on top of managing cougars since this unit is location surrounded by sheep units. We, in Utah, need to look at how Colorado manages their deer units, keeping track of how many lions come out of each unit. We need to set quota for individual little units. He went on to explain how Colorado does their management. These areas are too broad for management. Houndsmen truly love hunting and pursuing cougar and they don't want to see them wiped out. We should implement some of Colorado's ideas to address some of our problems. The South Slope Diamond Mountain units should be harvest objective.

Ernie Millgate said he can see both sides of what is being conducted today. Having been on the cougar committee drafting the new management plan, it was set up to work. We haven't given the plan a chance to work. It has only been in place for one year. This recommendation has some potential to do some real damage. Beaver Mountain could be wiped out and then onto the Monroe if we go with this amendment. The areas people will want to take lions off of are not going to happen. He is embarrassed that we are going to try this again, wiping out the lions. There were only three lions taken off the Henry's in the last three years and the deer are doing great. Up north the lions have been wiped out and the deer still are not doing very well. He doesn't understand why we're going this direction once more.

Orin Midzinski said he is a houndsmen. He asked the Board to take into consideration the public input. The information is indicating the lion population in Utah is not at sustaining numbers because of the females and young lions being taken. He does not want to jeopardize the tool of hunting lions. It shouldn't be done at such a drastic level. There are many other things adding to lion mortality. Stop making the lions the scapegoat. Don't try this again. We have a plan in place from last year. Give it a chance to work.

Lee Howard said he is representing himself. He would like to see the bighorn sheep areas have the cougar quotas doubled. He has a hard time realizing that cougars don't have an impact on deer. It has to be a factor. When we transplanted sheep on the Wasatch Front, we had a quota of 12 and over that year we killed 44 cougars. We don't have a good handle on how many cougars are in the state. We should stick with the old plan. He would like to see the Diamond Mountain area go back to harvest objective.

Jordan Hasler said he was raised by a deer hunter and grew up as a deer hunter. When he turned 21 years old he got into dogs and is passionate about them. For years now we've been on a "snipe hunt" looking to save deer populations and he believes in the sink-source stable model. He has spent hours this past year learning about the biology. He does not believe that what is being presented today, nor the associated tag numbers is the right way to move forward. He does believe that refining it and moving forward with a better plan would benefit deer hunters and lion population.

Chad Coburn, Utah Houndsmen's Association said the reason the houndsmen are not showing up is because they are not being heard. They are very frustrated. They're not coming to the RAC meetings any more. They are going with preconceived ideas and they are not representing the public's concerns. We already have a plan in place that hasn't worked yet. The Division and Board assume the lions are killing deer. They need to find out what is killing the deer. We need to do things biologically, not in an emergency. You have a responsibility today to ask yourselves, "are we making a movement, by the Board, amended to make changes on mule deer under the assumption?" Today you are not making that move. They have a responsibility today to make changes on the deer. The lion population has been addressed and there have been no results. He would like to see the RACs and Board have a dialogue about the opinions and recommendations of the houndsmen.

Ryan Foutz, President of Utah FNAWS said he supports harvest objective out on Diamond Mountain as presented by Mr. Horrocks. Also, he thanked Mr. Bunnell for his efforts. He has done a good job explaining the eco region versus the units. He feels torn today on the issue. There is a fine line between what impacts are affecting the deer. Nobody wants to see the lions killed off. We're trying to do a lot of things to try to recover our deer herds.

Byron Bateman, SFW President said their Board met and had a lot of discussion. A lot of these guys hunt lion, bear, deer and sheep. Their Board voted to go along with the Division's recommendation with a few exceptions. The first exception is to go back to the February 1st split and the other is for the South Slope Diamond Mountain put back into harvest objective. They spent lots of money getting it ready for bighorn sheep. Lions move in and out of that area and we are going to put sheep out there eventually. We need to be ready. Northeastern region reduced deer permits by 4,000 because the population is suffering. Lions do eat deer. He has hunted lions himself for over 40 years. Predator and prey is always a difficult issue. The Division has done a great job in determining what is affecting the deer herds. He was on the original group that put the cougar plan together ten years ago. Just because we come up with a plan, we still need to be flexible. The study on the Monroe will help in making decisions. We need to get the conservation cougar statewide permit made a year round permit. This permit has no biological effect and gives a lot of money to be used for research. Thank you for all you do for the state of Utah.

Lunch break

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC recommendations.

Director Karpowitz said he needs to clarify a few issues. He is not trying to affect the outcome either way. We tend to move back and forth on issues because the RACs and Wildlife Board are responding to public input. It was clear to the Division that the Board wanted them to find a way to accelerate cougar harvest without doing unacceptable damage to the cougar populations, so we moved that direction. On the emergency, after the post season deer classification last year and after we were well into the cougar season, we had exceptional snow conditions and many units closed very quickly including some units where we have deer herds that are really in trouble. After looking at our deer classification last year he was very concerned. In South Central and Southeast Utah there are deer units in severe stress. He felt we needed to act immediately and take emergency action to protect what deer were left coming out of last winter. We immediately put in \$175,000 additional money into coyote control and focused it on those units. We committed to longer term money for coyote control and we are now putting in over \$600,000 annually. We have committed over three million into coyote control over the last three years. We raised caps and allowed a few more cougars to be taken on those units. We did this in response to the Wildlife Board telling us we needed to do everything possible to help deer herds. He would like to dispel the rumor that the Division is only focused on cougars. If you don't think the Division isn't doing everything they can in several ways to help our struggling deer herds, then you just aren't paying attention. In the last five years we've spent 70 million dollars to improve habitat, over 600,000 acres. We've worked with UDOT and expended 45 million dollars on highway bypass structures. We've committed to huge research projects on mule deer. If you go to the tab on the website titled "What is the Division doing for deer?" Click on that and find out what we're doing. It is more than any other western state. Cougars are only part of the equation.

Director Karpowitz went on to say that after that emergency action, he decided not to do this again. He went to Mr. Bunnell and asked him to find some flexibility in the cougar harvest that will help us move hunters from unit to unit, depending on snow conditions and availability. We need to do that without compromising our cougar populations. Mr. Bunnell went to work to modify the existing plan to give more flexibility to move harvest around with a modest increase in cougar harvest. They also built some safe guards into it so we don't overdo it. That is why we're with this recommendation today. The Board led us this direction. They asked us to look for ways to accelerate cougar harvest. The way they are looking to do it is focusing on areas where the deer are in trouble. As long as he is Director, they will error on the side of mule deer. We have the ability to reduce cougars and we have the ability to grow cougars. We are trying to do what's best for deer and cougars in light of what the hunting public wants. The Division is okay with whatever the Board decides to do. He just doesn't want to get around to next December and have the Board tell them to figure out how to harvest more cougars.

Chairman Brady said he has been here for all the meetings and seen how the Division is working to benefit mule deer. He then asked the Division to address the Diamond Mountain harvest objective recommendation.

Charlie Greenwood, Wildlife manager for northeastern region said he would like to discuss what is happening with bighorn sheep in that area. They have been preparing for a lot of years for bighorn sheep transplants on the Diamond and other sites in the area. They never know from year to year when they might get sheep. They have been looking at the cougar population since 2004 in preparation for this when they changed the management from limited entry permits to harvest objective, placing more pressure on the cougar population. The Goslin Mountain bighorn herd came down with pneumonia a few years back and the herd was culled out to keep the disease from spreading. That herd is located adjacent to Diamond Mountain. They backed off from the release site at that point and it went to a split unit last year. The Region is fine with the Bonanza and Vernal/Diamond going to harvest objective. We have seen better cougar harvest under harvest objective in the region than we have the split strategy. We also have nuisance cougars around Vernal every year. If it went to harvest objective on the South Slope it would allow us to address this issue also.

Chairman Brady said they will address this issue separately from the management plan if the Board is in agreement.

Mr. Bair said Josh Horrocks gave a great presentation. With that and after hearing the local biologist's information, he is in favor of moving Diamond Mountain back into harvest objective.

Mr. Crandall asked if that one unit was enough. Are there several units that might be combined?

Mr. Greenwood said the unit would be the Diamond/Bonanza /Vernal Unit.

Mr. King asked if it is alright to act on this since it came from the RAC and has not gone through the whole system. This has just come up today.

Chairman Brady said this type of thing has happened and it is part of the discussion we're having with cougars. He was at the RAC and asked Mr. Briggs to talk about this discussion.

Mr. Briggs said they had this discussion at the northeastern RAC and the representative from the Diamond Mountain didn't make it that night. One of the Board members is part of the Diamond Mountain organization and he made the amendment to the motion for this and we didn't get a second. Mr. Briggs thinks it was unclear and they didn't have these numbers in front of them. The discussion was made of how the cougar harvested brought decline with their concerns about it. When we voted we didn't have all the information that would have more than likely changed our decision on this.

Mr. King said the Division could live with this recommendation, right?

Director Karpowitz said yes.

Mr. Crandall asked if this might affect the existing or amended plan.

Mr. Bunnell said probably not. The way the plan is currently written is units that are under a PMP, the plan specifies that they should be hunted harvest objective or split. Units that aren't under PMP are hunted as limited entry or split units. This area would qualify for predator management. The other discussion we have just had in terms of units below 85% on adult survival, the Uintahs unit qualifies for that. It would be in line to hunt as harvest objective.

Mr. Perkins asked if any adjustment to permit numbers would be required.

Mr. Bunnell said no, because we set split quotas and harvest objective quotas in the same way. In some areas of the state we have had a higher harvest on split units than on harvest objective. We are still trying to figure out where the dynamic works and where it doesn't. Part of what was being considered is we didn't think we'd get the drop off in the harvest that we did. One year might not be definitive, but it did happen.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we put South Slope Bonanza, Diamond Mountain, Vernal Unit back into year round harvest objective.

Chairman Brady said they will now go on to the discussion of the Cougar Management Plan as presented.

Mr. Perkins said he appreciates Director Karpowitz's comments on the deer and cougar management discussion and going back and forth. He has heard multiple comments about wiping out the cougars again like back in the 90's. Back then there were changes being made in objectives without scientific data to back them up. It was just a feeling that there were eight cougars in every canyon and on the flip side, you could go out for 40 days and cut one track. There was a huge amount of emotion and course decisions being made. The Wildlife Board, in the present case, asked the Division to consider and find ways to link deer and cougar one small piece of a very complicated mule deer issue. From that point forward we have left this in the hands of very competent biologists in the Division using the science. He does not like socially driven changes to management plans during their life, but when we have better data and a better scientific tool, he feels obligated to use this information. He believes the Division has come up with something that has the potential to help our cougar populations as well as the deer populations. He tried to find the counter balance between the deer hunters and the houndsmen. It popped up at the Central RAC meeting. We have a nonconsumptive cougar advocate, Kirk Robinson who said he was uncomfortable with this because it would probably result in

the killing of more cougar. Still he supports this proposal because it is worth a try to see what happens year after year. If it works, adult deer survival will come up and ultimately it will take pressure off the cougars. If it doesn't work we will try something else and it will still take pressure off the cougars, just like we did on the Monroe. This is just a tweak in the management plan. Good data on both deer and cougar will come from this. He supports this change and thanked the Division for the work they have put into it.

Mr. Crandall said he sees two changes, units and how they are grouped together and higher permit numbers. There is also the issue of the start date of the split season. Does this tweak the plan enough to get better management?

Mr. Bunnell said the numbers are the same. We just applied them to the larger areas and this is how we'll apply the quotas. In some of the areas where deer herds have been struggling, this will increase cougar harvest. That is the objective, but it does it in a way that it won't go overboard. The Monroe area is a prime objective. Closure will happen later there most likely. These are also areas we are concerned with the deer herds. It is all linked together. There are some unknowns here and we will watch it closely over the next two years. If we need to tweak it, we will.

Mr. Bair said he is very torn on this issue. We need to do everything we can for our deer herds and there have been very valid points brought up by the houndsmen. Mr. Bunnell has dealt very professionally with a very difficult issue.

Mr. Crandall said you are not done with the deer management plan yet. This is just a piece of it. This is not going to be a cure all for the deer herd.

Chairman Brady said if we had this adult doe survival a year ago that would have been part of the plan. That and going from the individual units to the eco regions are the only changes we've made. We took the two pieces and said this is the potential of what we could kill and the potential is still the same because the quotas haven't changed. What actual kill could change because you're not going to hit the quota in some areas that you would otherwise.

Mr. Bunnell said the potential is the same in terms of the numbers aren't changing, but this will increase harvest to probably 340-360 where we've been at about 300-310. That's the difference that he is predicting. We will see.

Mr. Perkins said, before making the motion that he promises the houndsmen if there is a significant problem that develops in this, he will be very sensitive in putting in a correction next year.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed 5 to 1 with John Bair opposed.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Cougar Management Plan and revised harvest recommendations including the change on the South Slope Bonanza/Diamond Mountain/ Vernal Unit as presented.

Mr. Perkins said he would propose a compromised date on the opener for the split harvest objective. Somewhere that does fall in the Division's recommendation also.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins and died for a lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we change the split harvest objective opening date to the Monday closest to February 15th.

Mr. Bunnell said there is a 4-5 day period between where one closes and the other opens because we have to compile the harvest from limited entry to determine what the quota is when we open for harvest objective. He suggested closing it on the Saturday closest to the 15th. It would open eight days later. A discussion took place as to how this would be worded.

Mr. Bair said he appreciates the spirit of compromise, but he has a concern with moving the opening date. Last year he had a friend draw a Southwest Manti tag and it took him 10 years to draw it. Snow conditions were good. He had some health problems. The timeframe really affects the hunters who have invested years and bonus points into drawing those permits. If there's a dead time on those limited entry units that is quite a negative for those hunters. We have dealt quite a blow to the houndsmen today and with changing the date that is a lot of change toward what they would consider to be a negative. Where we have the date toward the end of February is a good place for it. He appreciates the spirit of compromise on this motion, but he would like to see it unchanged.

Mr. Crandall asked why the first of March or February.

Mr. Bair said if he draws a limited entry permit on the Southwest Manti and the season starts the end of November, he gets to hunt until the end of February before it would go into harvest objective. It gives a few more prime days to those who have invested years into getting that permit. Sometimes you get lucky and kill a lion in the first few days. His opinion is it is better to leave it on March 1.

Mr. Crandall asked why we are hearing houndsmen who want to move it to February 1st.

Mr. Bair said that is coming from the deer hunting because of a windfall of lion harvest in those first few days. It would also shorten up the time for the outfitters to take the hunters out who have bought the conservation permits.

Mr. Perkins withdrew his motion and deferred to Mr. Bair's expertise.

Mr. Albrecht said he is okay with that. As a Wildlife Board we asked the Division to go back and look at the cougar plan, not specific dates. What Mr. Bunnell has presented is very good and it is a step forward.

8) Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy W1AG-04 (Action)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief presented this agenda item. He said we have discussed a lot of this information on the cougar side already, but he will cover changes on how we manage coyotes relative to deer. The purpose of this policy is to provide direction in managing predator populations. He went on to explain the policy. (See Powerpoint Presentation) The options available to the Division to remove predators were covered. Predator management plans and the criteria or triggers for consideration of a unit for predator management were covered. Relative to cougars, the changes made to the predator management policy to reflect what we just talked about in the amendment to the cougar plan, using adult survival as the trigger. If adult survival drops below 85% for two of the past three years in one of the cougar management areas, they would consider moving it into a predator management scenario or if it drops below 80% for one year. In the future we will look at over a three year period.

Mr. Crandall asked what the sensitive species are.

Mr. Bunnell said there are places where we are trying to increase sage grouse production. That is one of them. We are looking at red fox and raven control as well as coyote in that situation. Out in the Uintah Basin we have a black footed ferret recover area and we reduce coyotes in that area. Those are two of the species and also bighorn sheep and deer.

Mr. King asked how long units stay under predator management.

Mr. Bunnell said typically it is under for at least three years, but they look at it annually. On cougar it says they do not anticipate any unit being under predator management for more than two recommendation cycles, six years.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Howard asked if the Division could create a bounty on coyotes.

Mr. Bunnell said there is a bounty system in the state that is handled through the counties, but there are probably ways to make it more effective perhaps by increasing the bounty in the winter time where you are more likely to remove and break up reproduction and some things like that. Bounties are something we are not involved in at this point. Some of our regional folks have been discussing with the counties about ways to make it more effective. One of the problems is the money in place for a bounty is not being used. There is not an interest and it is being returned.

Mr. Howard said he is thinking toward increasing the bounty. At a meeting in St. George there was a cost analysis that said they are paying \$600 an animal to have ADC kill an animal.

Director Karpowitz said he's not sure on the amount, but it is pretty high per animal because we are asking them to do it a certain way so deer get the maximum benefit. He does not know that the Division could do it any more effectively. They are doing a good job and coordinating with us. We raised the bounty amount and encourage counties to participate. If they don't use the money it rolls back into the Wildlife Services.

Mr. Albrecht said in doing some management plans for deer in the future, it would be a good time for the Division to bring up the bounty program to the counties.

RAC Recommendations

Southern, Central and Northeastern RACs passed the recommendation unanimously.

Southeast – Mr. Jones said they passed it with one opposing vote.

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said they passed it 9 to 4.

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC recommendations.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by John Bair and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Managing Predatory Wildlife Species Policy W1AG-04 as presented by the Division.

Mr. Crandall asked why the Northern RAC was a split vote.

Mr. Byrnes said part of the concern is they had not adopted the 85% threshold on adult survival on the cougar management plan. They felt it would be somewhat confusing. They also felt the source of the data was good, so they would like to try to use it.

Director Karpowitz said the net effect of what the Board has done with these two rules is a good thing. It has linked cougar harvest with adult deer survival, and coyote control with fawn survival. That is something we have been missing in past years. The fact that we have these three to four hundred radio collars out on deer is really going to help us do a better job of targeting the right predator at the right place and time. We are focusing in on how best to do the predator control so it will benefit mule deer.

9) Bobcat Harvest Recommendations (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He said he will propose two things, first an amendment to the bobcat plan and recommendations that follow that. He presented a bar graph showing trapping harvest, average harvest and number of trappers from 1982-2011. He discussed the price of pelts as driving bobcat harvest through the years. In the last few years the average price has been over \$400 a pelt. The goal of the plan is to maintain a healthy bobcat population within existing suitable habitat and provide quality recreational opportunities for bobcat harvest while considering the social aspects of bobcat harvest. He covered the population objective, performance targets, and the plan amendments. He gave background that led to the proposed amendment and explained variables that will trigger the various options. The 2011-2012 permit recommendations were also made.

Director Karpowitz asked about pelt prices between last year and this year.

Mr. Bunnell said they have been hovering around \$250 and \$350 for the last several years. Historically, this price is high. It is being driven by the Asian market. There is a big demand for fur. There is no real significance from last year's price.

Mr. Albrecht asked where the largest population of bobcats is in the state.

Mr. Bunnell said bobcats inhabit anywhere from the deserts in the state clear up to some of our high alpine areas. Anywhere there is appropriate prey, which is most often rabbits, you can have bobcats. There is not really anywhere but the salt flats where a bobcat might not be found in the state.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions.

RAC Recommendations

All RACs with the exception of Southeastern passed the proposal unanimously. Southeastern passed it with one opposed.

Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bobcat Harvest Recommendations as presented by the Division.

Mr. Albrecht complimented Mr. Bunnell on the work he has done as Mammals Coordinator over the past years, since he is now the Wildlife Section Chief. He commended him for his work.

10) Walk-In Access Rule Amendment R657- (**Action**)

Leslie McFarlane, Walk-In Access Coordinator presented this agenda item. She went over the WIA program. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This is being brought to the Board for change today to fix some of the language in the rule to fit some of the problems that we have met in acquiring fishing access. She went over the current program requirements and presented the proposed WIA Landowner Association requirements. Compensation was outlined. The proposal is an effort to keep track of those using the access, any person 14 years of age or older must obtain a WIA authorization number to access properties enrolled in the WIA program. Users would have to call or register online once a year. This would facilitate an annual survey on use of WIAs. Landowner early termination from WIA program was also presented.

Director Karpowitz clarified that this would not do away with the sign in box. The landowners want to know who is on their property.

Ms. McFarlane said most landowners still want registration boxes. What it will do though, because of the privacy laws we are not allowed to ask anything other than name when they register, if we have a number then we can tie it back to an actual person.

Director Karpowitz said you'll have to register electronically then when you go to a walk-in access area, you sign in and put your number on it. He had a conversation with a landowner who said the sign in was one of the most important aspects to him, because he really liked the program and he really wanted to know who was on his property and when. He would go check his property a couple of times a day to see who was there.

Mr. Albrecht asked what the penalty was for not signing in.

Ms. McFarlane said when we put this into the rule they can be cited for trespass or be asked to leave the property.

Mr. Crandall said the current program is there is no landowner association and you have certain limits. You want to add provisions for a landowner association and as such they will have to meet the criteria. He asked how they go about doing habitat improvements.

Ms. McFarlane said all they are doing is leasing the access for recreational opportunity. The landowner still has total say over the property. If we want to do a habitat project it has to be in conjunction with the landowner. One of the things that have been hard for landowners is to get habitat improvement because they do not want to give access. This is a way to do it outside of a conservation easement and it helps with that situation.

Mr. Crandall asked what the base rates are. Is that per acre?

Ms. McFarlane said for hunting it is 80-240 acres, \$400. There is an actual scale. For fishing we are quite a bit higher because it is hard to compete on water access. For a ¼ mile to ½ mile stream, it is about \$1000. Every ¼ mile beyond that, we add \$250. Most agreements are between one and five years and that is a per year payment. If you do the association, it is an additional 25% on top of that because you are working as a group.

Mr. King said the proposal says the permit is based on a calendar year. Any thought to tying that to a 365 day program.

Ms. McFarlane said because they are dealing with so many different licenses they went with the calendar year. You just write your number on your license when you have to get a new one.

Mr. Bair asked how much it costs to get a registration number.

Ms. McFarlane said it is free. It is being maintained off a federal grant at this point. At some point they might have to seek funding to keep the program going. It totally depends on the success of the program.

Mr. Bair asked if the number would be on a certificate that he could take with him when out.

Ms. McFarlane said if you registered on line you could do that. If you call on the phone they would just give you a number. The plan is to use the same company that does our HIP numbers. It would be the same process as that and they would send you something.

Mr. Fenimore said he would like to expand this program to include bird watchers, hikers, and watchable wildlife folks associated with a fee. We could put this on the action log.

Director Karpowitz said we currently have a watchable wildlife fee approved, but have not been able to use it. This might be a opportunity where we can do this. Right now your entry into these places is you having a hunting or fishing license. You could do the same with watchable wildlife if they had a permit and if the landowner approved that activity.

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

Director Karpowitz said we can start investigating that with or without it being on the action log.

Mr. King asked if he is on a walk-in access area with his combination hunting and fishing license and his camera, but without a gun or a fishing pole, would that be ok.

Ms. McFarlane said that would probably be okay.

Mr. Crandall asked if that would have to be a permitted use.

Ms. McFarlane said the definition is in the rule for recreational lease activities as "wildlife dependent recreation" fishing, hunting or trapping, because when we approach a landowner we are telling them we want to lease it for those reasons. We could certainly approach it as a bird watching type activity, but right now the way it is written outside of

these activities, they would have to get permission from the landowner and do it outside the walk-in access program.

Director Karpowitz said they need time to go back to the group that worked on walk-in access and discuss adding this in.

Mr. Crandall asked about signing in.

Ms. McFarlane said you sign in every time you go onto their property, you sign in at the box. She said the number would be a one time call or registration per year. Anytime you went to walk in access property, you sign in with your number. This makes people responsible in case any damage is done to the property.

Mr. Albrecht asked who's taking care of this in the regions.

Ms. McFarlane listed the regional walk in access folks, Northern-Clint Brunson, Central-Steve Gray, Southern-Heather Grossman, Southeast-Leroy Mead and Northeast- Amy Vandervor.

RAC Recommendations

Southeastern, Southern, Central and Northeastern voted unanimously to accept the recommendations. Northern voted to accept 12 in favor with 1 recusal who is a landowner enrolled in the program.

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC recommendations.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Walk-In Access Rule Amendment as presented and ask the Division to look at ways of adding watchable wildlife activities to the Walk In Access program.

Mr. Bair said this is a great program.

11) FY 2013 Fee Schedule (Action)

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief presented this item. Yesterday at the RAC/Board orientation there was a request for a break down of our expenses by our different sections. He gave printouts of this to each Board member for their information. He then explained the process for changing fees and financial impacts. The DWR understands that the economy has been challenging for individuals and businesses. The Division has also experienced many of these same difficulties. Therefore, the fee

changes proposed for FY 2013 will not generate any appreciable new revenue from the public. He then also went over the proposed fee changes, \$20 for a resident wolf permit and \$80 for a nonresident wolf permit. (See Powerpoint Presentation) In summary there are no other proposed changes for FY 2013. Fee changes recommended by the RAC's and approved by the Wildlife Board will be addressed in the 2012 legislative session. Approved fees would take effect on July 1, 2012.

Mr. King said Director Karpowitz mentioned making the status of the wolf the same as the cougar and bear. How does this relate?

Mr. Sheehan said right now a wolf is considered a furbearer and if you decided we needed a hunt now, it would be a furbearer license and education course. So what we have now is a fee for a separate species, much the way we do for bear and cougar.

Mr. King asked what a cougar and bear permit costs.

Mr. Sheehan said cougar is \$58 and bear is \$83. Wolf permits would be \$20 which is about the same as other states.

Mr. Crandall asked if the \$20 resident and \$80 nonresident is enough. As soon as the wolf hunt opened in other states it was a mad dash and he would guess you could ask more for the permits. Is that market rate?

Mr. Sheehan said the areas where we would have any management authority if there were to be a hunt are largely private areas, north of Highway 84 and east of Highway 15. There is a lot of private land and access is going to be a problem.

Mr. Crandall asked if the landowners would not want the wolf hunters on their land.

Mr. Sheehan said they might not want to see lots of public on their property. They may want to take matters into their own hands. Because of the limited amount of permits where people could really get onto the land, our encouragement would be if you are fortunate enough to be able to hunt in some of these private areas, here is a bonus, buy one of these wolf permits and take it with you when you go hunt on a CWMU or wherever you might have access. We are really not on the verge of hunting wolves yet.

Mr. Crandall said it still might not be high enough for a permit.

Director Karpowitz said whenever they set a permit fee they always look at surrounding states and try to be competitive with them. They looked at Idaho and Montana where they have one year of hunting behind them. They sold a lot of permits and they will sell a lot more this year. Our thought was to be in line with those other states. The question is what is more important a high price or volume. We felt the best place to be on price was right around Wyoming and Idaho who have a few years experience on it. Right now we know of no wolves in that part of Utah.

Mr. Crandall said the program in Wyoming was pushing that the wolf is a predator on the same status as a coyote which means if you see one it is fair game. Do you know what they worked out?

Director Karpowitz said as he understands it, they basically accepted their plan, except they used a larger area for the trophy status and put more of a buffer around Yellowstone.

Mr. Crandall said so they are basically a predator and nuisance animal, the same as a coyote and raccoon. You see one and it is fair game. Can we do that here in Utah?

Director Karpowitz said that is not what our management plan says, but we have a problem in that they are endangered in all of the rest of the state. Until they are delisted we don't have control over it. We do have a wolf plan in place should the USFWS ever delist them.

Mr. Bunnell said in relation to the question about Wyoming, after 7-8 years of legal battles and millions of dollars, the line shifted south about 10 miles for the trophy game area.

Mr. Sheehan said we can adjust the license fee down the road if necessary.

Board Discussion

RAC comments were summarized.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the FY 2013 Fee Schedule as presented by the Division.

12) Convention Permit Audit (**Action**)

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Chief presented this item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This is an audit review of the Wildlife Convention per rule R657-55. The Board members received a copy of this audit in their Board packets. There are copies available to the public here at the meeting. He gave a brief background of the convention. This rule was passed in 2005 and allowed for up to 200 permits for issuance at a convention that was anticipated with attendance of at least 10,000 people. This set of permits was for a five year period that began in 2007. Permits were available for the group that had demonstrated value in enhancing protected wildlife species in Utah. He went on to explain how permits were distributed to residents and nonresidents. This is the fifth year of this convention.

The scope of the audit included insuring that personal data is properly handled and secured. The drawing process for the convention permits were conducted using the

methodology as agreed to with the Division. They reviewed the number of applications and success of residents' versus nonresidents was also included in the audit.

The only finding they had in future drawings was when their contractor comes here for the drawing that they log into our internet instead of using wireless. This would make it run more smoothly. He then went over drawing information over the last five years with the number of applicants and number of applications, 196,000 and the gross revenue was \$981,000 generated by those applications. They also looked at success rates relative to residents at 89.6% versus nonresidents at 13% for this past year.

Mr. Fenimore asked about the audit not being performed using general accepted auditing standards.

Mr. Sheehan said they did the audit internally. The Board didn't dictate exactly what type of audit it needs to be. If it is a formal audit there are certain requirements. We have really not spelled out what those are other than this draw is conducted fairly.

Mr. Fenimore said on the draw and the process, there was a temporary loss of internet connection and a pass phrase was not transcribed. What happened with this?

Mr. Sheehan said they were using a WIFI hotspot and it was kicking in and out. He turned the time over to Mr. Evans.

Greg Evans, IT Supervisor, said one of the things they are cognizant of is to review the code prior to the actual drawing and one of the checks and balances that they input into the code is a pass phrase, to make sure that the code that we review is the actual code that is run. Because of the reasons that Mr. Sheehan mentioned, the contractor had an air card connection that he was running off of. When he started the process of the draw, it takes a long time to run and when we were waiting for the process to complete the conductivity was broken and they had to refresh the page. That brought the pass phrase up at that time. At that point we did a code review, checked with all the participants in the room to make sure they were comfortable with what was happening and that he wasn't running a separate set of code that could insert records. They did another code review at that point and the pass phrase came up again. It caused a point of concern so it was mentioned in the audit. We did take the proper steps to make sure the validation of the code was still there and that the drawing was still there and correct. In the future they would recommend a land line connection in the future and make sure it doesn't happen again or anything that could raise a question.

Mr. Fenimore said the MDF and SFW have a wonderful program going here. It brings a lot of economic activity to the state and is great for publicity and tourism. He congratulates them on how well they run it.

The following motion was made by Ernie Perkins, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

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

13) Convention Permit Allocation (**Action**)

Alan Clark, Assistant Director presented this agenda item. Each year according to rule, the Board has to approve the permits that are taken out of our regular drawing and issued through the drawing at the convention. The maximum number is 200 and we have issued that many every year. He went over the changes in permit recommendations. (See table in the Board Packet) They reduced bison permits by two and replaced those with one Central Mountain Manti elk, late season and One Cache North Rich pronghorn. He clarified that the Rocky mountain goat permit on the Beaver Unit is for the early hunt. He clarified that the remaining bison permits are one for the early hunt and one for the late hunt. This will help the groups as they do their advertizing.

Mr. Crandall asked how many bison permits are on the Henry Mountains bison for next hunting season.

Mr. Clark said around 30. These are permit numbers are for 2012. The Board actually sets these permits before we set the regular season permits. Whatever the total ends up being the convention permits will be deducted.

Mr. Crandall said you'll still have the total number of bison permits with two that go to the convention instead of four.

Mr. Clark said with the population estimate where it is that we will not have as many hunts or permits for bison in 2012 because we are on track. We are not in population reduction mode. Also, they looked at whether the rule for the convention had gone out and it did go to all the RACs. Everyone had an opportunity to look at it. We do not take the annual permit approval to the RACs, but any rule change or reauthorizing of the rule we do take it through the RAC process.

Mr. Perkins said this is a one year allocation.

Mr. Clark said the rule says you cannot issue over 200 permits.

Mr. Brady said we are doing these permits for 2012. Have we already committed for the next five years?

Mr. Clark said yes. This is the first year of the five year commitment.

Mr. Albrecht asked with the loss of the antelope on the Plateau a year ago, was there any consideration in reducing permit numbers there for this convention.

Mr. Clark said we did that a year ago and kept them the same this year.

The following motion was made by Mike King, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimously.

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

14) Falconry 5-day Non-Resident Meet License request (**Action**)

Jim Parrish, Avian Program Coordinator made this request that the Board issue a five day falconry meet license. (See Letter in Board Packet) According to our falconry rule we need the Board to issue these five day meet licenses as needed. The group that is coming in is the North American Falconers Association. They will be in the Vernal area in November for their annual meet and it is their 50th anniversary meet. They have been in Utah twice before. It has been a very successful venue for them and they are coming again. We need to cover individuals that wish to hunt with their birds while their participating in the meet with this five day meet license. The difference in the meets and trials according to our rule, in meets they can hunt wild game and in trials they use pen raised birds and bag game. That is the reason we need this license.

Chairman Brady said with 250 participants, that's 250 birds.

Mr. Parrish said approximately. Some may or may not fly their birds, but they would be part of a group that goes out and maybe 1-2 out of 5 would fly. It depends, but potentially that many could have birds.

Chairman Brady asked how many birds are being taken.

Mr. Parrish said it is a surprisingly small amount. The birds miss a lot. They estimated approximately 10% success rate on those that would be hunting ducks and that equates to about 50 ducks. For upland game similar success rate, 30-50 rabbits and other animals they would try to take with their birds.

Mr. Fenimore asked if they would also release pigeons.

Mr. Parrish said no they don't release pen raised birds at these meets. They may use a pigeon on a tether to get their birds back, but they don't release them. They do those at the trials.

Mr. King asked where the meet is to be held.

Mr. Parrish said the Vernal area. The headquarters is the Western Plaza Hotel in Vernal. It is mostly public land, but if they go private they know they have to have permission.

Mr. Crandall asked what species they hunt.

Mr. Parrish said they hunt sage grouse (with a Diamond Mountain permit), upland game and ducks. Most focus on one prey.

Mr. Albrecht asked if this was taken to the Northeastern RAC.

Mr. Parrish said this did not go around to the RACs. It is just a Board request.

Mr. Albrecht said this should have been taken before the Northeastern RAC.

Mr. Parrish said he wasn't instructed to do that.

Mr. Briggs, Northeastern RAC Chair, said he doesn't see a problem with this.

The following motion was made by Bill Fenimore, seconded by Mike King and passed 5 to 1 with Jake Albrecht opposed.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Falconry 5-day Non-resident meet license request.

Mr. Albrecht said this should have been taken to the RAC.

Director Karpowitz said they will make sure they do this in the future.

Mr. Oswald asked about the CIP Rule presentation they heard at the RAC.

Director Karpowitz said he requested that this be pulled from the agenda. As they reviewed the RAC motions, it appeared that they needed some more coordination on that rule before we brought it to the Board, specifically it had not been coordinated well with the Department of Agriculture. We were making some significant changes and wanted to be sure all the bases are covered before we act on that. If there are only minor changes we'll bring it back to the Board and if there are any significant changes we'll take it back through the RACs.

15) Other Business (**Contingent**)

- a. Wildlife Board Awards Selection – Mr. Perkins said the award selections have been made for the September 7th annual banquet.
- b. DOPL Board Member Selection – Director Karpowitz said when the legislation was passed to license guides and outfitters, one of the Board members that review applications and revocations would be a Wildlife Board member so there is a connection with the Wildlife Board. Rick Woodard was our representative there. They handle complaints and revocations on guide licenses.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Ernie Perkins and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we appoint John Bair to the DOPL Board as representative for the Wildlife Board.

c. Report on Range Trend Field Trip and Paunsaugunt Visit

Chairman Brady said a few weeks ago the Board divided up and went two different directions, some went to the Range Study in Northern region and some went to Southern region. Reports will be given on these visits.

Mr. Fenimore gave a report on the range trend field trip. He congratulated Mike Canning and his team that oversees this area. There was a crew on the mountain outside Bear Lake that spend all season long measuring various plant communities and assessing range conditions in given areas. He was very impressed with the level of professionalism and detail with which they addressed this. It is clearly one of the better studies that are going on within the intermountain west.

Mr. Perkins said the data they collect on the basic 700 range trend sites is applicable to every one of our sportsmen, our deer units and the deer populations. It is very important information especially relative to deer management. In addition they do have a crew doing the watershed projects, trying to evaluate which manipulation techniques are working better than the other techniques. It is very significant to the habitat and watershed program and will pay off in the future. They will be in Central region next year and hopefully we can visit the Ephraim seed house.

Director Karpowitz said this information is really important. The information collected by this range crew is very important to our management of many species that we deal with. When you see the new revised unit deer management plans, you'll see that one of the driving factors in what we think the population level for deer can be on those units will be this information. It is good for Board members to get acquainted with how this information is collected and get comfortable with the level of sophistication that is involved here. In the end it will determine what our objectives are for deer and elk units. Over the years we have refined this information to make it more practical as we see new ways to use it. It is the best range trend information anywhere in the western United States. It is an interagency effort. We get money from state and federal agencies. It is going to be a challenge to keep that going with federal budget cuts.

Mr. Crandall said the range trend study is very well done up at Bear Lake. It was very impressive and interesting.

Mr. Brady and Mr. Albrecht went to the Paunsaugunt. Mr. Brady said he thought it was very interesting. He was very impressed with the dedication of the DWR employees. They seem to have a real passion for what they are doing. They showed us several different areas. They are dealing mostly with pinion juniper in that area and its improvement. They showed us several different ways they have addressed this throughout the past years and the difference in the results. It is a dry area and water is a

big concern. At mile post 41 that is where the DWR sets up their check station. He discussed the time of year the deer migrate and Highway 89. He was impressed with the amount of bitterbrush. There were also some guzzlers, one 100,000 gallon tank and two were 120,000 gallon tanks. It is very impressive to see the various projects they have done. He discussed some of the problems and repair they did on the guzzlers with volunteers and Dedicated Hunters. It takes time for the deer to become accustomed to coming into new places for water. It is very impressive to see what they have done. Those on the Alton CWMU and on the Paunsaugunt are working hard in those areas in habitat improvement. Again he is so impressed with the dedication of the DWR employees.

Mr. Albrecht said Chairman Brady covered most of what he had to say. He wanted to mention that Dustin Schaible and the people down there have gone out into the desert and are working on the Grand Staircase which is another agency they have to go through. He is dealing with some pinion juniper in that area, trying to thin it down. They won't have to haul water to the deer across the highway this year. The Friends of the Paunsaugunt work with the Division to get things done. The Heaton Ranch has been well taken care of and you can see why the wildlife comes into that area to feed. There is still plenty of feed for their livestock too. Mr. Albrecht is excited about the biologists the DWR has in that area. Hopefully we can get them the tools and things they need to keep it up.

Mr. Brady said they saw some big deer in that area.

Mr. Albrecht said the coal company down there took the existing road in Johnson Canyon, so they built a road that goes to the west and south that actually opened up new country that people will have access to for maybe some future habitat work there.

Director Karpowitz said he would like to see the Board get involved in as much of what they do as they are interested in. If the Board has interest in going to different parts of the state to look at projects, they should let them know. It is good to get out and see what is being done.

Mr. Albrecht said Jason Vernon suggested a few things. He said if the Board members have questions they should get with the biologists in the area and see what is going on. He talks to the biologist in his area all the time.

Mr. King asked when we determine the schedule for next year.

Ms. Coons said at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Perkins asked that a draft be put out.

The meeting was then adjourned.