

Utah Wildlife Board Work Session

December 5, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
AGENDA

Wednesday, December 5, 2012, 1:00pm

1. Approval of Agenda
– Del Brady, Chairman

ACTION

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

Action Log Items of Discussion

- Big Game Hunt Schedule – Anis Aoude
- Youth Recruitment – tag program – Mike Fowlks
- Standardization of RAC Minutes – Del Brady
- Lifetime License Holder/General Season Deer unit discussion – Greg Sheehan
- Update on Wolves in Utah – John Shivik

Review of Thursday Agenda Items –

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

December 6, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Thursday, December 5, 2012 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Del Brady, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Del Brady, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Greg Sheehan, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline
– Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013
– Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013
– Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Other Business
– Del Brady, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Thursday, December 6, 2012, 1:00pm

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. Motion to Dismiss — Time Certain 1:00 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cory Gleason | ACTION |
| 2. Board Appeal — Time Certain 1:30 pm <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jack Bennett | ACTION |

**ACTION LOG
Wildlife Board Motions**

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

Fall 2012 – Target Date – Preference Point Presentation

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to give a presentation on the preference point system relative to the new 30 unit deer plan.

Assigned to: Greg Sheehan

Action: Under Study

Status: Scheduled for November 2012 RAC Meetings/ December 2012 Board Meeting

Placed on Action Log: June 6, 2012

Summer 2013 – Target Date – Additional Take of Sandhill Cranes and Swans

MOTION: I move that we put the issue of swans and sandhill cranes on the action log to see if there could be additional take in other parts of the state.

Assigned to: Blair Stringham

Action: Under Study

Status: Pending

Placed on Action Log: August 16, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Nine Mile Range Creek

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to report back on the Nine Mile Range Creek change to any bull relative to all issues of hunting, including trespass, harvest, and hunter satisfaction.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude

Action: Under Study

Status: Pending

Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Premium Limited-entry deer tags

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into a premium limited entry deer tag similar to the premium limited entry elk tag.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude

Action: Under Study

Status: Pending

Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Duck Creek

MOTION: I move that we ask the Southern Region to address the Duck Creek issues and report back to the board within a year from now. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Bruce Bonebrake

Action: Under Study

Status: Pending

Placed on Action Log: November 1, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Disabled Hunters to take Carp with a Cross-bow

MOTION: I move that the division look at a proposal that will allow disabled hunters to take carp with a crossbow. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Kenny Johnson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: November 1, 2012

Late Fall 2013 – Target Date – Fish Possession Limit

MOTION: I move that the division look into the issue of fishing possession limits. This is to be placed on the action log.

Assigned to: Drew Cushing
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: November 1, 2012

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Hunting Turkeys with Falcons

MOTION: I move that we put the hunting turkeys with falcons proposal on the action log for consideration when the Upland Game Guidebook comes up for review.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: June 9, 2011

Summer 2014 – Target Date – Additional Benefits for Limited-Entry turkey tag holders

MOTION: I move that we have placed on the action log that the Division look into the possibility and feasibility of a limited entry turkey permit holder who is unsuccessful to turn in their limited entry tag and purchase a general season tag.

Assigned to: Jason Robinson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: May 3, 2012

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Management Buck Tags on the Book Cliffs

MOTION: I move that the Division be asked to review the buck management tags on the Book Cliffs. People are always reporting the presence of big two and three point bucks in that area. Perhaps these permits could be given to youth. This is to be addressed during the revision of the Deer Management Plan in 2014.

Assigned to: Anis Aoude
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: December 1, 2011

Fall 2014 – Target Date – Cougar Data – Female Harvest

MOTION: I move that the Division do an expeditious review of the data and to provide the board members their analysis, conclusions and recommendations concerning the possible over harvest of female cougars.

Assigned to: John Shivik

Action: Under Study

Status: Letter to be presented to the Wildlife Board November 1, 2012

Placed on Action Log: August 16, 2012

On going – Target Date - Multi-year guidebooks and rules

MOTION: We ask that the Division look toward multi-year guidebooks and rules and that they present a plan on how that multi-year guidebook and rule will work as each is presented.

Assigned to: Staci Coons

Action: Under Study

Status: Wildlife Board Updated – January 12, 2012

Placed on Action Log: August 20, 2009

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

November 1, 2012, DNR, Boardroom
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Revised October 23, 2012

Thursday, November 1, 2012, Board Meeting 9:00 am

1. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
 - Del Brady, Chairman
2. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
 - Ernie Perkins, Vice-Chair
3. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
 - Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director
4. Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 **ACTION**
 - Drew Cushing, Aquatic Program Coordinator
5. Illegal Species Movement in Utah **INFORMATIONAL**
 - Drew Cushing, Aquatic Program Coordinator
 - Paul Birdsey, Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator
6. Centerville City Hunting Closure Proposal **ACTION**
 - Neal Worsley, Centerville Police Chief
7. Conservation Permit Audit **ACTION**
 - Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief
8. Conservation Permit Allocation – 1 year and 3 year permit **ACTION**
 - Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief
9. Conservation Permit Annual Report **ACTION**
 - Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief
10. 2013 RAC/Board Dates **ACTION**
 - Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator
11. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
 - Del Brady, Chairman
 - Winter WAFWA

Thursday, November 1, 2012, Board Appeal 1:00 pm

1. Board Appeal — **Time Certain 1:00 pm** **ACTION**
 - George Jay Simon
2. Board Appeal — **Time Certain 4:00 pm** **ACTION**
 - Jack Bennett

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
November 1, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 15-16, 2012 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

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

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

MOTION: I move that we close #2 on the action log “Conservation Permit Program Report”.

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

MOTION: I move that we close action log item #3 “Convention Permit Meeting”.

3) Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 3 to 1 with Mike King opposed.

MOTION: I move that we open Joe’s Valley to fishing beginning with the 2013 Fishing Guidebook.

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

MOTION: I move that we ask Southern Region to address the Duck Creek issues and report back to the board within a year from now. This is to be placed on the action log.

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

MOTION: I move that the division look at a proposal that will allow disabled hunters to take carp with a crossbow. This is to be placed on the action log.

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

MOTION: I move that the division look into the issue of fishing possession limits. This is to be placed on the action log.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented by the division.

- 4) Centerville City Hunting Closure Proposal (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Centerville City Closure Proposal as presented.

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

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

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

- 6) Conservation Permit Allocation (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the conservation permit allocation as presented by the division.

- 7) 2013 RAC/Board Dates (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2013 RAC/Board Dates as presented by the Division.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
November 1, 2012, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wildlife Board Members Present

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

RAC Chairs Present

Southern – Bruce Bonebreak
Southeastern – Derris Jones
Central – Fred Oswald
Northern – Robert Byrnes
Northeastern - Boyde Blackwell

Public Present

Tyler Reist
Lauren Reist
Josh Thornton
Paul Dremann
Troy Justensen
James Gilson
George Sommer
Daniel D Smith
Brent McNee
Miles Moretti
Bill Christensen

Division Personnel Present

Judi Tutorow
Staci Coons
Cindee Jensen
LuAnn Petrovich
John Fairchild
Anis Aoude
Justin Dolling
Mike Fowlks
Robin Cahoon
James Parrish
John Shivik
Dean Mitchell

Public (continued)

Brett Prettyman
Roy Hampton
George Kinney
Quinn Woodmansee
Bob Knight
Brent Daybell
Dorothy Sackett
Clifford Sackett
Sterling Brown
Dale A Jones
Ryan Foutz

Chairman Brady welcomed the audience and introduced the Wildlife board and RAC Chairs.

- 1) Approval of Minutes (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 15-16, 2012 Wildlife Board Meeting as corrected.

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

Ernie Perkins covered this agenda item. We have four items to mention today. The first item will be on the work session next month. It is the preference point system with the 30 unit deer plan. The second item is Conservation Permit Program report and it will be presented today and will be completed.

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

MOTION: I move that we close item #2 on the action log “Conservation Permit Program Report”.

Mr. Perkins went on to say the third item on the action log is the Convention Permit meetings and the Director will report on that.

Director Karpowitz went over a letter in response to the Board’s request. They followed a three step process in meeting with the convention groups and with United Wildlife Cooperative. He first met with them separately and talked about options, looking for resolution. They then meet collectively and narrowed the concerns, trying to look for common ground to address the public’s concerns. In the end they identified four primary areas that are outlined in the letter, that UWC felt like if those were part of the contract they would be satisfied with the program, at least for the time being. They had Mr. Bushman draft a voluntary amendment to the contract and the groups agreed to it and signed it. It is now complete and in effect. The amendment also includes the Board motion on an annual report. (See Board Packet for letter under Action Log section) He is hopeful that this will put this issue to rest. He complimented the convention groups on their willingness to make these voluntary changes.

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

MOTION: I move that we close action log item #3 “Convention Permit Meeting”.

Mr. Perkins said the last item is an interim report as proposed by the Division on female harvest of cougars. This will be addressed today.

John Shivik addressed the Board relative to the Cougar Plan and response to that discussion in the last Board meeting. In summary, looking at the cougar data and biology and understanding the situation and the size of the units, we’ve acknowledged that the plan with cougars is aggressive, but we’re following the plan and just about to get to the end of the three year cycle this next year. We will have good data at that point to put together strong recommendations. He wants to do those recommendations with the houndsmen, going through the regular public process. We should be able to incorporate a lot of their suggestions and it is just a matter of timing at this point. The largest part of this inquiry had to do with timing in that is there an emergency, or can we do it right now

or according to the plan? There is no imminent threat of losing cougars in the state and we can make our adjustments according to the plan this spring/summer. Finally, he did want to propose increasing the relationship in working with the houndsmen. He would like to do a more detailed study on the Wasatch / Manti, getting the houndsmen involved in treeing, getting biological samples and a marked recapture genetic analysis so we are all on the same page. He has done what he can so far to find funds to do that. (See Board packet for letter under the action log section) He then asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Bair said he has a letter from Andy Lyon. The west Manti units are perfect cougar units and houndsmen would always hunt the Manti units verses the Cascade sheep units. The houndsmen have concerns about letting this go another year. Is there any reason we couldn't make a few changes without ruining the plan and messing up the data.

Mr. Shivik said it's not about ruining the plan. He still stands by his recommendation. We have a plan and a process and we need to stick with it, especially when we're talking about controversial animals like predators. It is really important to have good data and numbers as we go forward and make recommendations. His job is to protect cougar populations. He doesn't want to get us into a place where we are making rash and immediate decisions without all the information or without indication of a real emergency.

Mr. Bair said he understands the importance of sticking to the plan, but having hunted these units and sharing the same concerns as the houndsmen, being the pressure we want on the sheep units is going to the two Manti Units which can take 10-12 years to draw a tag on. He is leery about letting that problem go another year.

Mr. Shivik said again he considers it a matter of timing. There are a lot of good ideas out there and they look to propose some of those suggestions to separate out this situation. This is not an emergency situation and we can make our adjustments next spring.

Mr. Bair said the houndsmen do consider this a dire emergency and just to be clear, Mr. Shivik does not feel that letting it ride for another year will decimate the lion population.

Mr. Shivik said it will not bring it to an unrecoverable point. He is confident we can make adjustments in the spring and get back on top of it.

Mr. Bair said we have some comment cards and it is clear where he stands on this issue.

Chairman Brady said it is an action log item and we will hear the comments, limiting it to three, with only three minutes each. The Board cannot make any decision at this point in time.

Mr. Bair said he feels they deserve to be heard.

Kevin Bunnell said the idea of not putting pressure on sheep units and putting the demand on the Manti, if he thought it was really occurring. The reason he doesn't think

it is, is because the Manti Units are all split units, so up until the end of February if you want to harvest a cat, unless you have a limited entry tag, you have to go to those sheep units. Granted, if you have a late snow year you can have significant harvest after, but during the best time of the year, January/February you have no choice but to go to the sheep units. It's not like it's that way year round, it occurs after the transition of the splits.

Mr. Perkins said there is still an emergency shut off switch throughout next spring in terms of the Director doing an emergency closure on any unit. That is always an option if a much higher than expected harvest occurs. On the public comment, we'd be interested in new information rather than a repeat of information we've already received.

Public Comment

Jason Adamson from Sanpete County addressed the Board. This is a real problem and where Mr. Bair has had some experience down there, he understands. He distributed some information he gathered from the internet on these cats. As for Mr. Shivik's letter, he is doing his best, but he has only been in this job for a little over a year. A lot of us have a lot more experience than that. He's been chasing cats for over 35 years. The Board was given a handout with information relative to his viewpoint. He then went on to quote from the letter to illustrate that cougars are born and stay in the same units. If we wipe out these units, we wipe out the seed too. When they're traveling that far we've taken away these areas that these cats are staying in and are going to reproduce in these areas. Those cats are killed out, if they're traveling that many miles. He talked about the cougar population history in Yellowstone. He then compared the Oquirrh to the Monroe. He also discussed some collared cougar harvest and information. He feels adaptive management is needed in this situation.

Chet Young is the Utah Houndsmen representative and he addressed the Board. It is not so much the plan that is the problem. The situation with the Manti Units has been going on since 2009. He read from the 2009 minutes of the Wildlife Board. It was to put the Manti Units on a straight up harvest objective and the Board changed it to a split. In 2009 Justin Shannon said when they went to harvest objective there, they killed cats very quickly and it was closed in just over a week. The percent females taken increased substantially and in the following years the age and the animals decreased quite a bit. When you go to harvest objective on the Manti you affect the population quickly because of access and the success that is possible. In talking with local biologists, they did not see response in the deer herd. Mr. Bunnell said despite reduction in the cougar density, we say very little response to the deer herd, cougars are not the problem. Director Karpowitz said we need to do the right thing for the deer herd. He has been a proponent of accelerated cougar harvest over the years. He is for doing all we can to help the deer herd, but let's be sure we are doing the right thing. Back in 2009 when the Manti Units became a split, we had people who were worried that we were going too far at the time. Now we are combining these units with the sheep units at a real high harvest rate. This really scares them as houndsmen. Mr. Shivik said he can see that this is an issue to be addressed next year, why not do it now and plane the problem off? The letter from Andy

Lyon is the houndsmen's position. They'd like to see the sheep units split away. You still have the same amount of tags for all nine units.

Mr. Bair said he does not want to let this go another year. He understands they are split units and we need to adjust the harvest objective side of the season. He doesn't like where it's headed.

Mr. Perkins said it would be inappropriate for us to take any action at this meeting, because we would be cutting out a huge number of the public. We could ask the Division to take a proposal out through the process, the November RAC and December Board meeting.

Director Karpowitz said he sees a few options for the Board and one is to do nothing and let it go another year as had been recommended. It would be problematic to try and change the direction of the plan, unit boundaries, season dates that are already in print. That becomes a law enforcement issue and a big concern. The one step between those two is to adjust the harvest objective quota through the RAC/Board process now, or leave it to the Director to do an emergency closure at whatever point necessary. The quota could be adjusted.

Mr. Bair said he would like to adjust the quota or put some type of stipulation on it during the harvest objective part of the hunt. His preference would be to lower the quota to be sent out at the next round of RACs.

Director Karpowitz said the next round of RACs is the Big Game meeting and it would most likely be a different group attending with a different perspective.

Mr. King asked what information they would use to lower the quota. Is there a good biological basis to do this and set a number?

Mr. Shivik said we have our plan and we will have the numbers and it might tell us to reduce the numbers by 20-25%. He might look at it and through discussion we might want to redefine what our baseline is for these permits numbers, but for right now the biological basis is what is in the plan which they are trying to follow.

Mr. King asked what would be the basis for an emergency closure.

Mr. Shivik said if the cougars don't move around over the entire unit that might be the trigger situation, but we are talking about a pretty small area in the state and some people that are passionate about this one unit. He is thinking on a bigger scale in terms of time and the state. He doesn't know how to answer this question because the numbers are okay.

Mr. Bair asked if they kill 10 cats one week into harvest objective and they are all on the Manti, will we be concerned. This is worst case scenario and that is what the fear is.

Mr. Shivik said he is having difficulty answering this, as the plan is we're looking at it as an area, but it is important, especially with the species to follow our process and if we need to adjust permits, do it according to the plan. He worries about being arbitrary about these kinds of things.

Chairman Brady said we have seen Director Karpowitz exercise his emergency authority when necessary. He is totally confident in the leadership of the DWR and their ability to manage whatever situation arises. He is more comfortable in staying with the plan and if we see a real problem they will act on it.

Director Karpowitz asked if they see circumstances with the harvest results coming in with perhaps a large number females or juveniles and hearing there are no tracks, could you see recommending to the Director an emergency closure.

Mr. Shivik said if they start blowing past a quota. It is difficult to argue, when we're nowhere near quotas, that there is an emergency. If all of a sudden that whole area starts really getting hammered, they would take care of these populations and deal with the situation.

Mr. Bunnell said in response to the Chairman Brady's comment, we don't like to put the Director in that situation, so if the Board is concerned that we're going to get there we would like to put something in place. If you're afraid that might develop, we would prefer to take it out through the process.

Mr. Bair asked them to look at one thing. It is a big unit. When we put these numbers together we anticipate the harvest being spread over the whole unit.

Mr. Bunnell said if we saw a big number of females coming from a small area that would send up red flags.

Mr. Bair said that is what we would ask. The north and south Manti are going to take the brunt of that harvest. If the limited entry guys fill up and we have good snow with the cats coming in off the Manti, particularly females, that is our concern. We can't let this happen. If we can commit to the houndsmen that we can keep a sharp eye on this that would be acceptable.

Mr. Shivik said he wants to make it clear that we are keeping an eye on this, discussing this and responding to it. It is their job to protect the resource. He said he will provide the Board with the real time numbers on cougar harvest during the hunt.

Mr. King asked how that information will be communicated.

Ms. Coons said they will add a file to their drop box and the information will be available that way.

Mr. Perkins said this closes this action log item for today, and it will remain on the action log for fall 2013 as published.

3) DWR Update (**Informational**)

Jim Karpowitz, DWR Director said we are mindful of Bill Fenimore who is having surgery today. He also thanked LuAnn Petrovich for doing the minutes over the past years.

First of all, he wants to update on the deer hunt since we've gone to a new system. We saw some interesting things this year. We saw a significantly improved deer number with numbers of deer coming through the checking stations increased. Last year at several of our deer checking stations we checked 552 deer and this year at those same stations, 910. That is a significant increase in deer harvest with quite a few older bucks than we've seen in the past. We also have the preliminary muzzleloader harvest data and that success rate increased from 20% to 32%. As we do our post season deer classifications, we'll see what the buck/doe ratios look like after the hunt. The deer coming through the checking stations were in relatively good shape with an average amount of fat on them despite the drought and summer conditions.

Relative to law enforcement, there were very few problems with boundaries considering we went to the 30 units. Hunters understood the boundaries and stayed with their units. The jury is still out as to whether people like the new system. We had a lot of mixed reports. We still didn't experience many problems, although that doesn't mean there were a lot of law enforcement concerns during the hunt. We still responded to a lot of illegal kills and illegal activity, but not related to unit boundaries.

On our fire rehab efforts, we burned almost 1/2 million acres in Utah this summer. We have a very good habitat program and were able to respond to it very quickly. Today we've mixed 1.1 million pounds of seed and distributed it to be put on the ground by aircraft and by ground. We have two shifts working night and day. Chains, harrows and equipment are responding quickly. We're running out of time now and have a lot to do and have about half the seed out. We are concerned about the BLM being short on budget and cannot get fire rehab done on BLM lands. We are going to try to make up for their shortage. We are working on money we don't have, with a commitment from the legislature, and look to get reimbursed from the legislature.

Fall fishing is in full swing and is phenomenal around the state. This is a real credit to our aquatics personnel that are doing a great job.

On the Coyote Bounty program, we have already bountied over 1000 coyotes. They are starting to come in big numbers now as furs become prime and trappers are getting started. We also have 50 Desert bighorn sheep in transit to Utah as we speak for release on the Kaiparowitz Unit.

Today is Director Karpowitz's last Wildlife Board Meeting after 34 years with 7 1/2 years as Director. He said this is the best Board he's worked with and they've done a great job.

He wishes them the best of luck. We will have a new Director announced shortly and the interviews have taken place. He sent out a list to his employees last week on the major accomplishments of the Division over the last 7 years. It is a very impressive list and he is very proud of the Division and all they have accomplished. We have hit some huge milestones with over one million acres in habitat improvement. It is great to see Kevin Conway's dream fulfilled in improving habitat in the state. All fish hatcheries are up and running for first time ever in more than a decade. 20,000 acres of fragmities have been treated to improve waterfowl hunting in the state. Community fishing ponds have increased from 19 to 50. Walk in Access has 80,000 acres in it with 40 miles of fishing streams. This is a great credit to our people in this agency that work so hard. We have increased anglers by about 90,000. We also have more people applying in our big game draw every year, 330,000 and there is still high interest in our State of Utah in fishing, hunting and other wildlife activities.

There are a lot of challenges ahead, but this agency is up to it. We have a great public process in place and it allows lots of public input, contributing to the agency's success. He thanked the Wildlife Board, the Division employees, all the sportsmen, conservation groups, all those who love wildlife. We have a lot of good things going in Utah because people in this state are passionate about wildlife and what we do. The results have been amazing. He wished the new Director luck in the future.

Chairman Brady said he first heard Jim's name in the 70's relative to the sheep program. As we associate with other states, they are blown away by the things Utah is doing. We as sportsmen of the state of Utah owe Director Karpowitz a big thank you.

4) Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (**Action**)

Drew Cushing, Aquatic Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. He recognized his counterpart Paul Birdsey, Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator. He went on to discuss the guidebook and rule. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He went over disposal of fish in various situations, the taking of game fish, and restrictions on taking fish and crayfish. He then talked about taking carp with a bow which is a crossover sport, prohibited fish and regional recommendations. This concluded the presentation on recommendations.

He then went on to discuss the Public Statewide Survey which was online to solicit public input. They also encouraged them to hard mail the Division, held a number of open houses in each region where people could come in to discuss things with the local personnel, solicited email, phone calls and internet forums. The survey was open for just over a month and they had 1,367 people participate. He went over the types of questions and the results. There were a few "write ins" that we need more law enforcement presence, they love community fisheries, and encouragement in preserving stream access.

He then went over the Utah Lake Survey Comments. 50% would support a change and 50% were opposed and that's why they followed up with the additional survey. They honed in on who the bass fishermen are on Utah Lake. The other issues was the same as

statewide, wanting carp removal program to continue, more law enforcement and more access around Utah Lake. As a result of this survey, we need to educate folks to make the relationship between regulations and populations.

Mr. King said at the beginning of the presentation he referred to the 3-5 rig lines. If you have a multiple hook rig in possession are you in violation or only if you use it.

Mr. Cushing said he wasn't sure. Mr. Fowlks said he thinks it's only if it is used, but he'll look into it.

Mr. Perkins asked for an update on the Utah Lake carp removal program in terms of how well it is doing and finding a funding off set.

Mike Slater said it is going very well. We have one of our biologists out there with the Loy Fishery Company on a weekly basis monitoring what we're seeing and catching both by catch as well as the carp. We are looking forward to the ice fishing season and they catch a lot more carp through the ice than in open water. The market for the carp is a perennial issue. We're still addressing that and have Director Styler involved with a group, trying to investigate what are some opportunities to get others involved in funding this program and ultimately marketing the carp themselves. Rather than it being just the DWR trying to use the fish, there might be people like Utah County, the businesses; those associated with Utah Lake have something to gain with the removal of the carp. They are trying to investigate that presently to see if that's a way they could utilize some money from some other sources to provide some kind of facility right there on the lake to process those fish, considering various scenarios.

RAC Recommendations

Southern – Mr. Bonebrake did a short summary with the proposal passing unanimously.

Southeast – Mr. Jones said they did not have a quorum, so were unable to vote on recommendations. They heard the presentation and discussed with those present.

Central – Mr. Oswald said the proposal passed unanimously. They had a second motion that had to do with wheelchair bounds groups and crossbow fishing. The motion was to ask the Division to meet with groups and formulate a plan to see how the rule fit and it passed unanimously.

Northeastern – Mr. Blackwell said they had two motions. The first was to accept as presented, but to add the two day possession limit. It failed 2 to 4. The subsequent motion was to accept as presented and that passed unanimously.

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said after discussion on the disposal method, they had a motion on the proposal with the opportunity to comment on disposal method once it is determined.

Chairman Brady asked if there were any questions from the audience.

James Gilson asked Mr. Cushing to address their RACs discussion on the Joe's Valley closure and what the Division feels about it being open next year.

Mr. Cushing said they did a tiger muskie introduction in Joe's Valley a few years ago. It is doing well and the anglers are happy about it. The tiger muskies are approaching 40 inches. The splake fishermen have converted over to tiger muskie. There were about six people present at Southeast RAC and they all had a similar comment to remove the closure for splake fishermen on Joe's Valley in the fall, to extend the opportunity for tiger muskie fishermen to fish in the fall. The biologists talked about that from a biological standpoint and they support it. They are relatively in favor, but it hasn't gone through the public process. They suggested it be taken through the next RAC cycle with the survey, then go from there.

Mr. Gilson asked if there are any other lakes that are closed for that same season to protect splake in the state and have there been.

Mr. Cushing said there are portions of reservoirs that are closed around the state. The one that comes to mind is Flaming Gorge with a closure on Linwood Bay for Lake Trout. It is a night time closure.

Public Comment

Ken Strong representing himself addressed the Board. He thanked Director Karpowitz for his service. He talked about fish limits relative to trout which is the smallest limit of all species. Presently if you catch a limit of fish, you have to bottle, smoke or consume them and until then they remain on your limit. We used to have a limit of 10 fish. His concern is anybody that bottles fish is doing them four at a time or breaking the law by stock piling. In Idaho, the law reads that the number of fish that may be legally harvested by one person a day is the bag limit and the bag possession limit is the maximum number of fish that may be in possession of a person while they are in the field or transporting the fish for consumption or storage. So once they hit the house they're no longer considered part of the limit. His proposal is to change the possession limit so we can have several possession limits in our freezer or preserved some other way, so we can have fish throughout the winter.

Paul Dremann, Chairman of the Utah Anglers' Coalition thanked Director Karpowitz for his support and service. They have had the opportunity to meet with the Division and fully support all their regulations. They do have a few comments, one being that there be no changes on the large mouth bass regulations at Utah Lake or perch regulations at Forsyth Reservoir until there's a lot more study done on these issues. The other issue is the harvest of yellow perch as a means of population control is an ineffective management strategy. They appreciate and support the work done by the aquatics people.

Terry Reese representing Utah Spearfishing Association addressed the Board. He is a sportsman and loves to hunt and fish often with his family. He loves the outdoors and appreciates the wildlife resource management, but the current regulations on spearfishing for June to November are restrictive. The September cut off for Fish Lake is even more so. There are bag and possession limits for all waters in Utah and he believes they should also apply to spearfishermen. Line fishermen use the spawning in September at Fish Lake to their advantage. He believes there is a false perception that spearfishing is easy, but it's not. If limits need to be in place they should apply to everyone. He's asking the Board to base decisions on facts and biology, not hear say. Spearfisherman are just like anyone else, they want appropriate and logical game management to preserve our valuable natural resources. All waters should be open to all legal forms of take and should apply to everyone equally. Through the ages spearfishing has been one of the most sustainable types of fishing known. 90,000 fishermen have been added to Utah fishing, but we might add 50 spearfishermen a year. Rules for spearfishing are limited and restrictive and not equal to other fishermen.

Clifford Sackett said he knows a lot of people like to keep fish. He likes to keep bass, but the limits on them now are very restrictive, so many under 12 inches and only one over. In a lot of ways it's quite confusing to people who haven't fished for bass before. We also have the slot limit on trout. With the bass, nobody really likes catching 10-11 inch fish. There is not much meat on them either. If you have a 14-20 inch bass size limit, where you could keep one, then fill up your limit with the others, it would make it better for the fishermen.

James Gilson from Castledale asked the Board to consider a change to the proposal for 2013 and return Joe's Valley to year round fishing. If we have to wait a year, there is no biological reason and it's debatable whether it was necessary in the first place. We can't fish for six weeks now and if we don't address it until next year, we won't have this time either. There is also some interest from businesses where they would like to have it open also. Some of these businesses have contributed to this fishery and would like to enjoy the benefits.

George Summer representing Utah Bass Federation thanked Director Karpowitz for his years of service. The Utah Bass Federation is opposed to liberalizing any rules relative to spearfishing. Utah allows more opportunity for spearfishing than any of the surrounding states. Their intention is to take this to the RACs next year to address and review current regulations and conflicts we're having with hook and line anglers. The conflict with hook and line angling is the main difference is no take and release with spearfishing.

Dan Smith works at Fish Tech Outfitters in Salt Lake City. They get a lot of comments on spearfishing and fishing for a record that leads to wasting. He gave some examples of situations where they're fishing for records. Their recommendation is to do away with the records. Once you shoot a fish, you can't let it go. It takes about five years for a bass to get 12 inches long and be able to spawn. We want to preserve that gene pool. As a tackle store, they are worried about losing customers because the big fish will be gone.

James Gilson said he has some time left and asked if they received the letter from the Emery County Public Lands Council supporting opening Joe's Valley.

Board Discussion

Chairman Brady summarized the RAC recommendations.

Mr. Bair asked how many spear fishermen there are in the state.

Josh Thornton from Dive Addicts said they sell more equipment in the state than anybody and he would guess there are around 200.

Mr. Bair said if we don't take action on Joe Valley today, next year at this time it will still be closed.

Mr. King asked if there isn't a time when this could be addressed before then, after it has been looked into and had more public input. Those who spoke for it at the RAC were a small group.

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

MOTION: I move that the Division consider removing the fall closure on Joe's Valley by running it through a RAC meeting in the near future, or no later than next year when it can be adequately considered.

Director Karpowitz said if we approve the guidebook today, it will be printed as closed and there's not opportunity for a Board process. If the Board decided to go with a fall opening, it would have to be handled through the media and signage. It will be in print that it is closed.

Mr. Perkins said he recognizes that, but this would allow both going through the full public process at some point earlier and it wouldn't take two years to get implemented.

Director Karpowitz said it is possible, but we do get complaints when it's in the guidebook. It is possible that it could go through the public process next spring or summer and have it open in the fall.

Mr. Albrecht said on Mr. Perkin's motion it would be closed this fall and open next year if the proposal is addressed.

Mr. King said he has not problem with opening the reservoir, but hasn't heard anything from the Division yet as to the biological reason either way. This has not been through the process and he'd be hesitant to make any decision at this point.

Chairman Brady said this was a bad time for the Southeast RAC not to have a quorum and asked Mr. Jones to pass that along to the RAC members.

Mr. Jones said those individuals who spoke for this opening were very passionate about it and is probably the most interest we've ever had on fishing. It is probably due to the addition of tiger muskees and fall is the best time for them. Other things that have affected this is the loss of a big fishery in Huntington Canyon due to the Sealy fire and had a die off at lower Fish Creek, because of the shut off at Scofield dam. People are looking for places to fish. Joe's Valley has turned into a trophy fishery and it's going to get more and more popular as people learn about the big splake and tiger muskees there. If there's a way to handle this with only this year's closure, we need to work toward having it open next year. The anglers in Emery County understand if nothing can be done this year, but they'll be very disappointed if we go one more fall without it open or at least addressed. The RAC members who were present were in favor of opening.

Mr. Bair said he's uncomfortable with making a decision now, but doesn't want to leave it until next year either. He would like to open it up for next year even if it's on an experimental basis and continue gathering information.

Mr. Cushing said they have discussed this with Southeastern extensively and there were more people there at the RAC than we've ever had. Biologically they don't believe there is an issue. The rule was put in place because of the public perception more so than the impact on the fishery. Mr. Bates said if they're going to open it, they should just do it, but the fear is that there is a contingency of folks out there who are opposed to it, but we just don't know. Chances are there's not, but we don't know.

Mr. Perkins said with the Division's support, they indicated this could go out in the November RAC meetings being handled by the regional fisheries biologist, would probably get full approval by the RACs and come to the Board for vote in December.

Mr. Cushing said the only drawback is it will be printed as closed in the guidebook.

Mr. Perkins said however we've got multiple corrections posted to guidebooks on the internet for this year's regulations. News of this would spread like wildfire.

Mr. King said he admits the public support was much greater than at the meeting before, but his concern is this not having gone through the process. We stuck to the plan with the cougar and the houndsmen would have liked us to act on their recommendation. It would be inconsistent to act on this, even though he would support opening the lake to fishing.

Director Karpowitz said there is no biological concern and you're not taking away anyone's opportunity. Mr. Jones said the public has voiced support. He thinks this is different than what happened with the houndsmen. The guidebook is already in print and with their request we'd have to have changed the plan to do everything they wanted. He sees this as an expansion of opportunity not a limiting of it. He doesn't think it would be a problem in changing this for next year. He is nervous about printing the guidebook, then changing it. He doesn't think the Board would be way out of line by expanding some fishing opportunity, if there is no biological reason to do otherwise.

Chairman Brady said in receiving this information, there does not appear to be conflict or a problem. Also it is an additional opportunity in Southeast region.

The following motion was made by John Bair, seconded by Jake Albrecht and passed 3 to 1 with Mike King opposed.

MOTION: I move that we open the Joe's Valley to fishing beginning with the 2013 Fishing Guidebook.

Mr. King said he opposed the motion based on circumventing the process. He is not against the opening of the reservoir.

Mr. Perkins withdrew his previous motion at this point.

Those who voted for it said they would have preferred to see this go through the RAC/Board process first, but couldn't see a problem on this issue.

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

MOTION: I move that we ask Southern Region to address the Duck Creek issues for ice fishing on the lake and report back to the board within a year from now. This is to be placed on the action log.

Chairman Brady said this would be put on the action log.

Mr. Bonebrake said they already have this in motion.

Mr. Bair said he cannot imagine that we have enough spearfishermen in this state to have any kind of adverse effect on the fishing business or the population of walleye or lake trout. Is he wrong on this?

Chairman Brady said yes he's wrong.

Mr. Cushing said they worked with the spearfishermen four years ago to create a list of waters where the species need to be taken. They've talked to spearfishermen in the Northeastern RAC about revisiting that list. However, there is a problem with public perception and a disagreement between 450,000 anglers and 100. The people who pay the bills should be heard. There is a real issue between the spearfishermen and the regular anglers. They need to work together.

Chairman Brady referred to the problems that we had at Fish Lake where out-of-state hunters were coming in and taking the spawning population of lake trout.

Mr. Perkins said he agrees with Chairman Brady. He started spearfishing 52 years ago, but this must go through the entire public process with opportunity for public input from all anglers.

Mr. Bair asked what types of discussions have taken place at this point.

Mr. Cushing said since this first came up at least three years ago, we have encouraged both types of fishermen to get in the same room and work together. The spearfishermen came to one meeting, are part of our angling public, but they need to be part of the team and work together on things. He agrees that it needs to go through the public process.

Chairman Brady said that Mr. Weylan had his eyes open after talking with Mr. Cushing.

Mr. Cushing said he did have his eyes opened. We told him we'd be happy to sit down with the spearfishermen and go over that list again. We will do that. It is a fairly liberal list compared with other states. We are committed to including this and will come back with a recommendation next year. One thing that has influenced this was the survey, to get an idea of what we'd lose or gain in public opinion and support by supporting this type of recommendation.

Mr. Bair asked if there were any planned talks.

Mr. Cushing said we have done this before, and can do it again.

Mr. Bair said he hates to see two groups of sportsmen/fishermen who do not work together.

Mr. Cushing said they've worked with both groups productively. With regular fishing, catch and release is possible, not so with spearfishing. We talked to one spearfisherman about a tag system which is something we might think about in the future. If this is truly a hunt, there are some trophy fish out there.

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

MOTION: I move that the Division look at a proposal that will allow disabled hunters to take carp with a crossbow. This is to be placed on the action log.

Director Karpowitz said the disabled rule is on the December RACs.

Mr. Bair asked if he catches his limit and keeps over that in his freezer, is he in violation?

Mr. Cushing said yes.

Mr. King asked what the rationale is behind that.

Mr. Perkins said there was a recent bust up in southern Davis County with a couple that had just over 1,000 trout in the freezer.

Mr. Cushing said there are people who will just keep taking fish and piling them up. It's to prevent things like that. Other states have a two day possession limit, but we don't. It came up in the Northeast RAC and it is worth considering.

Mr. King asked if there was any evidence that those who had 1,000 fish in their possession had harvested them illegally.

Mr. Cushing said it was at a community fishery in Murray and they were catching four a day, and the freezer was full with 100's of fish.

Chairman Brady said where he has been, the possession limit is most often 2-3 days bag limit. He doesn't have a problem with that and would like to see that.

Mr. Cushing said Idaho and Oregon have a two day possession limit on fish and on game birds as well. It creates a situation in their state where if you go out for multiple days you could have a limit for each day you were there. It is worth considering and biologically there are a lot of waters where we need harvesting.

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

MOTION: I move that the Division look into the issue of fishing possession limits. This is to be placed on the action log.

Mr. Cushing said it needs to be on the survey also.

Mr. Perkins asked for confirmation that everything in the FWS is included in the Division proposal.

Mr. Cushing said it is.

Director Karpowitz said on the Joe's Valley issue, Southeastern did not vote on it. He sits on 2-3 other Boards and there is a process for ratification of Board motions. The potential exists here for the Board to ask the region to take that out at the next RAC meeting for ratification if you're concerned that there hasn't been enough public input. What he doesn't know is what happens if the RAC refuses to ratify.

Mr. Perkins said the answer to that would be in emergency closure.

Director Karpowitz said so if the Board thinks the public ought to weigh in on this and based on the input they already have, it is likely they will ratify what the Board did. The Board could ask the RAC that when they have a quorum to ratify this decision and take public input at that time. It is a local issue and Southeast should handle it. Where two

Board members mentioned the lack of public input and Southeast did not vote on it, it could be an issue. The Southeast needs to address this at their next RAC.

Mr. King asked if you're going to ask the RAC to ratify the Board's decision or ask them to ratify the proposal that was made.

Director Karpowitz said it's not really ratification; it's a recommendation from the RAC to support the Board decision, if you feel that strongly. It may just muddy the waters and open a door down the road that you don't want, but you could ask them to at least discuss this and get public input at their next meeting.

Mr. Albrecht said if there is no biological reason and if the RAC doesn't provide a vote for input, it is up to the Wildlife Board to move forward and make a decision.

Chairman Brady said with the RAC not having a quorum, what it really did was not support the public in that region, and the Board is trying to go beyond that and support the public input. What the Director is trying to do is add an additional layer of support to that motion.

Director Karpowitz said he agrees with Mr. Albrecht.

Mr. King said in the minutes there was input from the RAC members that were there and they supported it, along with the public.

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the balance of the Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented by the Division.

Mr. Cushing said it is legal to have multiple hook rigs in possession at any area, as long as they are not used illegally.

5) Illegal Species Movement in Utah (**Informational**)

Drew Cushing, Aquatic Program Coordinator and Paul Birdsey, Sport Fisheries Program Coordinator presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This goes along with the catch and kill things we have going on, and is the first effort to educate the public starting with the Board and RAC members. We will briefly talk about illegal species introductions. This is the biggest threat to fishing across the country. He presented a list of waters that have experienced illegal introductions, but it changes continuously. Every time they go out there is a new illegally introduced species. There are several categories that contribute to this. A number of these are reproducing quite well and impacting our fisheries. There is a great cost related to this problem and it continues to increase. We also lose revenue when fishermen get frustrated and no longer fish in these areas.

Some of things they are doing are chemical treatments, physical removals, use of sterile fish like the tiger muskie and the wiper, use of super males, complete water closures and potential regulation changes, such as the catch and kill that we have in place. To have a no limit is a benefit to the fisherman because he can take these unwanted species home wholesale. We're hoping this would create a situation for the fisherman where the act isn't rewarded.

Mr. Albrecht asked what the penalty is for people who get caught doing this.

Mr. Cushing said for moving \$2,500 and Class B and \$5,000 Class A for stocking.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they lose their license for doing this.

Mr. Cushing said it is up to the Division's discretion.

Director Karpowitz said our penalties are all in law. Wyoming increased their penalty, but have not made many cases. Just increasing the penalty might not accomplish what we're trying to do, but it is an option.

Mr. Albrecht asked if they catch people doing this.

Mr. Cushing said yes, they have a case in Layton presently where an individual has done both of these things. The penalty isn't really the answer because if you don't have a court system that is receptive to a \$5,000 fine for someone having a live fish in transport, it's not the penalty we need to address, we need to educate. We need to do a better job of educating the public and the law makers then we'll get the penalties.

Mr. Perkins asked if the super male technology has a potential on carp and burbot.

Mr. Cushing said he's hoping so. It's been done on one species and hopefully can be done on these invasive fish.

Mr. Perkins asked if the other states are working on this.

Mr. Cushing said Idaho is the only one he knows of.

Mr. Albrecht thanked the fisheries section for doing a great job in our state.

6) Centerville City Hunting Closure Proposal (Action)

Neal Worsley, Centerville Police Chief presented this agenda. He said he is here representing Centerville hunters, recreationalists, bicyclists, joggers, etc. Their proposal is to close to hunting certain parts of Centerville City. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He also referred to a request letter that is in the Board packet. The proposed ordinance is in the letter. There are a few things that are contrary to hunting completely. We want

people to be able to fish and trap. He then went over the map illustrating this request, including the buffer zone. Privately owned property owners want their land closed because they are in the process of improving that area and for the most part it has been posted. There is a lot of recreational use on the trail system itself. The city currently has an ordinance in place that bans any discharge of firearms within the city limits. That's where the hunting closure needs to come into play. The private properties are individually described and they are in agreement on it. He continued to describe the area based on the maps included in the packet. Through public hearings it was brought up that they want access to Farmington Bay. The reason we'd closed that out is that is Legacy Preserve and it is posted no hunting, no shooting. There is an entrance area on the south end of that where people can walk down through and shoot. The bay and anything east of the firebreak would remain open. These are definitive lines that people can recognize. This concluded the presentation.

Chairman Brady asked for input from Mr. Dolling.

Mr. Dolling referred to the response letter that is in the packet. They have worked with the city and feel comfortable with this proposal. They are comfortable with the firebreak road being a strong delineation even though it is not the border of the city proper.

RAC Recommendation

Northern – Mr. Byrnes said he lives in Centerville and the firebreak road goes along the foothills on the east. He did attend the public meetings on this issue. This is a very agreeable boundary for the waterfowl people and the city. Our RAC voted unanimously to accept this proposal.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the Centerville City Closure Proposal as presented.

Mr. Bair said he never likes to vote to close areas to hunting, but this seems well thought out and the logical thing to do.

7) Conservation Permit Audit (**Action**)

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief presented this agenda item. He gave some background on the audit and we've done it for the past eight years. (See Audit in Board Packet) There is a copy of this audit of all of the groups available to anyone who wants one. He summarized the table with the total amount of revenue being 2.8 million dollars last year, which is up about \$400,000 from the prior year. The amount of funds they are able to retain is listed. One change we did this year according to a rule that went into effect in August is where we came to an agreement that we would bill them for the amount of projects they agreed to and the money is collected accordingly. Every

group was in good shape and has done a good job. The only thing they noticed is Safari Club elected to keep some of the money, about 3%, where in the past they returned all of it to the Division. Mr. Sheehan thanked Sarah Scott for doing most of the work to compile this audit.

Mr. King asked where a person would go for a list of all the projects that were done.

Mr. Sheehan said Mr. Bunnell has posted these on the website annually in the past and will continue to do so.

Public Comment

Miles Moretti thanked Director Karpowitz for his great service to the state. He thanked the Division for the Conservation Permit Program and it is the envy of the west. They are able to put a lot of money to work for habitat. He knows there has been a lot of controversy around the program the last while, but the audit process keeps us transparent and accountable. Those that criticize the program don't take the time to realize what it is all about and how much good we accomplish.

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

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

8) Conservation Permit Allocation (**Action**)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) He gave some history of the program and a general overview of its accomplishments. The funds generated from this program have contributed to 322 different projects that account for over 302,000 acres in the last five years. We've accomplished a lot of big game transplants. It also helps us fund a lot of research that we couldn't do otherwise.

He went on to say that the permit "draft" was held in August for 2013-2015 following the established process. He went over the various groups and the permits that were awarded. 317 permits were allocated and 316 were distributed. There was a single cow elk permit left on the table, because nobody had enough money left to pick it up. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Bair said he read in the audit that the Division attended some of the banquets and auctions, checking on the process.

Mr. Bunnell said they have a policy that if any of our people that go to the banquets report back.

Mr. Sheehan said in the audit that Sarah put together identifies how many of the permits that were allocated that we verify at some of the different banquets. It is a spot check.

Public Comment

Roy Hampton of Utah Bowman's Association said they applied for 14 tags. The 14th was a San Juan archery deer tag that they were issued two years ago on a variance. They are requesting it again if the Board will give them a variance. They donate it to the Pope Young Convention which makes it available to a nonresident. Their banquet is in Dallas, Texas. It sold for over \$6,000 when they auctioned it off the first time. They had the tag for two years. There were no archery permits in that area on the list this year. There are asking for a variance to get this tag back.

Mr. Bair said they donate their 10% to Pope and Young.

Mr. Hampton said yes and the 90% comes back to the Division. The 10% they raise on their other tags they donate to the NASP Program.

Director Karpowitz said a few years ago we made a special provision for Pope and Young who were bringing their national convention to Utah. He thinks they developed a separate rule for that. Does anyone recall what we did that year and if that provision is still around?

Mr. Hampton said he doesn't know. The Board did give them a variance two years ago.

Mr. Perkins said it was a one year variance for one tag if he remembers right.

Mr. Hampton said they kept it for two years. They auctioned it off last year.

Mr. King asked why it wasn't included this year.

Mr. Hampton said it wasn't in the one year program.

Mr. Bunnell said the rule doesn't define what goes into the one year program. They go through and pick the units that have the most conservation tags allocated to them. They take some of those out and give those opportunities to the single year program whereas that unit doesn't qualify for many tags, it's not one we allocated for the single year program.

Mr. Albrecht said if that tag had been part of the process, he would have to have drawn that as part of his allocation or traded for it some way.

Mr. Bunnell said that's only with the multiyear program. He explained how the one year tags work.

Mr. Hampton said this is Pope and Young's national convention. It gives Utah a very good look on what we're doing. We're actually going to send two tags back there; one will be an elk tag and hopefully this deer tag.

Director Karpowitz said so the variance would be two parts. You'd have to allocate a permit to a unit that doesn't qualify for then turn it into a conservation permit that would be beyond the allocation. Why did it last two years and then go away?

Mr. Clark said the provision for having a special tag above and beyond the limit applies to a statewide tag for a convention or event held here in Utah. Since that event isn't being held in Utah it doesn't trigger that provision of the rule. We also try to look for hunts where if added it goes to no more than 5%, then we look at dividing it between single and multiyear. He doesn't know the specifics on that one tag.

Director Karpowitz asked why they had it for two years and not now.

Mr. Bunnell said the San Juan Elk Ridge only qualifies for three deer tags, but we didn't choose to allocate one of those to the single year program. We made the decision based on the process we described. What would need to happen to stay within the rule is one of the multiyear groups that chose a San Juan mule deer tag would have to be willing to trade for or give it up. That's the only way we could stay within the rule, because this would push us over the 5%.

Mr. Bair asked if there's another tag we could issue that wouldn't put us in violation.

Mr. Bunnell said the program qualified for 317, so no.

Mr. Perkins said he has some reservations from the perspective of what's fair for you should be fair for every other organization. If you're bringing a convention to Utah, then we'll make a tag available. He's not in favor of expanding this on the spur of the moment.

Mr. Hampton said he understands that the Board has the authority to grant this type of variance. Isn't that right?

Director Karpowitz said yes the Board would have to grant a variance that goes beyond what the rule allows.

Mr. Hampton said they can work it out and give them a tag from their pool, but he felt it was worth is to ask. It has done really well with Pope and Young and they really appreciate it, but he understands the rule.

Mr. Clark said in the past when an additional tag became available it was because there were more public tags which they would make available to the one year program. This is probably how this because available.

Mr. Bair asked how often Pope and Young has a convention.

Mr. Hampton said every two years.

Mr. King said we've done it once, but it was a different process.

Mr. Bushman said he doesn't remember the specifics of this, but bear in mind the Conservation Permit Rule doesn't have variance authority in it. The variance rule has been changed. He's not sure this request falls within the variance authority of the rule today.

Mr. Bunnell said he doesn't think it was a variance when last granted, but an extra tag, but the Division's recommendation is that we stick with the rule for the sake of the future of the program.

Mr. Bair said Mr. Bushman has informed us that we don't have the authority to make the change necessary to grant this variance.

Mr. Hampton said UBA will be fine with this.

Public Comment

Miles Moretti, MDF said they support the Division's recommendation on the Conservation Permit Program.

Mr. Bair said we have made some positive changes this year and this audit has been very effective.

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

MOTION: I move that we accept the conservation permit allocation as presented by the Division.

9) Conservation Permit Annual Report (**Informational**)

Kevin Bunnell, Wildlife Section Chief presented this agenda item. (See Powerpoint Presentation) This report is to promote and increase understanding of the program. He asked that the Board look through this proposal and feel free to give input. Within the report there is an overview of the program, permits and money, lists of participating groups, detailed information about the projects that are done, auditing and a table of projects for each group. He has had some suggestions from participating groups on how these projects might be presented. Over the next several weeks he would be available to feedback. This concluded the presentation.

Mr. Bair suggested including pictures illustrating the various habitat improvement techniques that are involved. He is excited to see this happening.

Mr. Perkins said as he first looked through it, it's an excellent job.

Mr. Bunnell said Amy Canning deserves a lot of credit for this and he used her information for this report.

10) 2013 RAC/Board Dates (**Action**)

Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator presented this agenda item. (See Board Packet) The Board was sent a list of the upcoming dates that are very similar to this year's. She asked if there were any questions or comments.

The following motion was made by Jake Albrecht, seconded by Mike King and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2013 RAC/Board Dates as presented by the Division.

11) Other Business (**Contingent**)

There was no other business discussed.

The meeting was then adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
November 2012
Summary of Motions**

BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2013 SEASON DATES & APPLICATION TIMELINE

SRO: **MOTION:** To accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates & Application Timelines as proposed with the exception that they limit the additional youth archery permits to 100 permits per unit.

AMENDMENT: To ask the Wildlife board to add the following item to the action log: To consider making the West side of the Beaver unit a limited entry buck deer unit.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT: Unanimous

VOTE: 6 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

SERO: **MOTION:** To accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented
 VOTE: Passed with one dissenting vote.

NRO: **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board establish an action log item to study additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunity as presented by Mr. Zundel.
 VOTE: Motion Carries unanimously

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented.
 VOTE: Motion Carries unanimously

CRO: **Motion:** To ask the Wildlife Board to establish an action log item for the Division to investigate additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunities in the state of Utah
 VOTE: Passed unanimously

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
 VOTE: Passed unanimously

NERO: **MOTION** to accept as proposed
 VOTE: Passed unanimously

MOTION that the Wildlife Board include a requirement for all youth who get an archery permit to take the archery ethics course. (The ethics course used for the extended hunt)
 VOTE: Passed unanimously

MOTION to have Lance Hadlock write his comments presented to the NER RAC regarding deer permits. Then give them to the RAC Chair to take to the Wildlife Board.
 VOTE: Passed unanimously

CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMITS NUMBERS FOR 2013

SRO, SERO, CRO, SERO

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

NRO: **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013.

Motion Passes: For: 7 Against: 1 Obstain:1

LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013

SRO, SERO, CRO

MOTION: To accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

NRO **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board approve Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 1

SERO: **Motion:** to approve as presented

VOTE: Passed 3-2

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Cedar Middle School
Cedar City, UT
November 13, 2012
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2013 SEASON DATES & APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates & Application Timeline as proposed with the exception that they limit the additional youth archery permits to 100 permits per unit.

AMENDMENT: To ask the Wildlife board to add the following item to the action log: To consider making the West side of the Beaver unit a limited entry buck deer unit.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT: Unanimous

VOTE: 6 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstained.

3. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMITS NUMBERS FOR 2013

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

4. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013

MOTION: To accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Cedar Middle School
Cedar City, UT
November 13, 2012
7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Sam Carpenter Cordell Pearson Dale Bagley Harry Barber Brian Johnson Chairman Steve Flinders Rusty Aiken Mike Staheli Dave Black Mack Morrell Mike Worthen	Richard Hepworth Stephanie Rainey Lynn Chamberlain Teresa Griffin Heather Talley Zed Broadhead Chris Schulze Jason Nicholes Dustin Schaible Riley Peck Anis Aoude Scott McFarlane Vance Mumford Jim Lamb	Jake Albrecht	Clair Woodbury Layne Torgerson

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 14 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Steve Flinders explained RAC meeting procedures.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Let's get things started tonight. Welcome to the Southern Region RAC meeting, bucks and bulls. I'm Steve Flinders the Chair. I represent the Dixie and Fish Lake Forests. And if we start on my left we'll introduce the RAC. Mike.

Mike Worthen: Mike Worthen, Cedar City, representative at-large.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, Bicknell, agriculture.

Dave Black: Dave Black, St. George, at-large.

Mike Staheli: Mike Staheli, Delta, at-large.

Rusty Aiken: Rusty Aiken, Cedar City, agriculture.

Richard Hepworth: Richard Hepworth. I'm the aquatics manager in the Southern Region and I'm here filling in for Bruce Bonebrake.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson. I'm from Cedar City and represent the non-consumptives.

Harry Barber: Harry Barber. I'm from Kanab. I represent the BLM.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale. I represent an elected official.

Cordell Pearson: I'm Cordell Pearson from Circleville and I represent at-large.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab. I represent the sportsman.

Steve Flinders: I see a handful of public here tonight. The way this will work is the Division will make presentations. I'll then ask for questions from the RAC, questions from the audience, and then we'll proceed to comments. If you want to make comments tonight, that's what we're here to hear, fill out one of those yellow cards and get it up front here please. If there's no questions . . . review and acceptance of the minutes, gentleman, from the last meeting. Does the agenda look all right? I'll accept a motion.

Brian Johnson: I'll make a motion to accept the minutes and the agenda.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Brian. Seconded by Harry. Those in favor? It's unanimous.

Brian Johnson made a motion to accept the minutes from last month's meeting as presented. Harry Barber seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Regional update, Richard.

**Wildlife Board Update:
-Steve Flinders, Chairman**

Steve Flinders: Wildlife Board update. I missed the last Board meeting. I've got in front of me the motions. Bruce Bonebrake was there. It looks like everything passed according to how we moved that night. And as you recall there was an issue with ice fishing at Duck Creek and Jake made a motion that it be added to the action log, so we're looking into that, Richard's looking into that. Any questions about the Board meeting? It looks like from the motions it was pretty straightforward

Steve Flinders: Regional update, Richard.

Regional Update:

-Richard Hepworth, Aquatics Program Manager

Richard Hepworth: All right. A couple of things in the aquatic section first, since that's what I work in. Navajo Lake, we got the dike patched. The lake is slowly filling at this time and we'll have to wait and see if the fish make it through the winter. But we did get the dike patched and we'll start working towards more of a long-term fix there. The other recent news, Lake Powell has tested positive for Quagga or Zebra mussels. We don't know for sure the level of infestation yet. There's been no adults found, just the larval stage right now. There will be some more meetings and we'll find more out tomorrow on that but it looks like it's most likely infested with mussels at this time. It will just get worse as time goes on, most likely. Law enforcement, if any of you saw the news the last couple of days, our winter poaching has started. We've found a deer down at Toquerville, when was that Chris, Saturday? Saturday night, that was taken and the only thing that was taken off of it was the antlers. It looked like a nice deer. But that started, hopefully it's the first and last. Wildlife section, they're starting their deer classification stuff. Anyone that may be interested in participating or riding along contact Teresa. Youth pheasant hunt, we had that this last weekend. We had 12 inches of snow out there but it still was wonderful and it sounds like the kids all got pheasants if not got their limit. They released 1000 pheasants on that. The other thing is big horn sheep, they just did a release out on the Kaiparowits and Lynn has a video that we're going to watch really quickly that talks about that. Yep, let's do it. (Video Shown). All right, a couple of other quick things, our habitat section they're continuing to do a lot of the fire rehab work, and they've installing two big game guzzlers, one out on the Southwest Desert and the other one on the Pine Valley. And that's about what I have for an update. If there's any questions.?

Mike Staheli: I've got a question. What about that new proposed national park, would that take in this sheep area? (Inaudible -off the mic)

Richard Hepworth: I haven't seen anything on that. I don't know.

Mike Staheli: (Off mic).

Richard Hepworth: Yeah, I haven't seen a map on that.

Steve Flinders: Sounds like a fresh new controversy. Any other questions for Richard? That's a really nice video. That's neat. Is that a Gopro camera under the trailer? That was awesome. I failed to mention that Layne Torgerson is excused tonight. If there's nothing else let's jump into the action items. Anis, Bucks Bulls and Once In A Lifetime Season Dates and Application Timeline.

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates & Application Timeline (action)

-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator 11:20 to 32:03 of 1:38:43

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Thank you, questions from the RAC? Wow that was thorough.

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the audience? I think unprecedented. Seeing no questions we'll move into comments.

Lee Tracy: Lee, Lee Tracy.

Steve Flinders: Ah, Lee Tracy.

Lee Tracy: You say on those unlimited archery youth deer tags, is there a quota or a cap on any of the units? If 100 of them choose one unit will you issue those?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. It's unlimited on all units.

Steve Flinders: Good question Lee. Any others?

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: Moving to comment cards. You're close to the mic Lee, go ahead. And then Brayden Richmond. Brayden has two hats tonight.

Lee Tracy: My subject isn't on the agenda and I am not sure if this is the proper meeting to have it but I would like to see the statewide archery deer hunt return. I have done quite a bit of research on what happened and why it was removed. And I find no viable reason for removing it. No biological reason certainly. And the Wildlife Board actually voted for it on a 4 to 3 basis with the Chairman breaking the tie. They went against 4 of the 5 RACs who voted not to implement it. Some of the conversations that took place in the RACs that were made by individuals indicated that they wanted to keep the statewide archery hunt even though they were in favor of Option 2. And the two largest bow-hunting organizations in the state also voted to keep statewide, the statewide archery hunts. There are only 16,000 archers statewide, their success rate is 18.5 percent, and so it impacts very very few of the deer. Additionally we're hunting bucks, which does nothing to increase the herds; and the reason for removing it was to increase the herds. I would like to see it returned. And I ask you to recommend to the Wildlife Board that they do that.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Lee. You did pick the right meeting and the right agenda item for that topic. Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond representing Beaver SFW. We, Beaver SFW, agrees with most of the Division's recommendations. We have one concern, not necessarily a disagreement, on the change on the boundaries on the Beaver Unit for the elk. We're a little concerned with the reasoning for doing that. We don't see that there's a major impact as far as agriculture. However, we do agree with this change if in fact we can do it to support the deer herd on the west side of I-15. We think that that should be the emphasis for this change. Several reasons there, that deer herd has some phenomenal gene pool, very wide open country, easy to hunt, easy to shoot them. We'd like to see that herd split, another unit added. What we would like to actually ask for is a limited entry unit there. That does a couple of things, one it obviously has another hunting opportunity for quality bucks, also it's a huge recreational

opportunity for the whole state right there on the I-15 corridor where you could come down and have very easy access to view great deer year round. So we think it's a win win situation right there in that unit. In our unofficial straw poll of Beaver County residents, the majority is in favor of this and the SFW committee voted unanimously that we'd like to ask for that. That's all I've got for Beaver SFW.

Brayden Richmond: Changing hats. This is representing myself. I have a concern with the dates. I've come to several RACs, I hope this is the right one to address this. I'm always told I'm at the wrong RAC. Is this the right one Steve?

Steve Flinders: This is it, you're here. It says season dates.

Brayden Richmond: Okay good. I cannot figure out why we continue to hunt bull elk in the rut with a rifle. The archery hunt we share with spike hunters and deer hunters, lots of pressure, not a great hunt, primitive weapon. Muzzleloader hunt, we share with deer hunters, primitive weapon. Rifle hunt we put in the middle of the rut, all by themselves, 100 percent success rate and then we wonder why it takes us 20 years to draw an elk tag. In addition to that we're issuing more cow tags in limited entry, than bull tags. It's illogical to me. I can't figure out why we're continuing to do this. My proposal would be that we remove this from the rut, we increase the elk tags because if we lower the success rate we can provide more opportunity. Large bulls will live because they'll hide because they aren't rut crazed and stupid. And to me it's a win win, other than the guys that have waited 20 years to hunt in the middle of the rut. But some of those guys are dying of old age now so I think they'll be happy. Thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Brayden. Question for ya. Rusty

Rusty Aiken: On the limited entry unit that you're talking, they're all limited entry. It would just be like you're suggesting a premium unit or a?

Brayden Richmond: No, limited entry is different than general season. The problem with general season, if we up the age class and made a general season, you're lifetime license holders and dedicated hunters can get that tag ahead of the draw. So we want to make it limited entry so we separate it out from that general draw. That's the reason for doing it. We'd love to just increase the age class and keep it in the general pool, but then you have your lifetime license holders and will monopolize those tags.

Rusty Aiken: Okay, I am still unclear. So it would be a general season limited entry? It would be (unintelligible)?

Brayden Richmond: It would be a deer limited entry, not deer general season. Deer limited entry. So it excludes the once in a lifetime license holders.

Rusty Aiken: So it would be the Book Cliffs and the, same as that?

Brayden Richmond: Yeah, yeah.

Steve Flinders: Does the Division want to respond to some of the things they've heard tonight before we start discussing these things? Specifically Beaver elk boundary, the logic behind that?

Anis Aoude: Should I speak to that? I'll have the biologist speak to that and I'd like to speak to the

limited entry deer thing as well.

Steve Flinders: Riley Peck.

Riley Peck: Riley Peck, sorry. I recently became the biologist in Beaver and Millard County. The elk herd that we have on the west side of the Beaver is, we do find that it is kind of a lot of private property, a lot of limited access for the hunters. And the habitat that we have on it is not the greatest that we have for a limited entry elk unit. Consequently our hunter success and our hunter satisfaction rating on the west side of that side, from the hunters that we talk to as well, have talked about how they're less satisfied with the elk because of the limited access that we have to that area. And so it makes sense to the definition that we have in the Division of what an any bull area should be.

Anis Aoude: Thanks Riley (off mic). It's, I guess just to add a little bit to that...It's similar kind of what the Oak Creek is currently. Very similar habitat between those two sides both west of the highway. It's not great elk habitat. Elk can live there but they're being supplemented by agriculture really, so . . . That's the main reason for it. And as you know there were two committees formed on those units and they came to that decision as a committee. This isn't just the DWR recommendation. So sportsman were involved, the local landowners, the BLM, the Forest Service, all the folks were at the table and they all decided that this was probably a good way to go. I'll switch gears to the limited entry deer. I guess as a Division we're not opposed to it. What we are for is to actually have it be a more inclusive process. As you know when we do decide to go that way we usually like to either have committee do a statewide plan or a unit plan. And really to have one group say yeah we want it that way without going through that process makes us uncomfortable to do that. The statewide plan is coming up in 2013 and it can be discussed then, and I think the unit plans for the Southern Regions are up again in 2014 and it can be done at that point. To do it at this late stage from one, this is something that will affect statewide, it has statewide implications and we haven't heard it in any other regions. So to have one region kind of driving that just makes the Division feel uncomfortable because we like to get broad scale consensus on that. Again, you know these things do get discussed every time we open up the statewide plan. There are always good ideas of people wanting them to be this one limited entry, that one limited entry, but when you actually put it out there to the public it often does not get that. So that's the short of it for . . .

Steve Flinders: Thanks Anis. Further discussion with the RAC?

Brayden Richmond: Is there any way that I could comment on that?

Steve Flinders: Do you have more information?

Brayden Richmond: Well, I guess my only comment would be that our chapter would definitely support if we could just get it on the agenda. That's all we want. So we aren't asking to make that change, we would just like to get that on the agenda to approach that.

Steve Flinders: I think that SFW has a member on every management plan that's drafted.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, and if this board felt like they wanted to make a, put it forward as an action item or put it on the action log, ask the Board to put it on the action log, they can pass a motion to that effect.

Steve Flinders: Certainly.

Anis Aoude: And then I'd also like to deal with the season date stuff, as far as why we hunt bulls in the rut. You know a lot of this is social; it's not biological. The majority of our hunters are rifle hunters; and as you mentioned most of them have been putting in for whatever, 17 years now. And to go switch it on them now I think we'd hear an outcry. We are, we have thought through this and we did a couple of years ago put together a change in the hunt structure that we hope to be revisiting. It will be a discussion topic at the Board work session in December. So we'll kind of be resurrecting that. It doesn't totally take the rifle out of the rut but it kind of puts archers in the rut a little bit, puts muzzleloaders in the rut first, and then rifle hunters get it last. They're still in the rut. So it kind of brings everybody into the rut. And we do in our management plans have a late rifle hunt that in the statewide plan it says that no more than 65 percent of the permits can be in the early hunt. So it does at least reserve at least 35 percent of the permits are always in the late hunt or you know, they can't be any less than that I guess. Uh, I do agree that we do hear this a lot, you know why do the rifle guys get to hunt in the rut? And everything we do is through a public process, committees, and all that. And every time we do that we kind of come up with the same thing. Obviously there are those that are going to be outside of what we decided because their views are not the same, but really when we get everybody at the table we seem to come up with similar things.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Anis. We will move comments up here and to keep things moving along. I was surprised personally that, how specific the statewide elk plan is, and it's because elk I think are so controversial. But it would be nice if there were more flexibility for local working groups and individual management plans to be able to specify weapon split. Sixty-five percent, the rifle tags in the rut, that's a hard number.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Well it can be lower than that but it can't be higher.

Steve Flinders: Yeah. It can't be higher.

Anis Aoude: So they can, if the local biologist felt like he wanted fifty percent . . .

Steve Flinders: But the late hunt specified as well.

Anis Aoude: No the late hunt is not. You have to have at least, you can't go above sixty-five on the early. So you could go thirty on the early and seventy on the late. You just can't go above sixty-five. We don't want the majority to be in the early. Well it's the majority but no more than sixty-five.

Steve Flinders: Yeah the majority but no more than 65.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, right. So, I mean yeah, if the local biologist . . . and I think Sean did this on the Beaver a few years back where he put more permits in the late hunt. So you can, it can be done, and we can deal with that when we set permit numbers. I mean if the folks, if the local biologist feels it's doable and the folks in the area get his ear I think that can be done. And if they come to the public meetings as well, the permit numbers can be changed. You don't have to have the majority in the rut.

Steve Flinders: It's hard to take something back.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: Dave you had a comment?

Dave Black: Well I just had a comment on a little different topic as well, on the key dates for the season where they post the results of the draws. Also at that time they post the results of the dedicated hunter program. And I'm a strong supporter of the dedicated hunter program for a number of reasons. But we have some activities where we used dedicated hunters; we have the St. George fishing derby which we have about anywhere from four to eight hundred show up on a weekend. We've also started the last couple of years during the week we have a special needs fishing day where we involve some of the local schools and we need dedicated hunters to come and take time off of work to be there. And these all occur prior to May 31st. And there are also the banquets that require a lot of time and effort. And by waiting so long to post the results for the dedicated hunters there's a third of those in our pool that we use that have participated for a long time that are still waiting to see if they've drawn out or not and it's hard to get them to show up. And so as an organizer I'd like to see if there's a way we can get back on the agenda, the dedicated hunter program, as far when they post the results. From a personal side, you know, last year my wife was put in and she drew out but we didn't know until after these other things had come up. Fortunately we had a fishing derby at the Hurricane pond and she was able to help there. But you know she's 50 years old, she's a female, she's a school teacher, she's not going to go out and do a lot of the things that are physical, and helping with the derbies and stuff like that are a good opportunities for her to do that. Next year I'll be putting in. And if I wait until May 31st, I'm probably personally going to have over forty hours in two or three months that I'm going to do regardless. But then if I draw out on May 31st I've got to come up with even more hours than the forty that I've already put in. It seems that there ought to be a way that we can either bank the hours or do something to help the program a little bit more during that lag period

Anis Aoude: I am going to address that a little bit. The dedicated hunter program is not in the big game program, believe it or not.; it's in the outreach program. But having said that we have talked about banking hours. And I think that's probable the best approach just because when we've gone to thirty units the drawing almost has to happen at the same time as the general drawing and that's the reason why you have to wait until May 31st. And then plus if we start seeing more dedicated hunters come online you do have those that are in their second and third year that are able still to do projects as well. So only first year applicants are the ones that are affected by the May 31st date. So there are some options there. But I agree with you. When this was first recommend I said we should be setting up a program where you can bank hours because I know hunters will do things, you know, before they know they draw and then if they have the hours already there they're done. There was some push back from the coordinator at the time and that's why it didn't happen. We just advertised the job. We'll probably have a new coordinator for that dedicated hunter program in here pretty soon. And hopefully if we can convince them that it is a benefit to be able to bank hours I think they'll see that. It was more a procedural thing. They thought it would be difficult to track hours of dedicated hunters that are not in the program. They just didn't see the vision. I think if they're, you know, if they're shown ahead of time that it can be tracked and it's not a big deal I think it's doable.

Steve Flinders: Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: I think that the banking would even be just for that year, you know, and it would go away, so the following year they would have to do it again.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, and we can explore that options. They could bank them forever. I mean if somebody is doing work for us why not give them credit for it and then whenever they do get into the program they've already done the work. So we can explore, there's limitless ways to do it. But I agree with you. That's something that was discussed at length, initially, but it kind of got put aside. But I think we can resurrect it for sure.

Steve Flinders: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah I just have a quick question for you. On that uh, the Beaver unit that you're going to have an open bull on, how much access, public access, is there on that unit? Or is there any at all? Or is this strictly going to be set up for the people that own the property to bring hunters in and let them hunt?

Anis Aoude: There's a little bit of public land. You know I'm not super familiar with it, maybe Riley can elaborate on that. You know and that's the reason, that's the reason it would make a good any bull unit. Most of our any bull units either are primarily private land or they have enough wilderness in them that makes access hard. And that's how you actually protect the bulls from being over harvested is because of that access limitation. So it actually if, the more private land that's on it the better it fits into our any bull structure. But Riley do you have any?

Steve Flinders: It's got to be 98% public.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, yeah it's mostly public but . . .

Steve Flinders: Between I-15 and Milford Highway.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, there's a lot of public but I imagine

Cordell Pearson: Yeah I know where you're talking about.

Anis Aoude: I imagine the elk are going to be keying into the private land where the agriculture is though.

Steve Flinders: It's spectacular elk winter range but it's poor summer range and now that I-15's fenced, you know there's little mixing back and forth.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, my next question is, okay, what about depredation hunts on that unit?

Anis Aoude: Well we have, we currently have depredation hunts but those are mainly for cows. We don't have depredation bull hunts.

Cordell Pearson: Okay.

Steve Flinders: The forest service doesn't really have a horse in the race for the west side of the Beaver unit, but sitting in the management plan meetings, the last two go rounds, as soon as we start talking

about the habitat projects and improvements on the Tusher range, the mountains, all of a sudden we're talking about depredation and problems in Milford and around the I-15 corridor; you know those elk are getting in trouble. And it's that small group of elk really. But it precludes moving the discussion forward to really talking about what the possibilities because I think where we ended up with that discussion both times and trying to deal with it out there. And a lot of folks want to feature mule deer out there and not necessarily elk. Other discussion?

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I had something else to say. And I agree with you. But the question that I'm asking is if it's ninety-nine percent private and there's no access . . .

Steve Flinders: Public.

Cordell Pearson: It's ninety-nine percent public?

Steve Flinders: It's BLM.

Cordell Pearson: So it's all public?

Anis Aoude: Mostly public but the elk tend to hang around the agriculture in the summertime because that's the only green spots.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, all right.

Steve Flinders: Other comments and discussions from the RAC? We moving towards a motion? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: One thing.

Steve Flinders: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, and this isn't for you Anis believe it or not, this is, the gentleman talking about the statewide archery and trying to get that back. I've hunted down here and I'm an archer myself, and this year having this unit by unit and having a control on the number of archers that are in there, it was like there wasn't even a hunt going on. I mean it was just awesome to be able to get out, get into a place and stalk these deer and not have people driving by, going. . . We get hammered down here. And I know that Anis says we've done studies and it's not over crowded and all this, but I can tell you it was a whole new deal this year. And the hunters that I talked to were elated with the fact that we had done this and were very happy to have this unit-by-unit management for archers.

Steve Flinders: Go Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, And I would just like to 2nd exactly what he said. Okay? Because this year on the Beaver Mountain it was awesome. There wasn't 19,000 4-wheelers riding up and down the road with bow and arrows strapped to them so nobody killed nothing. The people that drew the archery tags had a great hunt. And we've fought this thing and fought this thing. And I have nothing against archers, love them to death, but we just keep giving and giving and giving and giving. I mean they've got twenty-eight days to hunt; everybody else has nine. So that's three times as many days to hunt as a muzzleloader or a rifle hunter has. And it's kind of ridiculous. I mean the more that we give the more

that they want. You know I think this works and I think we should take a look at it for a few years and see how it goes before we start changing everything in six months.

Steve Flinders: More comments. Are we working towards a motion somebody? Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: I wanna talk about this unlimited archery you thing. I'm just a little afraid, is there a way we can put a limit on those things for each unit? You're certain it's not going to get out of hand?

Anis Aoude: I am not certain of anything but the data that we have so far says we'll roughly have five hundred archers statewide, youth archers, that will take us up on it. You could put a limit on it.

Rusty Aiken: Limit it to five hundred then or six hundred.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, I mean we've had as many as fifteen hundred when it was statewide and they could hunt anywhere. Now they have to pick a unit. So, and then we will know where they hunted. So I think as a way to get our youth into the hunting sport is nothing better than having unlimited, so if dad drew this unit, you know, Junior can go buy a tag and go hunting with dad. So to me you know we could set up a limit but you know then again you have youth that aren't able to go hunting once that limit is reached.

Rusty Aiken: I understand and I appreciate the . . .

Anis Aoude: I say, you know, if you feel uncomfortable you can, I hate to have an arbitrary limit because we don't know exactly what it's going to look like and you'll have some youths hit it and some not. And again, these are youth hunters that are going to have somebody with them. There's not very many youth that archery hunt. I mean as you know the equipment's not cheap and it takes practice. So I don't see a whole lot of them going. And the majority of youth will draw in the drawing if they put in for a rifle. And if they put in for a rifle they can hunt all three seasons but if they have archery that's all they can hunt. So there's more of a draw for them to put in for rifle hunts even if they're archers because then they can hunt all three seasons. So you know this is something that we feel will be good for getting youth into the hunting. Again, you know if we find after one year or two years that we're seeing a lot more of it, and then we'll also survey them and see how good, what they're harvesting, what their wounding rates are and things like that; and we'll know how many they're harvesting. I mean just because you have five hundred youth archers out there their success rate is likely going to be lower even than the adult archers, which is about eighteen percent. So we're talking, you know, harvesting maybe sixty or so deer or something like that.

Rusty Aiken: But it's also the exposure, the traffic, and the thing that you're trying to get away from. These deer just get pounded and pounded and we're trying . . .

Anis Aoude: Well, you know, yeah, another five hundred hunters in the whole state.

Rusty Aiken: Well if you limit it that would be okay.

Anis Aoude: Well, no, I'm just saying that's what's likely going to be there. If we see it go, I mean we even had, we had fifteen hundred set aside statewide and we never hit that. So I think we could have it be fifteen hundred and it still wouldn't be an affect on the statewide basis. It's just, there's lots of area.

Not all of them are going to end up on one unit; it's just not the way it works. They're just going to go more than likely where dad goes or in their back yard or in their area where they can get out on a short notice. Again, you guys are free to make any motion you like. I'm just saying why we recommended what we did. We had it for two year and it never went up above four hundred and fifty when we had fifteen hundred permits. And that's when they could hunt statewide. So they could hunt, you know, the south one weekend, in their back yard the next. To me that's more of a draw than picking one unit for, you know. So, in any case that's the rational we did it unlimited. We figured let's see what we get and if it ends up being . . . I don't anticipate it being a whole lot of youth, but if we end up seeing that . . . And the reason why I don't anticipate it is very few don't draw. We looked at the data of how many youth hunters put in the draw and how many don't draw and you know I think there's only a few that don't draw and those that don't draw end up putting in for the hardest units. I think any youth could hunt anywhere in this state if they wanted to, in the drawing they could draw a tag. As long as they don't put in for the really hard to draw units, which there are only a hand full of them in the state. Again, you know, whatever you guys decide to do, you know, we can take forward but that's our rational for it.

Steve Flinders: Let's keep moving along. Other comments?

Sam Carpenter: Anis, just one more question about that same thing. So if I understand you they have to put in and not draw in order to go buy a tag or is it something that's going to entice them to come and get a tag?

Anis Aoude: Right, they don't have to put in and not draw. But these permits will become available after the drawing is done. So either it's a youth that forgot to put in the drawing or a youth that put in and didn't draw or maybe one that just wanted to hunt archery on this one unit. So, uh, you know when it comes to youth the easier you make it the better off it is. And the more stipulations you put on it the more youth you're going to push out of the hunting business.

Steve Flinders: Layne, Dale sorry

Dale Bagley: It's all right. Um, how many roughly then do you figure don't draw a year? Is there an idea?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the one we looked at, again, these are when we were statewide, and we don't have data for this last season because this was the first year of unit-by-unit. But we figured there were roughly twenty-three hundred that didn't draw, twenty-three hundred youth total that did not draw. But most of those, seventy to eighty percent put in for the southern region which was the hardest region to draw at the time. So those that put in for any other unit, or any other region when we were on a regional basis drew. So now that it's on a unit-by-unit basis it's going to be . . . we don't know how many will not draw. I think the majority will if they put in in certain areas but there could be some that don't. Again, this is just trying to get, if dad drew a tag on this unit and Junior wants to tag along he can buy an archery tag especially if they're archery hunting. It's probably not going to increase harvest a whole lot and if it does we can cut permits. I mean this system, our system is set up to issue permits, harvest the animals, do the classifications, if we over harvested we reduce permits. That's the way this system is set up. Really you may over harvest one year but you're not going to do it two years in a row. So and to me to over harvest one year is worth it if you gained X amount of hunters.

Dale Bagley: Well, and I agree. I'm not anything against the youth. I just think there's a certain number

that aren't drawing out maybe we ought to look at kicking up that twenty percent of youth and kick it to twenty-five so we can give all our youth, whether they bow hunt or rifle or muzzleloader or whatever. And where the success rate on archery and muzzleloader isn't that far apart. And plus these kids only get maybe two weekends to hunt. Like I say, I'm not against anything that's going to help the youth get a tag.

Anis Aoude: And that's why we did it for archery and not the other weapon types because they have such a long season. They could, you know, go out in their back yard, you know, on any weekend during that twenty-eight days or after school or whatever, you know. So that's the rational for doing it in archery because it is such a long season they can take advantage of it. Where the other weapon types, you're right, you know most times they have two days, two Saturdays to hunt. And even if you give them a tag a lot of times they're not going to be able to.

Steve Flinders: Brian.

Brian Johnson: On a personal note I think it's a great idea to give kids an opportunity to pick up a stick and a string. I don't think the impact is going to be that much. I really think it's something that we ought to do. It's, there's these different opportunities that we put a little carrot out to dangle in front of these kids. I think we need to seriously consider approving this one. On another note from a non-consumptive point of view, I would like to see more viewing opportunities on this Beaver Mountain, of the west side. If we could maybe put this as an action item to get the ball rolling in that direction of making it, having the discussion of limited entry hunting. Because right off the I-15 corridor that would be a great opportunity for people to go and look and to view some wildlife that isn't clear over on the Henry Mountains, that isn't clear over in the Paunsagaunt, it's not on the Bookcliffs. It's right off the I-15 corridor. The viewing on it would be fantastic. It sounds like the locals are behind it. I'd like to see us pass a motion for to get the ball rolling. I think you called it an action item, to send up to the Board or something?

Anis Aoude: It's, so basically yeah you could ask the Board to look at it or ask us to look at it and see how feasible it is. Yeah.

Brian Johnson: Okay, I understand that. I just wondered if there are any more comments with the RAC with any of that. Well I think we could tie that in with the motion with this. I just, I just uh, that's just something I wanted to discuss if anybody else was interested.

Steve Flinders: Making it a motion, if you feel strong enough about it. Cordell

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I'll make the motion that we accept what has been proposed here by the Division of Wildlife except for . . . and I think, and before I go through with this I just wanted him to answer one question if he can. If we limited the archery, this is a question, if we limited the youth archery to one hundred tags per unit, okay that's what twenty-nine hundred tags?

Anis Aoude: It would be three thousand.

Cordell Pearson: Three thousand tags? Okay, yeah, we've got thirty units. Okay, if we limited that are we going to have the same opportunity pretty much, instead of overcrowding one unit with these twenty-nine hundred youth?

Anis Aoude: I don't know if you will have the same opportunity, cause, you know, if the hundred sell out and that one hundred and first kid who's dad drew, he's not going to get to go. So it is limiting it somewhat. But yeah, you're right it won't overcrowd one unit. But, yeah, and that's one way of dealing with it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay well I'd like to make a motion that we accept your proposal as accepted and we limit the youth archery to one hundred tags per unit.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dale. Everybody hear that motion? Discussion on the motion?

Brian Johnson: Wait. Um, I would like to make an amendment to that motion that we have an action item to discuss making that west side of Beaver a limited entry deer unit, to send that up as an action item.

Steve Flinders: Is there a second? Seconded by Rusty. Discussion on the amendment? Let's do the amendment first. Seeing no discussion lets vote on the amendment, the amendment only. Those in favor of asking the Wildlife Board to make that an action log item? Hold them high. Those against? That looked unanimous. We'll go back to the original motion. Cordell's to accept the agenda, item five, as presented. Except limit youth archery permits to one hundred per general season unit. Discussion?

Brian Johnson: I have a...I would like to vote that 100 up and down, as a RAC. I would like to make an amendment to that motion as well, that we just, that we just do it as is, leave it unlimited, let the opportunity for youth go. I would like to see how this RAC feels just about part of the portion of this motion. So if we, I would like to make a motion that we... I don't even know how to word this.

Steve Flinders: It's not really an amended motion. That's just opposing what his motion is.

Brian Johnson: Okay

Steve Flinders: I say we vote on it, the motion on the table.

Brian Johnson: Okay.

Steve Flinders: If there are no objections. Yes sir, Mike.

Mike Worthen: Do we have good enough information from this years hunt to determine the impacts that that one hundred would have on statewide or on any individual unit?

Anis Aoude: No, the harvest data for this year is not yet available.

Mike Worthen: So we have no idea of what, what we're even talking about here on the one hundred limiting?

Anis Aoude: Well, I mean there would be a potential of one hundred more hunters on units that have thousands, well some of them may not have thousands, but . . .

Mike Worthen: But, and my concern isn't one hundred more hunters, it's making sure that maybe we're

not giving more permits in an area that can sustain it.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. And we will deal with that once, when we get the harvest and do the classification we'll reduce permits overall on the units that are below objective. So that kind of takes care of itself. Having one hundred permits plus or minus is really, you know, on most units is not that big of a deal. And then if we find a unit that's bad we could even say, you know, the youth hunters can't go on this one or something like that. If we feel that it's an emergency. But for the most part I think harvest was, you know, from all indications it was pretty good and maybe above average this year. So we'll have to see what the post-season classifications show us.

Mike Worthen: Okay and then another follow up would be if they failed to draw in that one hundred permit process their second choice would be still the same, that the second choice would have to be within that one hundred permits?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. So since these are over the counter once one unit sells out they'll have to pick another unit.

Mike Worthen: So it's over the counter, nothing drawn.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, right.

Steve Flinders: Rusty

Rusty Aiken: What's the deer tags numbers, ninety-three thousand?

Anis Aoude: We don't know what they are. I mean last year there were eighty-six five statewide.

Rusty Aiken: So this is three thousand, we're talking about three thousand permits above that.

Anis Aoude: Correct. That gets adjusted annually depending on buck to doe ratio.

Steve Flinders: Further questions? Discussion on the motion on the table?

Brian Johnson: So if we limit those to one hundred tags are we going to have a second draw, is it going to be first come first serve?

Anis Aoude: It's over the counter so once a unit sells out they will just have to pick another unit. It won't be a drawing.

Brian Johnson: I just can't see limiting a kid. I know we hate bow hunters in Southern Utah, I just didn't know we hated kids.

Steve Flinders: I think we are ready for a vote. Remember we have one voice . . .

Cordell Pearson: I think you have the wrong idea here; there isn't anybody that hates kids. Okay? So I think your statement was ridiculous. I think it's great . . .

Brian Johnson: I'll strike that from the record.

Steve Flinders: Any more discussion.

Brian Johnson: Motion to strike.

Steve Flinders: Let's vote on that motion by Cordell. Those in favor? Did you see those Lynn? Those against?

Lynn Chamberlain: (Inaudible off mic)

Harry Barber: I did. I represent the BLM. I can't see whether either one is going to make a negative (inaudible, off mic).

Steve Flinders: Did I see 4 to 3? 6 to 3, motion passes.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates & Application Timeline as presented with the added amendment written above and with the exception that they limit the youth archery tags to 100 permits per unit. Dale Bagley seconded. Motion carried 6:3 (Brian Johnson, Mack Morrell and Mike Worthen against; Harry Barber abstained).

Steve Flinders: Thank you. That does in Agenda Item 5. Let's take a ten-minute break and move on to number 6, Scott McFarland.

Steve Flinders: Let's get started again and move through this. We're ready when Scott's ready.

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 (action)

-Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator 1:16:29 to 1:29:19 of 1:38:43

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Unless anybody objects, we assume you're following the rule and everything on these. Are there any split recommendations in the Southern Region CWMUs?

Scott McFarlane: Um . . .

Steve Flinders: I submit that we cut to the chase in the Southern Region, if there's any split recommendations . . . we never argue with you on CWMUs. Might (unintelligible) your tenure here. If that's okay with you?

Scott McFarlane: If you guys would like me to shorten this up I definitely can shorten it up.

Steve Flinders: Does anybody object to (unintelligible)? Let's go to the Southern Region and talk about any split recommendations in case they're here. We love what you do. You follow the Rule.

Scott McFarlane: I don't want to talk that long either.

Steve Flinders: We're familiar with the Rule. That's why he makes the big bucks.

Scott McFarlane: Something is not coming out quite right here. This is the Southern Region.

Steve Flinders: Any controversy here? Any split recommendations?

Scott McFarlane: There's one thing that needs to be discussed on this. The Grazing Pasture is a previous CWMU that changed its landownership more than thirty-four percent. It's the same CWMU it was, it was grandfathered into the program. It's been an elk and CWMU. And in order to maintain that we have a provision in the rule where it goes through a process where it goes through a process where it goes through a review through our Division and also the CWMU advisory committee. It has gone through that process. The CWMU advisory committee had a majority vote recommending approval of that. This is a CWMU that has been a very very good hunting unit and provided good hunter satisfaction in the past, and they have recommended renewal of this one.

Steve Flinders: I think that was one of the earlier CWMUs in the program really way back when.

Scott McFarlane: Yeah, this is one of the older ones. It was previously grandfathered in. There are no changes to the CWMU, in fact Vance has, I think it's the same person that's operating it. Same person that's operating it . . .

Steve Flinders: But it's under ten thousand acres.

Scott McFarlane: But it's under ten thousand acres. Yes, it's a sixty-seven hundred acre CWMU. So that would require RAC and Board approval. And that concludes the CWMU recommendations portion.

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Awesome. Questions from the RAC?

None

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public? I don't have any comment cards.

Brian Johnson: Do you really have a question?

Brayden Richmond: I really have a question.

Steve Flinders: Give us a question. I am glad you stuck around. Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: It's Brayden Richmond. Just a question, and it's just because I really don't know, why are the deer percentages public and private so low? You know you made a comment to a sixty-forty split. Antelope's about sixty/forty but deer are only about ten percent to the public.

Scott McFarlane: The CWMU's have different options. The best option for the landowner to take is a ninety/ten split with deer and elk. Moose have to be a sixty/forty split. The pronghorn are a sixty/forty split also. They can choose to do a different option. They can do an eighty/ten split or an eighty-five/fifteen split or eighty/twenty split. What the splits do for them is if there are antlerless permits it gives more antlerless permits for the landowner. If he chooses an eighty/twenty split I believe it's twenty-five percent of the antlerless permits can go to the landowner and seventy-five percent go to the public. If they choose a ninety/ten split on those one hundred percent of the antlerless permits go to the public.

Steve Flinders: Very good question. And don't get me wrong, I am just trying to focus and make our time most efficient. We're here to make sure that everybody hears what they want and is able to provide feedback.

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: I don't have any comment cards.

None

Comments from RAC:

Steve Flinders: Any further questions or discussion? I think we're ready for a motion. Mack.

Mack Morrell: I make a motion that we follow the recommendations of the DWR on CWMU management plans, permit numbers.

Steve Flinders: Moved by Mack, seconded by Dave. Any discussion? Those in favor? Any opposed? That looked unanimous.

Mack Morrell made the motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented. Dave Black seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Scott. Number seven, landowner permits.

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013 (action)

-Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator 1:31:40 to 1:35:20 of 1:38:43

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Scott, explain what's premium versus (unintelligible) as you're going to get it. Premium permits why they, so they can hunt all three seasons?

Scott McFarlane: Yeah, they get to hunt all three seasons with the premium permit. That option is just not allowed by Rule. It's not an option for it.

Steve Flinders: They have to take three September rifle permits?

Scott McFarlane: Um, can you help me out on that Anis? I am not real sure how that works on those.

Anis Aoude: They can choose any of the seasons; they just can't have all of them.

Steve Flinders: Questions from the RAC? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Just one quick one, how do you determine what they're qualified for when you go through that criteria?

Scott McFarlane: If you are looking at a specific region I can have the region address that.

Sam Carpenter: The Paunsaugunt was the one that I was questioned about. And I told them that you had a formula for that.

Scott McFarlane: Yeah, we have a formula for all of them. Dustin, he could probably explain that better, the process they went through to determine that number.

Sam Carpenter: How come I didn't ask you this morning?

Scott McFarlane: Yeah, you should have.

Dustin Schaible: We look at the percent of LOA enrolled lands versus the percent, or like and how that matches up with the percent of the total species acres across the unit. So if the LOA represents ten percent of the species acres in the unit then we give them ten percent of the tags. Does that make sense?

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, that's fine. Thanks.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Mike.

Mike Worthen: On the Paunsaugunt, wasn't it last year that the group came in and requested an additional buck deer and it was granted to them? Management buck deer.

Scott McFarlane: A management buck deer? I believe it was. Yeah, is that? Do you remember it?

Dustin Schaible: Yeah, there was a, yeah we actually decreased the management tags last year. And so we were trying to decrease for the Alton CWMU. And so they were asking for, you know, to keep that additional permit.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, we're missing Wade this year. I can't believe he missed the party.

Anis Aoude: Let me just clarify that. Last year the discrepancy was on the CWMU not the landowner association.

Steve Flinders: Other questions?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

None

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: I have no comment cards.

None

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: Ready for a motion.

Rusty Aiken: I will make a motion to accept the recommendations as the Division has presented it.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rusty, seconded by Brian. Discussion on that motion? Those in favor? Any against? The vote is unanimous.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented. Brian Johnson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: I failed to recognize Jake Albrecht here, earlier, from the Wildlife Board here. He stepped out for a phone call. Thankful for him to come here. Anything else tonight? I have no other business. Ready for a motion to adjourn.

Brian Johnson: I make a motion we adjourn.

Steve Flinders: Motioned by Brian. Next meeting is December 11th in Beaver. Falconry, Guidebook and Rule.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St.
Green River, Utah
Nov. 14, 2012 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

**MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously**

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

**MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented
Motion passed with one dissenting vote.**

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 (Action)

**MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.
Passed unanimously**

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013 (Action)

**MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as presented.
Passed unanimously**

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Derris Jones-We need a motion to accept the agenda as written.

Todd Huntington: I so move.

Second by Blair Eastman.

Motion passed unanimously

Derris Jones- Let's get to old business and talk about RAC schedules and go from there.

I guess we need an approval of agenda. Everybody get a chance to look at the agenda? We need a motion.

Todd Huntington- I move to approve the agenda.

Blair Eastman- I second it

Derris Jones - It has been moved by Todd and seconded by Blair. All in favor? Voting was unanimous

Derris Jones - I need an approval from the minutes for the last unofficial meeting we had.

Todd Huntington- I move to approve the minutes.

Blair Eastman- I second that.

Derris Jones- Todd motioned it. Blair seconded it. All in favor? Unanimous

Motion passed unanimously

Old Business

Derris Jones – Ok, let's talk about old business.

Derris Jones - We tried to make an effort to move the meeting around a little bit to try and get some public input, and I think it worked that way, but it seemed that when we went south, then north RAC members had a hard time getting there. And when we went north, then the south RAC members had a hard time. So, I guess it's up to you, but I would like to suggest that Green River seems to have never had a problem with a quorum before. And I know Charlie probably has to travel the furthest. Would you rather come to Green River every time? Or would you like to try to make a trip clear to Castle Dale or to Price once or twice a year?

Charlie Tracy- I don't care, it doesn't matter to me.

Derris Jones -Either way?

Charlie Tracy - The time averages two hours to three hours.

Derris Jones - Ok

Charlie Tracy -Pretty much shoots the day.

Derris Jones - Ok, I know especially on these short days. The new RAC schedule is on the website now, so make sure you guys look at it and mark those dates down and try to save them for 2013.

Derris Jones – Well, I guess with that I would like to have some kind of formal decision from the RAC folks present tonight.

Charlie Tracy- You want a motion to have it all in Green River?

Derris Jones – I want a motion for what you guys want. I don't want to dictate, but my feelings were that it worked out better in Green River.

Kevin Albrecht- Well, I would just say that based on the hours it takes to travel to Monticello or Blanding, federal government employees would have to stay overnight. And the problem with that is shrinking budgets there are travel counts and that made it very difficult to do that. So I am with the Green River that is much better.

Derris Jones - Ok, that is what he thought. Does anyone else have an opinion? Ok, I would like to entertain a motion if someone wants to start one?

Todd Huntington- I want to make a motion to keep them here in Green River.

Chris Micoz- I second that.

Derris Jones - Ok, Todd made the motion and it was second by Chris to have the 2013 meetings in Green River (and I guess that will make that to include the December meeting as well?).

Brent Stettler- Are we talking about this December meeting?

Derris Jones - Yes. Do you have plans for it somewhere else?

Brent Stettler - Yes, I was wondering if we can do that.

Derris Jones - Where was it scheduled?

Brent Stettler -In Blanding.

Derris Jones - In Blanding?

Brent Stettler –Yes, I can make a call to Staci Coons to see if it would be okay.

Derris Jones - Do you have an opinion, Justin?

Justin Shannon- I don't have an opinion, but I do want to point that the reason that we started moving RACs to different regions is that when we had open houses across the region, Blanding wanted to discuss bears down there. In Price, they wanted to discuss big

game up there. I just wanted to keep that in mind to as why we moved them. I don't have an opinion on where we have them but it was just that was why we started moving them in the first place. What was the date of the December meeting?

Derris Jones - The 12th of December. (12/12/12)

Charlie Tracy- Why don't we just leave that one there so we don't have any complications.

Derris Jones - Ok. So we will start with 2013 and have them all here in Green River.

Derris Jones - We have a motion and a second. All in favor?

Derris Jones – Ok, the vote is unanimous.

Derris Jones- So this December 12, we will be going to Blanding.

Derris Jones – Ok, is anybody here right now that doesn't think that they will be making that December meeting?

Derris Jones – Do you think you will have a problem, Kevin, with having to spend the night down there?

Kevin Albrecht- I will try to do my best to be there.

Derris Jones Ok. Alright then I guess we will go the regional update.

Regional Update

By Chris Wood

Chris Wood - I am the Habitat Program Manager and I am filling in for Bill Bates today. He is in Seattle visiting with family. So, I want to excuse him. Brent are you on the computer?

Brent Stettler- Yes

Chris Wood - As you probably know our director Jim Karpowitz is retiring this month. There is actually an open house for him. This is on Monday the 26th of November in Salt Lake City. I think it is at the Lee Kay Center. Right? From 2-4 there is an open house to

honor him and his services to the division. They did interviews for the director's job two weeks ago and we haven't heard yet who the new director is. So we are still kind of waiting. It should be announced I imagine any day now. I was hoping to have an announcement here today. The aquatics section has been busy. They have a lot of annual surveys this time of year. They have been in Straight Canyon. They surveyed a mile long stretch and saw several hundred Brown Trout. They were checking for Tiger Muskie that came over from the reservoir. And in their sampling they didn't find any Tiger Muskie. And that is a good thing. Our Aquatics Manager pointed out that Straight Canyon is going to be a good alternative for fly fisherman in the upcoming years, as Huntington Creek has some water quality issues and some mud slide issues, and erosion issues. So this will make Straight Canyon a great alternative. They have also have done some sampling in Huntington Creek, Price River, San Rafael and Mud Creek for damage that was done by the Seeley Fire this summer. They are talking about perhaps stocking some of those streams in the upcoming years. It will take a few years for the Huntington Creek to settle before it is worthwhile to restock that creek. He noted that the entire stretch of the Price River and the San Rafael River received some fish kill as a result of that erosion and flooding from the fire. And so there is some talk about doing some native transplant or restocking in those stretches of the rivers as well. They did some gill netting in both Scofield Reservoir and Electric Lake in October. They are finding that the slot limits are working in Scofield with the cutthroat trout surviving and growing well. They anticipate a really good ice fishing year at Scofield with some of the gill net surveys they have done. They also mentioned that Kokanee Salmon will be stocked next spring in Electric Lake. And in two or three years from now, there could be some good Kokanee Salmon fishing at Electric Lake. It was on the news a little bit about Lower Fish Creek. The Bureau of Reclamation and some of the water user's groups turned off the water at Scofield and they probably did too quickly and as a result, a mile from the dam (down river) we had fish kill. We have talked with them and they are going to work with us in the future. They understand the importance of not shutting it off so quickly, We will be restocking that area in the spring and summer of 2013 and the fish that are below a mile from the kill will also recolonize those areas that now watered. That hit the news, and it is something that we are working with them on. Conservation Outreach has been busy working on a TV show with Emery Telecom. I believe these shows are every Friday?

Brent Stettler – Yes.

Chris Wood - I think twice, like at 5 and 10 or something like that?

Brent Stettler - Yes it is and then once in the morning as well..

Chris Wood -Ok this is on the Emery Telecom channel, so you have to be a Emery Telecom cable subscriber.

Brent Stettler -It does air in Carbon, Emery, San Juan, Grand counties.

Chris Wood- There you go and they have been following us around on some of our efforts that we have done on whether it be habitat projects or aquatics, fishing, law enforcement officers (I think they have been following around to check stations). You see they make these 30 min. segments and produce these really nice shows. And Brent is a co-host on the show. We also have done a kid's shooting event at North Springs on September 29th. We have had some Green River fishing events on Oct.8th. Then last week, or was it this week? No, it was last week Brent hosted some media from Emery telecom TV Station and from the Sun Advocate there in Price. And they did some fishing in Scofield and showcased that fishery.

The Habitat Section has been busy doing habitat work. This is our busiest time of year. This time of year we try to get seed on the ground for winter and spring moisture so things can green up. We have had a variety of projects. Some are stream restoration projects. Along with San Rafael we did a wetland planting actually on Saturday at the Matheson Preserve in Moab. We have done big game habitat work, both at Gordon Creek and Poison Springs Bench out in Emery County. We did a Gunnison Sage Grouse Project with the Nature Conservancy just east of Monticello there. So we are hitting all kinds of habitats trying to improve habitat for game and non-game species.

Law Enforcement has been busy as well. These two pictures on the top of the screen, this case came about last fall and had just recently adjudicated. I guess those two pictures are of pictures that have posts that those kids had put on Facebook. And with those pictures on Facebook and some subsequent leads they were able to press charges and those kids face several thousands of dollars of fines and revocation.They have had their licenses revoked and such. They are currently working on I believe 24 active cases in our region from August, October and through this month. They have a variety of different cases such as wasted deer and elk and along with other poaching cases. So they are always busy for law enforcement especially this time of year.

Our wildlife section has been busy also. There have been several Chukar hunts. We planted Chukars in Gordon Creek and had a Youth Chukar hunt in September. And the last two weekends we have planted Pheasants both at Huntington game farm and Desert Lake. This provided opportunities both adults and youth to hunt Chukar's, or pheasants. We have also been collecting CWD samples at our check stations during the hunts. I think Justin pointed out today to me that there has not been a whole lot of people stopping at these CWD sampling tables. And they don't know if it just that people aren't interested anymore or they are not worried about the disease, but it is a pretty low number of samples this year. Currently they are doing Big Horn Sheep flights, looking for rams and ewes, doing the ram to ewe ratios. Then later this month and in December they will be looking at deer classifications. Looking for buck to doe ratios, along with doe to fawn ratios.

Chris Wood - Ok, that's all that I have got. Any questions?

Derris Jones- Any questions for Chris?

Wildlife Board updates

Derris Jones - Well with that, I will give a quick summary on what happened at the board meeting on November 1st. There were some concerns regarding the Manti cougar harvest. The locals felt like the Manti was having too much cougar removal. That prompted John Shivik to put together a quick summary of some cougar biology and what data we have under this new cougar management plan. The bottom-line is that the board decided not to do anything with the Manti cougar harvest other than to keep a close eye on it and if the female harvest gets excessive early in the season, then they will pursue an emergency closure from the executive decision from the director's office. The meat of the board meeting was on the Aquatics. There was a pretty big public push to increase the possession limit on fish. Right now 1 daily bag is the possession limit and there are some people who felt that that was restrictive. Some people like to bottle fish and so if they were in their freezer or on their shelves that they felt like that shouldn't count towards a possession limit. The board decided to put that on the action log and so someone from the division will probably be presenting something to the board prior to the recommendations for 2013. There was also a big push for spear fishing interests. They felt that it really doesn't matter whether you're taking a fish hook and line or with a spear as long as you are within the bag limit. That ought to be as legitimate a way to harvest fish as it is with a hook and line. There were several organized fishing clubs present to kind of counter act that. They felt like it was a lot of waste with fish. With hook and line you can catch and release, whereas with spear fishing that there is no release involved once you have taken that fish. That was also put on the action log. And the division has been directed to get all of the user groups together including the spear fishing and try to come up with some kind of recommendation for how to incorporate spear fishing in the angling into things. For Joe's Valley, we had those that were present at the meeting and had a big push from the public to do away with the November closure, the November and December closure at Joe's Valley. Some of that same interest showed up at the board meeting and was able to get the board to move without RAC input from all RAC's, all they had was input from our RAC and it was a non-forum RAC so there wasn't really no vote. But with what our RAC expressed in the minutes of the meeting and the public that was at the board meeting, the board did decide to do away with that closure. So starting in 2013, Joe's Valley will not have a seasonal closure. The rest of the fishing guide book passed and there was a conservation permit

audit that was presented and I have a copy of that audit if anybody is interested in looking at it they are welcome take a look at it. And they re-did the three year conservation permit for the multi-year permit for conservation permits. I have a list of that too, if anybody wants to see which organizations got which permits. They passed the RAC and board schedule that some of us have. But it is on the website. So it's not that hard to look up. I guess that is it from the board. If there is anybody that has questions, I would be glad to try and answer it.

Kevin Albrecht- I have got a question. Um, maybe Justin or whoever can help. I have received some of those phone calls about the cougar management plan as well, and I know when we approved the plan I felt like I understood it well, but since that, I have received many phone calls. In the way that it was explained to me from cougar hunters was that they had a concern at the Central Mountains-Manti. That is why it is part of the sheep management zone and why there's an increase number on there. And I felt inadequate to answer that question or didn't even know for sure if that was the case. I was just wondering if Justin or Anis could address that on how that is.

Justin Shannon- Yes I can do that. It's not actually part of the sheep zone. The way they did is they made the cougar units match the deer monitoring units. So the Manti and the Wasatch both one unit for that monitoring, to tie all cougar harvest surrounding that to those units so we can basically see how our deer are doing and then tie the Manti cougar harvest to it.

Kevin Albrecht- So if I understand that right there could be an increase in tags on those units, if it doesn't reach the quota on the females.

Justin Shannon- Yes, but there is a higher quota because we are trying...well in the whole area because of those sheep units and because those sheep units are harder to hunt obviously because dogs can't really run in areas where sheep are and it is pretty steep stuff. The people do tend to gravitate to the easier units to hunt, which ends up being the Manti and that is what their concern is.

Derris Jones - Any other questions? Ok, with that we will move into the first action item with Bucks and Bulls, Once in a lifetime season dates and application timeline.

Bucks and Bulls and OIAL Rule, Season dates, And Applications

By Anis Aoude

Derris Jones - Are there any questions for the division and the RAC?

Charlie Tracy- Yes I have one question on the San Juan boundary change. Is that for the any bull elk hunt or just the limited entry?

Anis Aoude- It is for both. When you change the limit entry elk and the any bull. I believe it's both. Right?

Justin Shannon – It's just the limited entry portion.

Charlie Tracy- Because I was going to say that boundary should go clear over to the state line. So it is just limited entry then?

Anis Aoude- Yes it is so that would be general season spike and limited entry.

Charlie Tracy- Ok

Todd Huntington- I just wanted to clarify on that youth archery hunt, those tags have to be a specific unit. I get heart burn when we start talking the word "Statewide" and archery in the same sentence.

Anis Aoude- Yes that is a statewide recommendation. But they do have to pick a unit when they go to buy their permit.

Todd Huntington - And you mentioned a number of 450 was kind of something that came from the past when something similar was done, but that was back when we were state wide. Correct?

Anis Aoude - Yes

Todd Huntington – Are we are assuming or hoping that they will be similar in number and they will spread out in the units?

Anis Aoude –Yes, and that has been a trend with every hunter tag that we have-- everybody is always afraid that they are all going to go to one unit but that is not really the case.

Todd Huntington – I am too. I don't want to see them all up on Skyline. Ok, thanks.

Derris Jones - Does the division have a number in mind that if they exceed that?

Anis Aoude –No, we don't have a number in mind when we will start getting nervous, until we do some harvest areas to see what their success rate was. What their effect is on the unit, not how many permits they buy, so we will be surveying them to see what their success rate is. And then if we start seeing maybe one unit go above, you know where they are harvesting at pretty good success rate, and the numbers are, then we might start

thinking about where it starts affecting buck to doe ratio. I guess that is where we will start thinking that maybe we start limiting on this or that unit. And if we do that we would do it statewide. We would say there would be a percentage of the permits on each unit. Because to hold it at a specific number, some units have, you know, 500 permits and some other units have 5000 permits. So to hold at a specific number per unit would make sense, but I think a unit with a percentage would be better.

Derris Jones - At one time we kind of capped our permits at 97,000 and now they are at 95,000 something now?

Anis Aoude – 86,500

Derris Jones -Is that number just a self-imposed number that you guys have?

Anis Aoude – Yes, that number can change annually depending on the buck to doe ratio does, so it can go up or down depending on what units do. It is a starting point basically and then when we do our classifications, if we need to reduce permits to get to our ratio, we will and inversely if we need to increase it to lower a buck to doe ratio, we will as well.

Derris Jones - Ok, thank you.

Blair Eastman-On this Nine-Mile Range Creek boundary change and the Book Cliff boundary change. Isn't that a tuff little deal to control at a law enforcement stand point?

Blair Eastman- The boundary change right here in Green River, on the Book Cliff south and the Range Creek, Nine-Mile Range Creek unit all it takes in is this little bit of river bottom above us right here. That just looks like a really hard boundary to manage.

J.D. Abbott- Just from looking at it, I don't it will be too tough, especially with that road going up along the river.

Blair Eastman - Do you know who your landowners are up there?

J.D. Abbott - I haven't dealt much with them

Blair Eastman - Ok, good luck.

Blair Eastman - That is an odd little piece to pull out.

Derris Jones - If I remember right, it is because the Book Cliffs is limited entry and with all of those land owner's along there al wanted to be in the land owner's association so it's kind of a deal that they worked out so that they could hunt general season deer but still be on that Book Cliffs unit. And because of that, they just had to switch that extender.

Derris Jones - So now they are calling it Nine-mile Range Creek clear to the Hasting Road, I guess.

Blair Eastman – Right, that just looks like a tough little area too. You know it's in between the river and Hastings's Road.

J.D. Abbott -It's not a lot of extra and I think like Derris said, it's the agricultural stuff and I am just not for sure. I know TJ out of Moab has dealt with land owners a lot more here than I have.

Blair Eastman - Thank you.

Blair Eastman - I have got one more question now. On that extended late season youth hunt, your targeting Diamond Mountain? Or did I miss read that?

Anis Aoude - No, no, not Diamond Mountain, it's down below that the boundary. The boundary hasn't changed. You are talking the any bull?

Blair Eastman - Youth late season any bull hunt November 30- January 15th.

Anis Aoude - Yes

Blair Eastman - Unit #9

Anis Aoude - Right, it's within that unit but the hunt boundary doesn't include that.

Blair Eastman -I don't like those long season hunts any ways.

Anis Aoude -That hunt has been there for three years now. And you know it really hasn't been a ... you know

Blair Eastman - How many kids get tags for that?

Anis Aoude - About 50 and has always been how many.

Blair Eastman - Ok, Thanks

Derris- Any questions from the RAC? From the public? Mike, do you have any questions? How about from young Mr. Tracy? Ok, how about any comments from the public?

Derris Jones Is there anything else?

Blair Eastman - I accept the recommendations as they have been presented.

Charlie Tracy – I second it

Derris Jones -Moved by Blair Eastman to accept the division recommendations, second it by Charlie. All in favor?

Vote- The vote on the Bucks and Bulls and OIAL Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline was approved except for one dissenting vote cast by Kevin Albrecht.

CMWU Presentation

By Scott McFarlane

Derris Jones - Are there any questions from the RAC? From the audience?

Sue Bellagamba-Can you tell us where Summit Point and JB Ranch are located?

Scott McFarlane- I had better have the region do that. They are more familiar with that.

Guy Wallace- Summit Point is north east of Monticello and JB Ranch is on the LaSals.

Sue Bellagamba - Does Summit Point include the new property that the Nature Conservancy just bought?

Guy Wallace- No

Sue Bellagamba-Ok

Scott McFarlane- Summit Point is northeast of Monticello and JB Ranch is on the north east side of the LaSals , a private ranch.

Derris Jones - Are there any other questions?

Todd Huntington- I don't want to take a lot of time, I don't need a real detailed answer. But can you remind us how these tags are allocated or how the decision is made on those? Is it by acreage? Is it by? I mean how do we get to a deer number of 79 total permits, 66 private 13 public? How do we get to that?

Scott McFarlane- I'll try and make this as simple as I can. In a limited entry unit we have to follow guidelines just as if it was a land owner's association. So a percentage, or whatever percentage of that unit of the habitat that they have in CWMU is what percentage that should be allocated to the CWMU out of the total number that is allocated for the unit. It's basically an agreement between the biologist and the CMWU operator. And they are allocated as far as splits, the land owners or the CMWU operators or whoever makes the decision has the option to have a variety of splits or split options. Most of them have a 90/10 split. That is 90% of the tags go the private end and 10% go to the public. And with that when they have antlerless tags, that means that 100% of the antlerless tags go to the public. If they opt for a different split, say like a 85/15 is the next one that they can take this allows them the private land owners to keep 25% of the

antlerless tags and 75% goes to the public and then it goes on down as the splits changes. Does that sort of help?

Todd Huntington- Ok, so if you have a unit and we are taking the acreage of the whole unit and then we add the acreage of the CWMU, and so we are using that percentage and then that's the percentage of animals as well?

Scott McFarlane - That's in a limited entry, if that is included in a limited entry unit.

Todd Huntington - If it's not and if it's in a general unit?

Scott McFarlane - Then it's separates to a mutual agreement between the operator, basically the biologist. The biologist is there to make sure that they are not over harvesting or under harvesting for that matter.

Todd Huntington - Ok, so there is some leeway there if they are in the general unit. Ok so that answers that other question I had too.

Kevin Albrecht- So it is a yes on the two units that needed the variance. Is the acreage needed for the 10,000?

Scott McFarlane- Yes, I probably should have explained a little better. Both of those units were brought into this system before there was the 10,000 acre minimum on it. So they're basically grandfathered in to the system. And since then the requirements for an elk CWMU was a minimum of 10,000 acres, continuous acres and so in order for them to keep that they need or it does require a variance. Just because it is under acreage and a non-conforming unit.

Kevin Albrecht- I noticed that one was like 66 which is significantly under, so do they have to increase that number or..?

Scott McFarlane -It will stay at that. Basically it is the same unit that has been working very successfully in the past. They are already increasing acreage and in fact the same people are running the unit. It is just that the land ownership has changed.

Blair Eastman - They add 640 acres of state ground. My assumption is that you agreed to that based on the increasing the public permit by one?

Scott McFarlane - Yes they actually decreased their private permits by one and increased their public permits by one.

Blair Eastman – That's how you did that?

Scott McFarlane - Yes. And then that one is because the land or acreage that the public land is completely surrounded by the private land

Blair Eastman - Gotcha, Thank you.

Derris Jones Is there any questions or comments from the audience?

Derris Jones- I invite a discussion from the RAC?

Charlie Tracy- I guess everything is fine. If they wanted to complain then I guess they would have been here. Are you asking for a motion now?

Derris Jones - If we are ready.

Charlie Tracy- I make a motion that we pass the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as it has been presented to us.

Wayne Hoskisson- I second that.

Derris Jones - Motion made by Charlie Tracy to approve the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 as it has been presented by the division and seconded by Wayne Hoskisson. Everyone in favor?

Vote: Unanimous.

Landowner permits by Scott McFarlane

Todd Huntington- So these tags are figured a little bit differently than the CWMU's? These are based more on the limited entry unit that they are in and is this a specific percentage of the tags in the limited entry unit?

Scott McFarlane - The limited entry unit is allocated when they make a recommendation they say this many tags or permits are allocated for the unit and the limited entry land owner association if they qualify for whatever percentage of the habitat, they have with in that unit so say if they have 50 for simplicity sakes, if the land owner association complies with 50% of the habitat in the unit then they would qualify for 50% of the tags. That is allocated for that unit.

Charlie Tracy- So you have to be in a limited entry for this land owner's association thing to kick in. Right?

Scott McFarlane - That's correct

Charlie Tracy- So it's the same boundaries as the limited entry?

Scott McFarlane – Right.

Charlie Tracy- Ok, Thank you.

Derris Jones - Are there any questions from the RAC? Any questions or comments from the audience?

Derris Jones -Let's go back to the RAC and discussion. Can we have a motion please?

Blair Eastman- I would move that we accept the land owner permit numbers as they were presented,

Chris Micoz- I second that.

Derris Jones - We have a motion from Blair to accept the land owner permit recommendations as presented, second it by Chris. Are all in favor?

Vote: Unanimous

Derris Jones adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY – MOTIONS PASSED
Vernal Northeastern Region Office, Vernal/November 15, 2012

5. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2013 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION to accept as proposed

Passed unanimously

MOTION that the Wildlife Board include a requirement for all youth who get an archery permit to take the archery ethics course. (The ethics course used for the extended hunt)

Passed unanimously

MOTION to have Lance Hadlock write his comments presented to the NER RAC regarding deer permits. Then give them to the RAC Chair to take to the Wildlife Board.

Passed unanimously

6. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013

MOTION to approve as presented

Passed unanimously

7. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013

MOTION to approve as presented

Passed 3-2

Carrie Mair: We are missing information from the Diamond Mountain Landowners Association pertinent to passing the variance.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY

Bingham Entrepreneurship & Energy Research Center (Bingham Center), Vernal
November 15, 2012

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Floyd Briggs, Chair
Kirk Woodward, Sportsmen
Brandon McDonald, BLM
Carrie Mair, At-Large
Wayne McAllister, At-Large
Bob Christensen, Forest Service

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Ron Winterton, Elected Official
Andrea Merrell, Non-Consumptive
Rod Morrison, Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Boyde Blackwell, NER Supervisor
Anis Aoude, SLO Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Scott McFarlane, SLO Private/Public Coord
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Derrick Ewell, NER Wildlife Biologist
Lowell Marthe, NER Wildlife Biologist
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Biologist
Clint Sampson, NER Conservation Officer
Torrey Christophersen, NER Lieutenant
Ron Stewart, NER Conservation Outreach
Gayle Allred, NER Office Manager

1 & 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

MOTION to approve agenda by Wayne McAllister, second by Carrie Mair

MOTION to approve minutes by Wayne McAllister, second by Carrie Mair

3. OLD BUSINESS

4. REGIONAL UPDATE – Boyde Blackwell

We've had questions about what items are addressed and which RAC is the time to address it these items. For a review: if you'll look on the website www.wildlife.utah.gov, people can find the RAC schedule. It's on there for the entire year and 2013 also. It tells what we're going to be talking about, whether hunt strategies or season dates, and when we're going to talk about permit numbers. It hasn't changed for many years now. April and November are the months to talk about numbers and season dates. Also, two to three weeks prior, Mark from the Salt Lake Office, sends the agenda out to the media so you'll know when and where the meetings are held.

Kirk Woodward: If the public has a hunt strategy, how can they get it on the agenda in time?

Boyde Blackwell: We can take public input on season dates at this meeting.

Kirk Woodward: How does that get passed on to the Wildlife Board?

Boyde Blackwell: We'll take input here and when we go to the Wildlife Board, Floyd will explain what was passed and input received. It will also be in the minutes and recorded.

Kirk Woodward: I don't think I'm alone with this frustration. There's some concern about how to get the items on the agenda or how we actually get them heard.

Floyd Briggs: Prior to the time we set the agenda for the RAC meeting, contact the RAC chair and we can get it put on the agenda that way.

Boyde Blackwell: As long as it's not dealing with permits at the wrong time or strategies at the wrong time, we can add it to the agenda.

Anis Aoude: If an idea isn't presented ahead of time and comes up at the RAC meeting, if a member of the RAC thought it was worthwhile to move forward, they could make a motion to put it on the action log to be studied further. The action log includes ideas that come up in meetings that we can't act upon right away because ramifications are unknown. We look into these matters and see if they're feasible or not, benefits and drawbacks. That's a preferred way to do it if someone comes into the RAC with a suggestion that some RAC members thought was a good idea. RAC makes a motion that it be considered.

Bob Christensen: That would come back to all the RACs?

Anis Aoude: Right. If the Board thought it was worthwhile, they will ask us to take it out to the public.

Kirk Woodward: I wanted that to be clear because in my experience over the last several years, good ideas haven't gone anywhere.

Boyde Blackwell: We want public input and to be able to discuss it.

Carrie Mair: One way we could do it is table information that should be presented at the next meeting, and brought up in the next meeting as Old Business under Robert's Rules of Order.

Deer Hunts:

Check stations 2012: we had a lot more deer checked in at our Strawberry check station. In 2011 118 were checked in; in 2012 there were 180 were checked in. 30 were yearlings in 2011 and 42 in 2012. Many check stations were up in 2012 from 2011.

Fisheries:

Treatment of the Middle Fork of Sheep Creek was completed in late summer. The annual burbot netting in Flaming Gorge has been completed. In some areas it's down and smallmouth numbers are up, but on the Wyoming side, burbot is up 60%, so we're continuing to look at how to deal with the burbot which compete with other game fish.

Native Aquatics work is wrapped up and I should have information on that down the road.

Kokanee egg take. We took over half million eggs from just one stream, Sheep Creek so we'll be able to hatch out quite a few kokanee.

Outreach: Worked with fisheries on Red Fleet, Starvation and the Gorge. Signs have been placed on Flaming Gorge fishing peer.

Law Enforcement has been working hard on the hunts.

Retirement:

Charlie Greenwood has retired. The new manager is Dax Mangus. He and his biologists would love to hear ideas from you that we can work through.

Jim Karpowitz, Director of Wildlife Resources, is retiring at the end of the month. We haven't heard who the new Director will be yet.

Positions filled:

Predator specialist who collects coyotes and nuisance bear is Kyle Kettle
Walk-in access replacement is Alex Hansen, who moved from the Habitat section

**5. BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL 2013 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE
– Anis Aoude**

2013 General Season Deer Hunt dates

Archery	8/17-9/13	28 Days
ML	9/25-10/3	9 Days
Any Weapon	10/19-10/27	9 Days

2013 General Season Elk Hunt Dates

Archery Spike Bull	8/17-9/6	21 Days
Archery Any Bull	8/17-9/13	28 Days

Any Weapon	10/5-10/17	13 Days
Muzzleloader	10/30-11/7	9 Days
Youth Any Bull	9/14-9/22	9 Days
Late Youth Any Bull	11/30-1/15	47 Days

BBOIAL Recommended Changes Statewide

Allow youth to purchase unlimited over-the-counter general season archery deer permits. These would become available over-the-counter after the drawing. There was some concern initially because it is unlimited. What seemed to calm those concerns is when we looked at the data; we actually had only sold 450 of the 1500 available in 2011, so not every youth will take advantage of this.

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

(Northeastern Region included in this recommendation)

Add Late Any Weapon Limited Entry elk hunts on the Wasatch, Nebo and Deep Creek units to reduce crowding. Now that we're seeing permits on each unit we need to split it back out. The Wasatch unit is shared by Central and Northeastern Region.

Key Dates for 2012

Big Game drawing:

Feb 1 – March 4, 2012

Application period for bonus and preference points and application withdrawal period:

February 1 – March 11, 2012

Results posted:

May 31, 2012

Questions from RAC:

Floyd Briggs: On the draw results dates, that's two months after the application period ends. Is there any possible way that can be moved up?

Anis Aoude: We don't set permits until the April/May timeframe. Pretty much, the day the permits are approved by the Board, the drawing takes place and is a pretty quick turnaround.

Floyd Briggs: I'd like to know a little earlier than the end of May.

Anis Aoude: We can't make recommendations until we get the harvest data, put it together, and go through the RAC process. That's the earliest we can do it. To have it earlier, the RAC would have to use year-old harvest data, which a lot of people are not comfortable doing.

Carrie Mair: Regarding the unlimited over-the-counter archery permits for youth, will they need to take an archery education course?

Anis Aoude: No.

Carrie Mair: That should be implemented, at least the ethics course for archery, implemented into the hunter safety program before we release all these permits to the kids. All archery should have a hunter education program.

Anis Aoude: That's a great idea. That's been suggested.

Carrie Mair: I've received information from sportsman groups who fund packets for the Hunter Education System. I think that's vital to the release of an unlimited amount of permits archery to the youth; there's a bad name regarding archery. What if we required that go before the Board in a motion?

Floyd: Yes, that can be done.

Bob Christensen: Two RACs haven't had the opportunity to vote on that.

Anis Aoude: It doesn't preclude you from acting on it; it's just a way to get what you want put forward.

Boyde Blackwell: When a recommendation has come from a RAC, that hasn't gone all the way around, often times those are the things that go on the Action Log. The Board will give them a deadline and report back.

Kirk Woodward: So we could pass everything that Anis just gave us and suggest that the Wildlife Board look at implementing an archery ethics course for all archers. We wouldn't have to include that in your motion to pass everything else. In the past we've gotten bogged down to add things and then it bogs things down. Where, if we passed everything and then made a proposal to push that onto the Board, that makes it more simple.

Anis Aoude: Whether it's a separate motion or included, it would be to the Board, so they would hear that at the Board.

Kirk Woodward: What implications are there, if we started messing with laws, that all archers would have to have an ethics course? Is that something that could happen that quickly?

Boyde Blackwell: If it's code, no, but you could add it. It would have to go through the Legislature.

Kirk Woodward: You are proposing a change of law.

Anis Aoude: There is an archery course available but it's not mandatory yet. Archery information is included in the regular hunter education class.

Kirk Woodward: The archery course is online and you can choose to take it.

Carrie Mair: There's a program that's gone through Leadership team meetings called the Tag Along system. It's another youth program that's been discussed. For every adult tag dispersed, you are able to purchase a tag for a youth hunter to go along with you. That means they can use a tag to go along with you and opportunity to use a weapon on your tag. I'm disappointed it was not presented at these RAC meetings. I submitted that program.

Anis Aoude: That was discussed and we were going to present it at this RAC, but it has to be a law change, because it's a transfer of tag and right now it's illegal. We are pursuing it as an informational item at the Wildlife Board meeting in December and then for us to present it at the Legislature as a rule change. Our law enforcement will present it.

Kirk Woodward: So she doesn't have to make a suggestion.

Anis Aoude: Right. When we went through our lawyers, they said it's a law change and we need to make the Wildlife Board aware of it. They can't act on it, but if they're behind it and don't see any red flags, we'll pursue it. Once it's in law we can pursue it and vote on it.

Questions from Audience:

Travis Mold: Regarding sales of antlers. Can you explain the dates?

Anis Aoude: Those dates have been around since there has been a proclamation. Those are the dates when you can legally sell those items.

Travis Mold: I wasn't aware that there was a season on selling those items. We make part of our living on selling antler chandeliers and it was never brought to my attention. When we have orders, we have to seek antlers out.

Anis Aoude: Once they become furniture or taxidermy, they're no longer an item. And it doesn't cover shed antlers but antlers attached to the skull plate.

Comments from Audience:

None

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: I like the youth archery I had questions about that at first; plus the tag-along system if that ever gets proposed. Is it possible when they do the surveys to have a question added to ask the youth if they want one of those?

Anis Aoude: We're going to have a separate survey. It's definitely something we're going to watch closely.

**MOTION by Kirk Woodward to accept as proposed
Second by Bob Christensen**

Passed unanimously

MOTION by Carrie Mair to request the Wildlife Board add an addition to unlimited tags for youth, to also require an archery ethics course for the State of Utah for all archery hunters.

Anis Aoude: Is it the ethics course or the archery hunter education course?

Carrie Mair: Both, possibly combined into one.

Anis Aoude: They have both into them.

Carrie Mair: There are people already in the system that would need to take the archery course in addition.

Kirk Woodward: What would that have to offer that they haven't already had?

Torrey Christophersen: Where would you draw the line with bow education and muzzleloader education? We require them to show proficiency with only a .22. Hopefully they're going out with an adult to get accurate with archery.

Floyd Briggs: Archery takes a lot more preparation than with a rifle.

REVISED MOTION by Carrie Mair that the Wildlife Board implement a requirement for the youth to take the archery ethics course.

Bob Christensen: Like the ethics course for the extended hunt?

Carrie Mair: That course.

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

Kirk Woodward: We need to address some ideas.

Lance Hadlock: I would like for the RAC and Board to have deer categorized as just deer, not general, limited entry and premium entry. It should all be a deer tag and cost the same amount. The Division might be concerned because limited entry gets so much, but I propose if you put in for Henry Mountains and don't draw, you get a bonus point and a 2nd 3rd, 4th choice and still get your bonus point. You might not get to hunt a Southern region rifle, but a muzzleloader or archery as a second unit. This will give more opportunity. Trophy hunters want to hunt bigger deer and are willing to do it less often. It might take a few years, but it will help the point system. If they have a lot of points, they'll hold out for the Book Cliffs, but later, with only a couple points, they'll put in on a lesser hunt. It will make those tags more accessible.

Another possibility is that for the guy who wants the premium hunt, a late muzzleloader hunt like they used to have for deer be offered; maybe three percent which would be three guys. I can guarantee there will be a lot of guys who will want to hunt that and take them away from hunts that they would be hunting if that wasn't there, and give somebody else the opportunity to hunt that.

To spread people out and give opportunity, offer an all three seasons premium hunt for 1% of the tags, which would be four to five people. If you draw that tag in muzzleloader, archery and rifle. It's going to take a lot longer to draw but give a better opportunity for a larger buck. The guy that wants that will wait for it, and others will have more of a chance.

Put all hunts together. I don't see why a Henry Mountain costs more than a Diamond Mountain. It's not fair to the public to have to pay multiple prices. The Book Cliffs premium hunt costs \$500.00. It's not fair. At least with the deer it should be this way. I propose the Division look at

that. The people who want bigger bucks will take one unit with few permits available; others are opened up.

Bob Christensen: What about the lifetime license holders?

Lance Hadlock: It's not going to make them happy but they are about too old anyway.

Carrie Mair: I am a lifetime license holder and am guaranteed a tag. There's really no way to do this without making a lot of people unhappy.

Lance Hadlock: If life-timers don't draw the Henries, they will draw their second. I'd like it for the Wildlife Board to consider.

Kirk Woodward: He's made a suggestion that will make some people happy but that gives those to those people who want to put in for those units and maybe have a little less time.

Floyd Briggs: We are spinning our wheels here. We already went and moved the buck/doe unit back.

Kirk Woodward: True. All this does is change the way that people apply for this unit.

Lance Hadlock: Yes. A deer is a deer. It doesn't change management.

Kirk Woodward: For example, if I put in this year, I could put in my first choice Diamond Mountain and my second choice South Slope. I may not draw my Diamond Mountain tag but for second choice I could get South Slope and not lose my points. So I'm still trying for the trophy unit but get my second choice. Financially, a deer's a deer, and how much we're going to draw when we draw that Diamond Mountain tag, but the idea is sound, giving people opportunity and ability to still put in for what we're calling premium units. Right now I put in for the Henries and as a second choice I get a general tag. This would force me to put in for first, second, third and fourth choices.

Anis Aoude: This is nothing new. We've considered this many times. Colorado does this. But the difference is general seasons have "preference" points, limited entry have "bonus" points. You could not transfer preference points to bonus points. Preference points prefers over others, whereas bonus points are split into half. Taking people's points away and reallocating has legal issues and would be a nightmare. Beyond that, if we went to that system, it would not increase opportunity. People are always going to put limited entry as first choice and then make a second choice.

Anis Aoude: It only places people in the same point system. We will continue to manage limited entry like they are now, for huge bucks. Given that, you're not increasing opportunity because the guy is committed to that, but he'll put the second choice as Vernal and points, but it doesn't change anything.

Anis Aoude: The only way to increase odds is to make permits and we're not going to increase deer. He had some good ideas, but combining the points isn't going to change a whole lot as far as opportunity goes. It's the same outcome but with a different process.

Kirk Woodward: He said we'd change it all pricewise. If we make everybody pay \$40, I don't know if that changes much.

Anis Aoude: I don't think the price thing is an issue at all. It just all has to go through legislation. You have to run the Division and you have to bring in so much revenue. As long as it's revenue neutral you can change the structure. If you raise the price there will be more than 50% of the people angry about raising the price of the general season because there are more who hunt general season than limited entry.

Anis Aoude: It will make maybe 1 /10 of 1% in draw odds. You don't realize the disparity of how many people put in and how many draw out.

Kirk Woodward: It does make the social issue so if I want to hunt with Wayne and we had three and four points we could hunt together.

Anis Aoude: You could do that now. There isn't a general season now that you can't draw with three points or two points. It'll be just as hard to draw. The permit numbers haven't changed. It's just a different way of dividing the pie. I'm not opposed to any of it but it's a lot of work. And people who lose their points will be angry and you'll hear from them.

Floyd Briggs: Lance, would you put this in writing and get groups behind you to endorse it? I've taken letters to the Wildlife Board and they look at them. Don't compare Utah to another state, just put down what we need to do in Utah.

Comment card from Seth Simmons: The guys who want to draw that good tag, they'll put in for those good units. When they nullify out, they'll put in for those good units again. Others will put in for South Slope so they'll draw out more often. That would free it up for guys who want to put in for hard to draw units.

Mike Davis: Question: A non-resident can apply for all species, residents have to choose. I think we're backwards. It's definitely once in a lifetime. I'm not going to live long enough to hunt mountain goat and bison and moose.

Kirk Woodward: What's the downside to letting everyone put in for every hunt?

Carrie Mair: You're decreasing your odds. You're increasing the amount of people putting in. There will be three to four times as many so it takes longer to draw.

Anis Aoude: If you allow everyone to put in for everything, the tag that takes 15 years will take 30. By allowing non-residents to put in for everything, it makes it harder for them to draw. It's more of a revenue generator.

Kirk Woodward: Wouldn't it work out because of all the different choices?

Anise Aoude: Your chances increase one in five but the people coming in greatly increase the odds.

Kirk Woodward: If I can now put in for all of the once in a lifetime, will it make it that much harder?

Anis Aoude: If the bison guy could put in for all the species, it would be that many more people competing with you for the species.

Anis Aoude: If your chances increase one in five but a thousand people put in for the draw, you just shot yourself in the foot and your odds will diminish greatly. There's a thousand putting in for bison, several thousand putting in for sheep. All of those people would be coming into your hunt choice. **I can run the numbers.**

Kirk Woodward: I would like to see them.

Anise Aoude: It might not be much different for someone doing it all but would really hinder the process for someone who only wants bighorn.

Kirk Woodward: I want to hear the down side before I make the suggestion.

Anis Aoude: We've considered it. They will eventually realize they'll never draw out in their lifetime.

Kirk Woodward: So the public needs to come in an organized force with a paper and with backing, before they come to the meeting.

Floyd Briggs: If you get people as a group and have representation from all the groups, then maybe it would be heard.

Kirk Woodward: So now Lance has to go back, get Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, or whatever, and signatures, and get that for next year?

Bob Christensen: You can make a motion now and have the Board look at it.

Floyd Briggs: We work on deer plans last year and every year. And I don't know how many years we've voted on increase in numbers and don't have solutions.

Carrie Mair: They can't give an immediate response. It takes time, like for the Tag Along proposal.

Boyde Blackwell: It needs to be in written form with the endorsement of other sportsmens groups.

Floyd Briggs: Boyde has an idea. What if Lance was to bring to the RAC Chair this proposal in written form? We've heard his ideas. If he was to bring it to the RAC chair before the Wildlife Board meeting, we could take them a letter with a recommendation that they address it? Lance would you be willing to do something like that?

Lance Hadlock: Yes.

MOTION by Kirk Woodward to have Lance Hadlock give a written proposal of his comments presented tonight to the RAC chair he'll take it to the Wildlife Board.

Second by Wayne McAllister

Passed unanimously

Floyd Briggs: When you get it written up, run it in to the NERO.

Kirk Woodward: Run it by the sportsmen groups in the area and get their feedback.

Boyde Blackwell: The Wildlife Board meeting is on the 6th, so we'd need it before then.

6. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013 – Scott McFarlane

Circle Bar Ranch met the acreage requirements but the configuration did not meet the requirements for a CWMU.

Questions from RAC:

Carrie Mair: Can the region explain what the issue was with Circle Bar?

Lowell Marthe: (slideshow). 1. In the Lucerne Valley area there are two pieces on each side tied together to reach the total 5,000 acres. The two pieces don't work well together. The connecting point is a house with a canal and 10 acres of non-huntable area. The landowners are not all on board with the CWMU application, etc. 2. Regarding the signing marking, there are lots of corners which would be very difficult to mark. There are over 88 corners, not including roads, rights of ways, and streams. 3. There is a general access question regarding the reduction in number of public hunters as others get permission. Other landowners are still willing to give permission and many are not in favor of this CWMU. There is lots of confusion and some landowners want to pull out.

Floyd Briggs: Jed Olsen, on the Crowfoot, have you explained to all the landowners there what constitutes a CWMU?

Jed Olsen: I have. On both units, it needs all the landowners to understand what the program is for. In Circle Bar Ranch, I believe it was a good unit. Maybe some of the landowners felt it limited who they were going to let in and hunt. I'm fine with it being denied if the landowners aren't on it. But as for the Crowfoot the people have all had it explained to them.

Floyd Briggs: I heard Milt withdrew.

Jed Olsen: No. He called me about three weeks ago and I went up and talked with him again on it and he was fine.

Floyd Briggs: Do you have to have signatures on this before you put it in from the landowners to make application?

Scott McFarlane: That's part of the application, is a complete list of signatures or a copy of the hunting lease contract.

Jed Olsen: That's why I didn't understand that there were landowners who had problems.

Floyd Briggs: Did you get signatures from Doug?

Jed: Yes, in July sometime.

Floyd Briggs: Did he understand? Doug said two nights ago that he didn't sign it.

Carrie Mair: This is making me real nervous.

Floyd Briggs: Is it primarily the agriculture land on the creek and meadows, not the flats?

Jed Olsen: Not the flats.

Lowell Marthe: showed Floyd map and Jed explained the boundaries.

Carrie Mair: Why do you want the CWMU? Is it a problem to manage deer there now?

Jed Olsen: I believe one unit would be easier. If it's in its own unit, the private landowners and people who own the ground can manage it. During the general season, there are people who trespass. As a unit, law enforcement would be able to manage it better. I want to grow the deer.

Carrie Mair: How do the landowners respond when they find out they can't hunt? Are you the lead for both CWMUs? Can you give me a Cliffs Notes form of your discussion?

Jed Olsen: At the beginning of the year, at Circle Bar, landowners didn't understand the program. Each one of them had the application for over three months. I told them that they'd be putting their ground in a unit as a separate unit that gives 10 tags. 5000 acres of continuous ground can become a CWMU. One permit to the public and the other permits controlled by the CWMU, so landowners can hunt deer on their ground for a two month period of time. This will grow bigger deer and hunt your own private ground not when everyone else is putting hunting pressure on it. You can either hate the wildlife on your property or manage it.

Carrie Mair: Many people just like to farm, not to outfit.

Jed Olsen: I would distribute the tags. Each landowner could have one tag for the unit, and the remaining tags I would be in control of as the operator.

Floyd Briggs: On Crowfoot, Kale and Clint signed up for it and explained it to the Becks. How many landowners are there in Circle Bar?

Jed Olsen: Lots. (Named as many as he could remember). I am happy with the Circle Bar Ranch application being denied if there are landowners who are concerned. I believe the Crowfoot will be okay.

Wayne McAllister: I think Jed has worked well in bringing this together.

Jed Olsen: As a landowner, your land is very important. To have land enrolled in a program they're not comfortable with, that's understandable.

Floyd Briggs: On these nine tags that Jed would get, if one of the families got one, is that a voucher?

Scott MacFarlane: It's a voucher. The public gets a tag; the family gets a voucher that can go to whoever they want.

Questions from Audience:

None

Comments from Audience:

Mike Musselman: (Manila resident) I don't want to see a CWMU in Manila because it's not bordered by landowners; it's bordered by School Trust Lands which I hunt. These are areas where I can hunt now. The areas that I can hunt are shrinking. For a long time, the guy before him poached everything, and I had to go down to the county recorder and find out where land is. I'm unhappy that a non-resident gets a bigger window than I do and I get pushed back. Another issue is that these animals are "not to be bought and sold for profit." But with a trespass fee, that goes against what we have in our proclamation that big game animals are not to be sold for their parts or for profit. Some CWMUs are better than others, and they give a percentage to the public after the high dollar people come in and wipe them out. I'd like to give my father opportunity to access School Trust Lands and not to give it away, with these individuals having such a long period to wipe them out on the hayfields. I think we cater to too many special interest groups; I'm against hunting for profit. I think on all these CWMUs and cow elk tags that people are making a ton of money off of, they should be issued a tax number and pay taxes on them.

Jed Olsen: In my opinion, it has nothing to do with squeezing him off state ground because it's all private property.

Floyd Briggs: All this private ground is in the base of the mountain, and then at one end there's SITLA land up on top. SITLA can manage their land the same as private ground. So, on this mountain there are roads. In the past, the hunting club that managed it had an agreement through SITLA, through Broadbent. SITLA has the roads blocked off, so the hunter prior to Jed was able to drive all over the SITLA ground along with the private ground whereas the others were not permitted. Jed's advantage was that hunters could drive on SITLA ground. The public had to walk in. This would give Jed some advantage.

Nobody's supposed to drive in there but if they own a small piece of property, they can drive in there.

Floyd Briggs: It's already been established the rules for CWMUs.

Comments from RAC:

DISCUSSION AND MOTION:

Bob Christensen: Is the issue with Circle Bar or Crowfoot?

Boyde Blackwell: Circle Bar

Floyd Briggs: So, "as presented," means Circle Bar is out and the DWR approves the Crowfoot? What if there were any issues with landowners?

Scott MacFarlane: Once this goes through the RAC and Board process it's a binding agreement and the landowners can't pull out. It's between the landowners and the owner for one year.

Carrie Mair: So if someone wanted to pull out they would have to do that before the Board meeting?

Scott MacFarlane: Right.

MOTION by Carrie Mair to approve as presented

Second by Brandon McDonald

Passed unanimously.

7. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2013 – Scott McFarlane

Questions from RAC:

Carrie Mair: There are management buck tags on limited entry units? Why? I thought that was against the rules.

Anis Aoude: It's on a Paunsaugunt unit which has management buck tags so they qualify.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Comments from Public:

Michael McCarrell (Diamond Mountain Landowner Association): I'm here to present a letter which we read every year to request a variance for the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association.

Carrie Mair: Can I see the records of the hunters you've allowed on your land? I requested them last year and no one can provide that list for me. In order to provide that variance we need to be able to see who was allowed to hunt.

Boyde Blackwell: The variance is not based on letting people on their property. The list came about as some landowners have done it on their own.

Dave Chivers: I don't have 100% of the names and signatures, but I have quite a few and you can come by my office and get a copy.

Boyde Blackwell: Carrie would like a list of names. I don't think that's too much to ask. If you would bring them by or give them to your biologist, I think that would probably help Carrie. I'd like to see that too.

Carrie Mair: How many vouchers do you get?

Mike McCarrell: 35%

Boyde Blackwell: They get vouchers not private tags

Mike McCarrell: When this was proposed, the CWMU rules were not in effect. That came later. Steve Cranney and Walt Donaldson set the system up and asked us to combine 70 people in the system.

Floyd Briggs: We never had had someone come here and complain in a RAC meeting.

Carrie Mair: You can't show me a list of public going on private lands?

Dave Chivers: We get 35%, the public gets 65% for public lands. We don't have all the information because not everyone keeps records but you're welcome to what we have.

Boyde Blackwell: If you would, please provide the information. You can drop it off with the biologist so we have the information.

Kirk Woodward: If I own 1,500 acres and somebody forces me to allow somebody access to that that I don't want access to that, I'm not going to participate in that program. If we force them to participate, that opportunity goes away for the 70% that are participating in a well-managed area because all the landowners are going to drop out.

Brandon McDonald: I've not had any reports of people complaining they can't get access to public land because it's land-locked. In past years I have, but not this year. I also think sometimes it's that one person that's making a lot of problems for everybody who doesn't allow access.

Carrie Mair: I'm sure there's property above where people are cutting across, but I'm representing the public, and if the landowners dropped out, the public wouldn't care.

Kirk Woodward: I don't think there's any spot that you can't absolutely not get to if you want to walk or ride your horse.

Floyd Briggs: I think this is a good process to keep everybody in check. This RAC has representation in various different entities. Sometimes I think we have to remind ourselves we're not working for the public or the landowners. We're working with DWR.

Wayne McAllister: As past hunter of the Diamond Mountain area, you can access BLM, most of it without getting permission from landowners. There's access through private land and you'll get permission from landowners. There's a lot of ground to hunt that's not private. There's still BLM.

Mike Davis: (representing myself): I assisted my daughter-in-law with an archery hunt on Diamond Mountain. Out of 156 landowners we contacted 74 landowners and only got permission from three landowners on 10 acres, respectively. The greatest issue I have is the private landowners get their vouchers and I have to compete with their people to hunt on public property. We did get permission to hunt limited private property, and there are a few who allow permission. I just have heartburn with hunting with them on public land.

Bob Christensen: What is the difference between them and any other landowner association?

Boyde Blackwell: One, it does constitute all of the landowners on the unit, but that's not to say the other landowners associations couldn't ask for this variance as well, they choose not to. The variance is available to anyone who wants to ask for it. You're talking 152 landowners; the other may have 7 – 15 landowners.

Scott MacFarlane: I think also, the difference may be a lot of the other landowners associations aren't dealing with the volume of permits, i.e. 44 deer permits.

Kirk Woodward: It's a possibility that if they have to allow 44 hunters, that one landowner could get 44 hunters on his land.

Brandon McDonald: We just finished the Wounded Warrior hunt on Diamond Mountain. I just want to thank all the landowners up there and the support they were willing to give. They were gracious about letting us on the land; I thought that was pretty cool.

Kirk Woodward: So a motion would be approval of the landowner permit numbers along with the variance from the Diamond Mountain?

Anis Aoude: Yes

**MOTION by Kirk Woodward to approve as presented
Second by Wayne McAllister**

Approved: Wayne McAllister, Kirk Woodward, Brandon McDonald

Opposed: Carrie Mair, Bob Christensen

Passed 3-2

Reason: We are missing information from the Diamond Mountain pertinent to passing it.

Boyde Blackwell: I'd like to thank the RAC members for being here, for doing this. I was afraid we weren't going to have a quorum and so we couldn't vote.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm

Next meeting: December 13, 2012

Subjects to be discussed: Falconry Guidebook, Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for People with Disabilities

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Nov 07, 2012

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

John Blazzard- Agric
Robert Byrnes- Chair
Paul Cowley- Forest Service
James Gaskill- At Large
R. Jefre Hicks- At Large
Russ Lawrence- At Large
G. Lynn Nelson- Elected
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bryce Thurgood- At Large
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Justin Dolling
Scott McFarlane
Anis Aoude
Randy Wood
Darren Debloois
Amy Vande Voort
Jim Christensen

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins

RAC Excused

John Cavitt-Noncon.
Joel Ferry- Agric
Jon Leonard- Sportsman

RAC Absent

Bruce Sillitoe- BLM

Meeting Begins: 6:03 p.m.

Number of Pages: 13

Introduction: Robert Byrnes-Chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda and Sept 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013
Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Introduction of RAC Members

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Sept 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Motion- Nelson- Approve the Agenda.

Second- Neville

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Motion- Gaskill- Approve Sept 12, 2012 minutes as amended.

Second- Cowley

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Item 4. Regional Update

-Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Personnel changes:

Brad Hunt- New Hardware Ranch Manager.

Adam Brewerton- Sensitive Species Biologist.

Corrie Wallace- Assistant Wildlife Specialist.

Amy Vande Voort- Morgan/South Rich Biologist.

Craig Schaugaard- Promoted to Salt Lake.

Swans have started to move in on the Great Salt Lake. Biologist going through post season deer classifications. Duck hunt started out well. Darren Deblois is looking for volunteer help on rebuilding elk trap. Deer hunt went well and is much improved from last year. Checked in more bucks. Deer are in good condition.

Law Enforcement:

1st Quarter of the year- from July 1st to October 1st, officers made 12,505 field contacts. Checked 6,833 licenses, responded to 48 UTIP calls to help stop poaching. Conducted 139 investigations. Detected 145 violations and issued 253 warning citations. Officers have been involved in an additional 393 investigations since January 1st. Continue winter range patrol. Waterfowl enforcement working swan hunt. Appreciation to SFW for decoy.

Fisheries:

Aquatics have been sampling Blacksmith Fork River. Try to increase the take from Hardware down to the mouth of the canyon. Stocked Holms Creek and Willard Creek with Bonneville Cutthroat. Weber River and Ogden River is fishing very well.

Habitat Section:

Busy reseeding and doing habitat work at our Millville WMA, Hardware Ranch WMA and also Henefer/Echo WMA. Working with BLM on some of the fire rehab work in West Box Elder.

Outreach Section:

Jodi has been involved in organizing volunteer efforts here in the region. For the first quarter of this year we have had 3,785 hours of volunteer service primarily through the dedicated hunter program and other small volunteer activities.

Coyote Program:

Currently checked in 1,365 coyotes statewide and paid out \$68,250 dollars. That program started in September.

Item 5. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Jefre Hicks- Big horns are having a tough time up there with disease. Are they all going to die? Do you anticipate them dying and if so, why not give a whole bunch of permits to clean them out.

Anis Aoude- If they come in contact with disease animals, they will die. This group has managed to remain isolated and have not gotten diseased. We don't want to overharvest them if they are not going to die imminently. There is not a lot of production but there are mature rams. We are just targeting those mature rams on a year by year basis. The way we set our permits is we do it on a percent of counted rams. It is either 12% of total rams or 30% of a class 3 and 4 rams. That is kind of what the number comes out to harvest. If we issue more permits, it will have to kill younger rams. We would rather see them grow up and provide opportunity for OIAL hunt. It is hard to say whether they are going to die for sure. We have had a die off there and production isn't good so we will have probably a good hunt for the next few years if these rams don't die. We don't want to hurry them because we are not sure if they will die. It depends on whether or not they come in contact with the other sheep or not.

Jefre Hicks- Can you tell me what is killing them?

Anis Aoude- It is really complicated. Big horn sheep are susceptible to several strains of pneumonia that are carried by domestic sheep. Although, in rare instances they can build up immunity, they don't do it quick enough to overcome the initial rush of it. That area is kind of one that does well for a while and then they come in contact with domestics. They can overcome it if adults are able to stay alive long enough for immunity to build up. Usually, it takes about 10 years for them to do that. It is tricky because we are trying to reintroduce sheep as many places as we can, yet we are trying to keep them segregated from coming in contact with domestic sheep.

Jefre Hicks- How do you do that?

Anis Aoude- We just put them in places where we know there are no sheep allotments. When the populations get to a certain size, we either transplant them or with harvest, try to reduce them. Right now, we have not had to do anything with harvest yet. We have been able to move them around enough.

Jefre Hicks- The sheep herds are staying relatively stable up there? The big horn are expanding to the range and back?

Anis Aoude- Exactly. When populations of big horn increase, then they come into contact with domestics more often.

Anis Aoude- Jim is the biologist for that area. I will have him give you more detail.

Jim Christensen- With this specific population, the animals that we are seeing are actually on Pilate Mountain itself congregated around some guzzlers that Nevada has put in. It springs down on the TL Bar Ranch. The animals that have been affected and getting sick there further south on the Lepi Hills and they will periodically go down into Wendover. They will be seen on the golf course. There is one water treatment plant there that spills water out where they will water. They will come in contact with domestics around Wendover around the water source and that is where the main disease has been affecting them. The geographic separation based off water placement that is keeping the actual Pilate Mountain herd healthy for now but they could come back and forth with population expansion. That is typically what has been happening.

Paul Cowley- On the archery deer tags, if we are going to open it unlimited for youth, is there any reason to set aside 20%?

Anis Aoude- Yes, these permits will be available after the drawing for any youth that didn't draw.

James Gaskill- I still don't understand if it is unlimited, why would they bother to put in and instead just wait and get one afterwards.

Anis Aoude- They could certainly do that. Unless they want to hunt with rifle or muzzleloader or if they want to hunt all 3 seasons, they can put in for rifle and do that. There will be an incentive. Most youth don't want to archery hunt unless they come from a family that archery hunts. They can certainly wait and get a permit.

James Gaskill- It won't be statewide right?

Anis Aoude- Yes, they have to pick a specific unit. It is not statewide.

James Gaskill- It should open up some tags for the drawing kids.

Robert Byrnes- On the Pilate mountain elk boundary change, will people drawing those tags be able to hunt on that private land. Are they going to let them get on that private land or not?

Anis Aoude- I will let Jim cover that as well.

Jim Christensen- They will be able to hunt down there. Part of the damage that they get in order for them to get a payment from us; they have to allow public access to hunt those elk.

Robert Byrnes- Lockhart overlaps the San Juan and the La Sal unit but you did not change it. There is no change recommended on that? It is not a problem because it is a smaller unit.

South of Lockhart in the San Juan unit could be included if that was increased.

Anis Aoude- I am not super familiar with that area. I will write a note down and find out for you and get back with you.

Robert Byrnes- If you are standardizing it, it does overlap. Lockhart is a smaller unit to start with.

Anis Aoude- Lockhart overlaps with which one?

Robert Byrnes- It overlaps into the La Sal deer unit. You are kind of going across to general season unit boundaries you are talking about trying to standardize on.

Anis Aoude- I guess my thought on that is that because it is a small unit, they want to be able to harvest those sheep individually rather than open up the whole La Sal. I will bring it up to those guys.

James Gaskill- Do you take into consideration that a deer herd and a big horn sheep herd are not necessarily geographically the same.

Anis Aoude- I think they took that into consideration and tried to include both if they were going to make it standard.

James Gaskill- There are going to be a bunch of non-good deer habitat and non-good big horn sheep habitat but that is ok.

Anis Aoude- Exactly. The considerations for where animal movements are taken into consideration when making those boundaries. They are minor changes if you look at them on a map.

John Blazzard- On the late "any weapon" elk hunts on the Wasatch, you are talking about having two separate seasons but you are not going to increase the number of permits.

Anis Aoude- We don't know what the permits will be. They may or may not increase depending on how the ages come back for the harvest. If they do increase, we will have two hunts to split them among. If they stay the same, we will split them amongst two hunts.

John Blazzard- So that would reduce pressure.

Anis Aoude- It will reduce crowding. Harvest is not going to change a whole lot.

Public Comment

Lynn Zundel- Email sent out to RAC members. Propose to make a statewide available muzzleloader hunt for pronghorn in Utah. Ask the council for a motion to recommend to the Utah Wildlife Board that they establish an action log item for the Division to investigate additional muzzleloader pronghorn opportunities in the state.

Anis Aoude- Basically, we are not opposed to it. The only reason we have not done it is there are very few pronghorn units in the state where we have enough permits to be split three ways. There may be a handful of units where we could do this on. If we do it across the board, there could be some ramifications for drawing odds, non-resident permits. If you look at the number of hunts that are any weapon and that are archery, those differ because there are not enough permits to have an archery hunt on some of these units. The reason we did it for the Plateau, we were getting to a point where hunter crime was going to be an issue and we figured we

could add a weapon hunt and add some hunters into that. I don't see it as a problem to do it if we look into it and do it right. To do it across the board may be problematic on some units. Robert Byrnes- An action log request from the Wildlife Board would incorporate all those different people in the division that would be looking at the licensing and drawing odds and everything.

Anis Aoude- Yes, that would be the best way to approach it. We would need a year to look at it and figure out the best way to do it.

RAC Comment

James Gaskill- Are we then investigating and studying these things that Mr. Zundel is interested in now? Do we really need to ask you to do it? Is it something you are already doing?

Anis Aoude- It would be nice to have it in a formal way. Right now, there is nothing burning to make us change because there is really not a need for it. Very few people put in for the muzzleloader only and the draw is pretty good still.

James Gaskill- It is just going to wake up another dog for you.

Anis Aoude- For us, it is not a burning issue. We weren't looking in making this change but if we are asked to look at it then we will.

Bryce Thurgood- I personally like the idea. We do it for deer and elk. I am in support of it or at least experimenting with it.

Jefre Hicks- If we are looking at all the seasons and splits, what is another thing to split out. I think he is just asking to investigate the possibility.

Motion

Motion-Hicks- Recommend the Wildlife Board establish an action log item to study additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunity as presented by Mr. Zundel.

Second- Thurgood

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Motion-Thurgood- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented.

Second- Nelson

Discussion on the motion

John Blazzard- I am concerned about the number of days that archery hunters have. They have almost a month to be out in the bush chasing and harassing animals. I find a lot of wounded and dead deer during the archery hunt. We need to think about where the deer are going. I wonder if it is time we take a look at how much time the archery hunters have to be able to harvest their animals. I think with the archery equipment nowadays and the range finders and all the things we have, they should be able to harvest an animal in a couple of weeks. It would give the animals a bit of a reprieve if they had a week off from the chase that starts the middle of August and ends the middle of November.

Robert Byrnes- In the past, we have had a lot of pressure from archery hunters for a long season.

John Blazzard- I understand.

Robert Byrnes- A lot of times, they don't want to start real early because of the heat. If they knew we were going to talk about it, they would be here to talk to us.

John Blazzard- I'm sure they would but where we are setting season dates, I wanted to throw that out.

Russ Lawrence- The equipment may be better but good equipment in people's hands that don't practice and have bad ethics is not going to matter at all.

Jefre Hicks- Why is it that bowhunters have such a long season. It is because of the reduced rate of success or just because they like to be out there for a long time.

Anis Aoude- It is because of reduced success. Even with 2 days, their harvest success is half of that. They are not harvesting as many deer. We always get the argument of wounding loss. That is probably more of an ethical issue than it is a logistic or legal issue because there are now rifles that are shooting thousands of yards and if you would something at that distance, you don't know whether you did or not. There are arguments to be made on all sides of it. This has been hashed over and over again. What tells you how many bucks you have after the season is when we do our classifications? Without any data or information, we can't say they are wounding too many or more than muzzleloaders. I hate to penalize one group of hunters for what may have happened. This venue is for such a comment and I appreciate you making it. We hear it on both sides.

Paul Cowley- Do you think the harvest would change significantly if that was dropped to a two week season vs. the four?

Anis Aoude- It may.

Paul Cowley- Is it similar to the other hunts that most of the harvest takes place in the first week?

Anis Aoude- No, it is not. It is a little more drawn out. Even on a day season, they hunt an average of nine days. So, it just gives them more chances to get out. They are not hunting all 28 days. Very few hunters do. If it was a two week hunt and they hunt 6 or 7 days.

Paul Cowley- In the two weeks.

Anis Aoude- I don't think success rate would drop a whole lot. They may feel more rushed to take a shot or whatever. You don't know where to find a balance. It is one of those things where there are good arguments on both sides of the story. If we say that much comment come to change it and it goes through the process, we are not opposed to shortening the season.

Usually, it comes out about even.

James Gaskill- They are certainly more organized than any other group.

Craig VanTassell- What is the trend with success in archery hunting?

Anis Aoude- It is fairly stable. It varies from year to year depending on conditions. It is usually 15-18% success rate. It has held that for a long time now?

Craig VanTassell- Archery has come a long way with new equipment.

Anis Aoude- It has. You still have to get fairly close. There are some that shoot 80-100 yards but a deer can move a little bit by the time your arrow gets there if you are shooting at 100 yards. Most ethical hunters are not shooting at that distance. Most archers I know feel comfortable around 40 yards. It is still difficult, even with the new equipment. I have heard of deer being shot at 80 yards or more but I think those are the exception to the rule. It may take

off like long range rifle shooting and become more of an issue. We should deal with it at that time.

Paul Cowley- As we add a second or late season hunt on the Wasatch and Nebo units, it does not necessarily mean that all the roads are going to be open. A lot of times, we close roads before them based on previous decisions. It is more of just a heads up for folks.

Craig VanTassell- Would it be appropriate to put it in the proclamation that there could be road closures? Because there is places where I think this time of year would be hard.

Paul Cowley- We have talked about adding a statement basically stating you should check the travel management plan of the land management agency to verify access which is a better way to do it than saying this road is closed at this date and so forth.

Anis Aoude- Often times, we can't know every road that is open and closed.

Paul Cowley- It is easier to tell them to check with the landowner or land management agency on travel access.

James Gaskill- Don't we already have a statement similar to that?

Anis Aoude- There is a general statement like that.

Craig VanTassell- Are some of these roads closed by dates?

Paul Cowley- That is correct. There is generally set dates but some of that varies.

Craig VanTassell- With the weather?

Paul Cowley- Yes, with winter storms.

Motion Carries- Unanimous

Item 6. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013

- Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Member Bryce Thurgood left meeting prior to vote.

RAC Questions

Lynn Nelson- How often can a CWMU change things? Can they change something every year if they needed to?

Scott McFarlane- They can. What we have built into the process is that we can change acreage. They can change permit numbers because our wildlife populations don't stay the same. We need to have the ability to adjust those if the population is up or down to accommodate that with the CWMU's. The things that are required, that if they do change, they have to go through the RAC and board process are permit numbers, season dates or permit allocation.

Lynn Nelson- So, does that change their four year cycle when they get it redone.

Scott McFarlane- It does not. The only thing to change their four year cycle is if they have to reapply as a new CWMU which if they have greater than a 34% acreage change or landownership change or something like that, they have to apply as a new CWMU. Then it starts another three year cycle.

Jefre Hicks- I see that most of these are a 90/10 ratio. Is that the minimum they can get away with splitting between private and public?

Scott McFarlane- I don't know if it is the minimum or maximum. Depends on what you are looking at. Yes, that is the best split that the CWMU can get is a 90/10 split. They can do that for elk and deer. Bull moose and pronghorn are a 60/40 split. It is different on those two. Jefre Hicks- But they could allow more public permits. The 90/10 is the minimum they can get away with?

Scott McFarlane- Right. What they do is with the 90/10 split, that gives 100% of the antlerless permits that are allocated to the CWMU to the public. If they go to an 85/15 split, then 25% goes to the CWMU and 75% go to the public. It changes as the split changes. It all has to do with the number that is allocated to the antlerless permits for public and private.

Jefre Hicks- On Deseret, they are looking for a variance because they are having brucellosis problems with Wyoming animals? Can you explain that? Is there a boundary that brucellosis does not cut across?

Scott McFarlane- This has been ongoing for some years. Wyoming is basically expanded their brucellosis positive area and their surveillance area right close to Utah in Sage Creek Junction area, right close to Evanston. When the winter gets fairly severe, we have an exchange of bulls that keep going across. At the request of Wyoming and the Deseret people, they have tried to herd these bulls back so we don't have that exchange. We are extremely worried about having Utah animals affected with brucellosis. We have tested a lot of animals and have come up clean so far. We want to keep it that way. They really don't need to hunt that late, they just want to have a few permits to keep the bulls pushed back so they don't have to herd them so often. It is not to their benefit to hunt into November.

John Blazzard- Is there any documentation what affect brucellosis is having on the elk? There is a concern from the livestock industry. It is rampant in Yellowstone area?

Scott McFarlane- You are kind of getting out of my realm here but I can kind of explain it. The affect it has on elk is the same effect it has on livestock. It is an abortion disease. It causes economic loss to the livestock industry. If Utah loses its brucellosis free status in the livestock industry, it has multi-million dollar impacts on us because we don't have the ability to export livestock until it is cleared up. It has some pretty severe impacts. It is more of a precaution thing right now.

John Blazzard- I was just wondering if it had an effect on the elk population.

Scott McFarlane- Yes, it could. It could have a profound effect on elk survival.

John Wall- Does Sharp Mountain have a two ownership or one ownership? I know the west side boundary is pretty good.

Scott McFarlane- I'm not sure. I would have to refer to Darren who is the district biologist.

Darren Debloois- I think there is a couple owners in Sharp Mountain. There is one operator for both of those CWMU's. The South Canyon one and Sharp Mountain is the same operator. I think there are four landowners.

Scott McFarlane- It is the same with landowners associations and the CWMU's. Anything in the limited entry permits, there are a certain number of permits allocated for that. When they take a reduction, we recommend a reduction for private permits also.

RAC Comment

Jefre Hicks- I am just looking on the change applications for deer and elk and almost every one of them are increasing private permits but don't increase the public permits. I would just like to see us push more towards a more equitable solution for public people. I have had a number

of people discuss the CWMU situation and even people that participate in it feel like they are not getting a fair shake. As I look at this, I see that all of these guys get to add a new private but none of them are adding new publics.

Robert Byrnes- Are those one tag?

Jefre Hicks- Yes. I just hate to see that as a public hunter.

Robert Byrnes- It could be part of the split.

Scott McFarlane- What happens is on very low numbers of permits, when they do a 90/10 split it is hard to split permits in half. For example, if they are adding one permit and only have 5 permits, they are allowed to do that up to 10 permits. As soon as it reaches 10 permits on a 90/10 split, the 11th permit goes to the public. So, it would be a 9 and 1 and as soon as it goes to 11, it would be 9 and 2. Then the private can start adding up until 20. But, the public always gets the first permit as soon as it breaks over that threshold. It is hard with moose and antelope permits if you are dealing with very low numbers. There is no true way to get a 90/10 split until they reach that threshold number.

Jefre Hicks- I understand what you are saying. It has to take up to a certain point before the public gets another one.

Scott McFarlane- I think that is what most of these have done this year as their populations have increased, they have been conservative, added a permit and until they add permits up to that threshold point, the public will not get one.

Jefre Hicks- At two over 2 million acres in the CWMU's and total public permits at 484, you can understand why sometimes people get a little frustrated with the lack of access to our publically owned animals.

Scott McFarlane- Right. I guess that all goes back to why initially we started the CWMU program. It is a matter of private property rights, the public wildlife on public property. One of the reasons that we did go into this program was to get some public access onto the private properties that previously had no public access. Another reason was that we wanted to make sure that the wildlife was valuable to private landowners and so to do that, there has to be some financial incentive. There is a financial incentive for them. It is also designed to try and keep farming and ranching operations intact. Rather than sell them to subdivisions and things like that. There are a lot of reasons we did this. We initiated the CWMU program and the splits were done right in the onset of the program and have stayed that way. There is a point to where it is not valuable to the landowner but it is not and sometimes it appears to not be equitable to the public also. That is why we have the public process to address that.

Ann Neville- Abstain from this vote since I manage a CWMU.

Craig Van Tassell- Do you get harvest totals on these?

Scott McFarlane- We do but the CWMU's turn in the same as any limited entry permits. The CWMU's have to turn in, like the OIAL with moose, tooth packets that they turn in. There is a harvest reporting requirement for that also. The same as if you applied for a limited entry unit. They are not required to turn that in themselves but the hunters are required to turn that in when they harvest or they can't put in for the limited entry the following year.

Craig Van Tassell- If they have antlerless permits, do they have to harvest those antlerless permits?

Scott McFarlane- Yes and no. They have to do that but in their management plans, what they do is look at it over a three year period and say they are going to issue this many tags for a year for an individual CWMU. They have a goal on there that they want a minimum harvest of X number of animals based on the ability the CWMU to harvest those. For example, if they had

20 permits a year, they might look at a 50% harvest as a reasonable harvest and hold them to that. They would harvest 30 elk over the three year period. I don't think there are any sanctions against them for not doing that. They are encouraged to do that, to harvest those animals. There is actually a process where we can go through if it is very blatant and are obviously not harvesting antlerless animals. It can come before the CWMU committee and put on probation until that situation was corrected. If it still cannot be corrected, they can actually pull the certificate or registration for a year. There are sanctions.

Ann Neville- I think possibly it would be helpful on the table that you provided for public and private permits to put antlerless.

Scott McFarlane- This is the buck and bulls.

Ann Neville- You are right.

Scott McFarlane- We will do antlerless in the spring.

Ann Neville- Just as a reference. It does help to see those numbers, how many public permits are allowed on CWMU's.

Scott McFarlane- That is something the RAC would like; it is easy to put on there.

Ann Neville- From what some of the things you guys have been saying, that would be helpful. Because the numbers flip.

Robert Byrnes- You could put the previous year's numbers.

Scott McFarlane- They are on a three year program so it is easy to project that out.

John Blazzard- That would be helpful because it seems like when we went through the elk management plan a while back and we talked about the carrying number. The big issue was how do we get those females killed with all the CWMU properties.

Scott McFarlane- It seems that elk harvest is a big issue right now as we are trying to control populations and the fairness of CWMU's taking their share in it all. If that is something you would like, we can certainly put it in there.

Ann Neville- It is just a reference.

Motion

Motion- Nelson- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013.

Second- Gaskill

Motion Passes- For: 7 Against: 1 Abstain: 1

Item 7. Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013

- Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Ann Neville- When you have the landowner disagrees, what recourse do they have? Do they pursue that or is what we recommend final? I am fine with that, I just wanted to know.

Scott McFarlane- They can pursue that. They can come and show up at the board and the RAC meetings and plead their case. There might some mitigating circumstance. What we have to recommend to the division is what they qualify for. They take the amount of acreage, the

percentage of that in the unit and sometimes the private lands have a higher percentage of habitat so they can qualify for another permit. That might be one of the mitigating circumstances on that. Basically, we have a formula we go through to qualify them. They can ask for more but we have to recommend what they qualify for.

James Gaskill- If the RAC were to go along with their requests as a motion for example, then we would be asking to overturn your rules correct?

Scott McFarlane- I am not sure how to answer that. I guess that is what that means. A rule or a guideline or a procedure, yes.

James Gaskill- Whichever you want to call it, you are the person who knows the words not us.

Scott McFarlane- I believe that when they do the permit allocation, it is in rule but is also procedure. It is spelled out very specifically how we allocate those permits to the units.

Jefre Hicks- How does the landowner association determine what they request?

Scott McFarlane- I think the reason these are requested is because that is the number they had the previous year. As the permits for the unit decreased, they still wanted to have the number of permits they had the previous year. I imagine that applies to all three of those. That is what they had the previous year. Nobody likes to take a cut in permits, public or private.

John Blazzard- I think it is a really good thing that we are able to give ranchers and landowners an opportunity to be able to stay on their land and this is definitely one way to do it. How many of these permits are used? Do they sell them all?

Scott McFarlane- Some of the landowner associations distribute them amongst their members. Some of them are sold. Any incumbent that is derived from these, a lot of landowners have gotten into this because they have had wildlife damages on agricultural fields and a lot of this is to mitigate for those damages. The incumbent they derive personally from that is detected from a damage payment. A lot of times these guys forgo the damage payments because all the sudden they have a benefit to having wildlife on their properties.

Paul Cowley- Are the landowner associations informed they have the opportunity to come and talk in front of the RAC if they want the additional permits?

Scott McFarlane- We do inform them.

Paul Cowley- I was just wondering if they realize all the RAC's see that and not just the southern?

Scott McFarlane- I think when the board makes a decision, they realize they are going to all the RAC's.

Jefre Hicks- On the landowner associations, they are different from the CWMU's, if they have 5 permits, are they obligated to give anything to the public at all?

Scott McFarlane- They are not obligated. They can, by rule unless they have a variance from it, they have to allow a certain number of the other limited entry permits onto that property unless they have a variance to that.

Jefre Hicks- They can sell them or give them away.

Scott McFarlane- Whoever qualifies to have that permit. A lot of them do sell them because it is a revenue source for the association. Some do a portion of it and have draws for members of their association. They are highly coveted permits.

Jefre Hicks- I imagine they are worth a lot of money.

Scott McFarlane- Some of them are.

Public Comment

Paul Roberts- Any incentives potential or planned on for enhanced vegetation management to draw or create more wildlife opportunities instead of drawing cheap grass, do they get more if they put something that the deer and elk can feed on?

Scott McFarlane- There is not an incentive for them to do that other than to enhance the wildlife on their property. Are you talking about landowner associations or CWMU's?

Paul Roberts- Either or both.

Scott McFarlane- In their management plan, we do have sections in there about what things they are going to do to increase habitat. It is not something mandatory but we would like them to think about it. Whether they do water developments, reseed projects, controlled burns or whatever. We have a portion in there. All the CWMU's at least put something on there that they want to work on and enhance it for wildlife. A lot of times, it benefits livestock also. They don't get additional permits for doing that. The reward for that is increasing wildlife population and possibly be eligible for more permits because the population has increased.

Paul Roberts- A loop.

Scott McFarlane- Right. It is definitely designed to make wildlife valuable on private properties to private property owners.

Motion

Motion-Blizzard- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013.

Second- Lawrence.

Discussion on the Motion

James Gaskill- What we are going to vote on is the recommendations by the DWR and not the permits requested?

Robert Byrnes- Correct.

Motion Passes- For: 8 Against: 1

Meeting Ends: 7:54 p.m.

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Public Library
45 S Main Street, Springville
November 8, 2012 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to establish an action log item for the Division to investigate additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunities in the state of Utah
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To leave the Fillmore, Oak Creek South limited entry elk unit as is and not change it to an any bull elk unit
Motion dies for lack of second

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013

MOTION: To accept the CWMU management plan and permit numbers for 2013 as presented by the DWR
Passed unanimously

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013

MOTION: To accept the landowner permit numbers for 2013 as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Public Library
45 S Main Street, Springville
November 8, 2012 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Timothy Fehr, At large
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Sarah Flinders, Forest Service
Richard Hansen, At large
Karl Hirst, Sportsmen
Kristofer Marble, At large
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair

Members Absent

Michael Gates, BLM
George Holmes, Agriculture
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

-
- 1) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

VOTING

Motion was made by Kristofer Marble to accept the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Timothy Fehr
Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Regional Update (Information)**
- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Wes Alexander hired as the predator management specialist, handling the coyote check-in/bounty program in the region
- For the most part, hunters didn't have a problem with the new hunt boundaries, with fewer violations than expected
- Good weather brought out the hunters for the pheasant opener, numbers up at the Utah Lake Wetland Preserve
- High harvest success on waterfowl opener, harvest has tapered off without major storm events (should change this weekend)
- Forest grouse numbers are up, good hunting reported in many areas

Habitat

- Wood Hollow seeding completed, chaining continues
- North Hollow chaining project in progress
- Lake Mountain seeding completed, chaining planned on SITLA and BLM
- Dairy Fork bull hog treatment continues

Aquatics

- Fishing improves as water temps drop at reservoirs, good time to get out
- Yuba Fishery Working Group continues to meet
- "Monster Pike" caught at Yuba Reservoir (46" long)
- Gillnetting completed at Deer Ck, Jordanelle and Strawberry reservoirs
- Study continues at Jordanelle to determine effect of stocking 10-inch rainbows, 30,000 fish to be stocked next week
- Working with Utah County to resolve access issues at The Knolls (Utah Lake)

- Working with USFS and local municipalities and elected officials on a plan to reintroduce Bonneville cutthroat trout into Mill Creek

Conservation Outreach

- Section reorganization following move to implement wildlife recreation programs (shooting sports, hunter recruitment, hunting and fishing workshops/expos, etc.)
 - Hunter Education moves from LE to Outreach
 - Community Fishing moves from Aquatics to Outreach
 - Shooting Sports (YHEC, NASP, Hunter Ed Plus, etc.) moves from LE to Outreach
- Derek Murdock selected to replace Katie Copple as the Volunteer Coordinator
- Tonya Kieffer moves over from Aquatics to run the Community Fishing Program
- Hunter Ed Plus program successful in its first year of operation (mentored shotgun shooting instruction and mentored hunts for recent Hunter Ed graduates)

Law Enforcement

- Skull of a large canine found in Diamond Fork sent to Fish and Wildlife Services lab in Oregon to determine if it's a wolf, wolf hybrid or some other dog (second sent in for testing this year)
- Checkpoints at Strawberry and 12-Mile yielded few violations (good sign)

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)

- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2013 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

- **Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – How are the bighorn doing on Nebo?

Dale Liechty – We will be doing a survey soon.

Karl Hirst – What are the dates for the late hunt on the Wasatch and the Deep Creek?

Anis Aoude – November 9th to 17th

Fred Oswald – Do you know if you can find on the website now the application numbers for the general season deer units?

Anis Aoude – It should be there, if it is not it will be soon, certainly before the application period.

Matt Clark – I am curious about the two new any bull units. You said it wasn't good elk habitat but there are herds on both of those units. What is the thinking behind that?

Anis Aoude – What we usually classify as an any bull unit is a unit that has elk on it obviously, that has lots of private land so it's hard to gain access to the elk or it has wilderness which reduces access to the elk. Those units fall into that category. The majority of the elk on the Beaver are east of I-15 so it won't be much different. There are a few elk that live west of I-15 but it's not great elk habitat. The Fillmore, Oak Creek has probably more elk on it but again they tend to hang out mostly on private land. It's managed for the lower age class already and it's an easy unit to draw but those who do almost always give it an unsatisfactory rating when they hunt. It's just not a great elk unit to be limited entry. We have recommended this in the past and it has not passed but this last year when they redid the unit plans they actually had the committee recommend this as well which was made up of public within that unit, both sportsmen and ranchers, and they felt this is the best way to manage this unit as well.

Richard Hansen – So this is a done deal?

Anis Aoude – It has been voted on but anything can be reversed. The Board has voted on it in the unit plan, this is basically just to make sure it makes it into the proclamation.

Richard Hansen – I have been getting a lot of comments from people down there. They really aren't concerned if it produces trophy class size bulls but it's a unit you can draw with two or three points sometimes and they like that. They are having a hard time with this. Part of the reason is several years ago we had that west desert unit west of Nephi and they took that out of limited entry and put it into any bull and the rationale at the time was that it just wasn't good habitat and it's not growing good bulls and when you did that everyone was scratching their head. You know what happened that hunt, they killed several bulls over 350. It was a slaughter.

Anis Aoude – You call it a slaughter but I say it was a good hunt. That's what will happen for the first couple years.

Richard Hansen – When you have instead of ten people out there with rifles you have 100 people it's going to be a good hunt, you are going to kill a lot of animals.

Anis Aoude – And we anticipate doing that. Having said that, it's becoming an any bull unit and on an any bull unit you don't expect to see those big bulls because there are more people hunting. It will change management. I do agree with you, the people who do own private land in that area would like to see it stay the way it is because they can gain access to those animals but the general public, the populous, year in and year out show dissatisfaction with that hunt.

Richard Hansen – The people who have talked to me aren't landowners they are just hunters. I'll make a motion when the time is right to do that.

Anis Aoude – You can certainly act on it.

Questions from the Public

Earl Cosby – With the general season rifle deer hunt being nine days long what are your thoughts on a Wednesday opener rather than a Saturday opener? Certain people can only get away for two days regardless if it's a Saturday or weekday and that would thin out the pressure of the crowds.

Anis Aoude – We have some Wednesday openers and some Saturday openers. I think with the general rifle hunt tradition plays into it more than anything else. It will thin out the crowds slightly but it will disadvantage those youth that can only hunt the weekend. It will deprive them of the excitement of the opener, whether that is good bad or indifferent is not mine to say. When we floated this out there people on the general rifle deer hunt like the Saturday opener. It is tradition and usually UEA weekend so they can take that Friday to get on the mountain. If we move it to a Wednesday there are many other hunts that would have to move. I don't think it would matter as far as harvest goes. It would make a few of those people who can take time off have a better hunt for that Wednesday but the general majority of the people, I think it would affect them negatively.

Comments from the Public

Kent Strong – SFW – We would like to thank Anis and those working on these proposals for the job that they have done and we stand behind the proposals that have been made.

Ben Lowder – UBA – First I would like to applaud the DWR for recommending the opportunity for youth to purchase an archery deer tag if they don't draw out. We believe that is a great opportunity to get youth involved that might not otherwise be able to be involved in the hunting season. In addition we support the remainder of the recommendations as well. Also I would like to touch on season dates. The last two years we have looked at restructuring the hunting season dates but that was pushed aside with the unit recommendations. As I recall the season restructure was going very well and was receiving very favorable comments at these meetings and I understand why we didn't do it at the time because of the unit by unit but I would like to put that thought back out there and when the time is right I would like to see us pursue that option again.

Anis Aoude – At the Wildlife Board work session after this RAC process they have asked us to bring that back and hopefully we will take that back out again. It probably won't be implemented until 2014 or 2015 but we will see what timeline they want us to pursue that at. It is something that is still in our plans.

Wynn Zundel – I represent myself and muzzleloader hunters in general. I appreciate you hearing me out. I sent a proposal to you about making more of a statewide muzzleloader antelope hunt in the state of Utah. I presented this same idea to the northern RAC last evening and they passed unanimously a task that they are going to bring before the Wildlife Board to have the DWR look into this idea. Basically we have roughly 15,000 pretty serious muzzleloader hunters in the state of Utah and I have a desire to take a buck antelope with my muzzleloader. I can apply for an any weapon tag and if I got that I could use my muzzleloader to take that animal. It's my belief though when I am hunting I like to wear my buckskin outfit and blaze orange and buckskin don't seem to mix. If we could have a separate hunt for muzzleloaders for antelope I would appreciate it and there are others. I would like to ask this council for a motion to recommend to the Wildlife Board that they establish an action log item to the Division to investigate an additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunities in the state of Utah. I thank you for your time.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I would accept a motion similar to the one that was made in the northern region that we basically ask the Wildlife Board to put Mr. Zundel's recommendation on their action item log. The Board would then take it up and then if they feel like they would like to do that it would then go through the process and would eventually come back to the RACs for an opportunity for the public to make comment on it and for the RAC and Board to ultimately have some disposition on it.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kristopher Marble to ask the Wildlife Board to establish an action log item for the Division to investigate additional muzzleloader pronghorn hunting opportunities in the state of Utah

Seconded by Tim Fehr

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Richard Hansen – I have had a lot of comments about the new any bull units.

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to leave the Fillmore, Oak Creek South limited entry elk unit as is and not change it to an any bull elk unit

Kristofer Marble – Anis, do you what that satisfaction rating has been on that unit?

Anis Aoude – I have looked and can give you a rough idea. Our satisfaction index is 1 to 5. Five means they had an exceptional time. It has always been in the 2 to 2.5. It's never been above satisfied. It varies. Some years they get into them and it all depends on how good harvest success is. When people harvest they have good satisfaction, when they don't they don't. It is managed for a lower age class so it is not managed for a high quality of antlers. There are some good ones out there as everybody knows. Any unit that is managed for limited entry is going to have some good bulls.

Kristofer Marble – Do you know how that unit has been performing against the harvest objective?

Anis Aoude – It's been pretty close to the objective.

Larry Fitzgerald – Are there any other factors involved in this? Is there a lot of private property?

Anis Aoude – Yes, which is one of the main reasons we are doing this. Basically it's a good way to deal with depredation. The area isn't great elk habitat so what ends up happening is the elk go

into the agricultural areas. That is the main reason we did the Oak Creek North. We had catastrophic depredation on corn. It wasn't because we wanted to kill off the elk herd but it was a way for us to deal with depredation.

Richard Hansen – One other question I have about that is were those landowners offered permits that they could sell?

Anis Aoude – Not at that time but on the Oak Creek South there are landowner permits. How that program works is they have to form an association and then they get a certain percentage of limited entry permits and they are aware of this change and they were involved in the committee so they know they are losing that revenue and they are willing to deal with that if they can get a permit. Basically they would be able to buy a permit to hunt their property which is a big draw for a lot of them. It will be a good hunt for a few years and then it will moderate and be an ok area.

Richard Hansen – It will become like the west desert is now. You might see an elk and you might not.

Anis Aoude – Yeah, that is kind of what the committee in that area, which included a lot of landowners, ranchers, forest service, BLM, decided as a committee. As I said this has already been presented this to this RAC and the Board and it has been approved. Not to say that it can't be changed, it certainly can, but I think there was a lot of ground work done and effort put into this. It wasn't just something we just thought of last night and floated it.

Fred Oswald – Motion dies for lack of a second

Motion was made by Kristofer Marble to accept the Division's recommendations as presented

Seconded by Matt Clark

Richard – Does that include adding the late hunts on Wasatch and Deep Creek?

Fred Oswald – Yes.

Richard Hansen – I've had some push back on that too. The concern is that if you add a late hunt on Nebo, which I think is a valid idea to split the hunters up, but the concern is that some years that late hunt is very successful especially on Nebo because we know where those elk get pushed to when there is snow. If there is a snow storm high you can see them from a paved road anywhere on that unit. That is the problem they are concerned with. Some years you might not have that problem. I think there are 40 any weapon tags on that unit and I don't know how many would be made late season.

Anis Aoude – In our statewide plan it says that any unit that has a late and early hunt cannot have more than 65 percent in the early hunt so going by that there would likely be about 13 tags.

Richard Hansen – My concern is the harvest. The success rate has been about 70 percent. If we cut a couple tags off that unit overall there would be fewer late.

Anis Aoude – The tag allocation always considers harvest success. That will be built into the process. If you get 90 percent success and you only want to kill 'x' amount then you only put 'x' amount of permits out. If you are killing 100 percent you can adjust for it. It is not something we are worried about. It is a limited entry hunt and it takes a long time to draw these and we do hope they harvest and they adjust the permits to make sure our ages stay where they need to be.

Richard Hansen – I think the real point with this is we need to be able to tell people the rationale behind this so they understand that the DWR really is looking after the best interest of the health of the herd as well as the hunters.

Anis Aoude – I hope people realize that. That is our main reason for existing is to make sure we have healthy herds and happy public.

Fred Oswald – We have a motion and a second to approve the recommendations. You can let concerns be known in the minutes as you have expressed them now or you can offer an

amendment.

Richard Hansen – I could actually do that when we talk about permit numbers because I do agree with the late hunt to deal with crowding but am concerned about harvest numbers.

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

5) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2013 (Action)

- Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kristofer Marble – In the scenarios where the CWMU is asking for an increase in tags is there an impact to the surrounding public units?

Scott McFarlane – Not normally because in almost every case the increase is very small. Most of these are under 10 permits. Normally the impact that a CWMU has on surrounding properties is that they increase populations because they are very restrictive on their hunting.

Tim Fehr – When it shows a split recommendation is that to approve or not approve?

Scott McFarlane – The Division is recommending a reduction in permits and the CWMU does not agree with that and they would like to retain the permits they had initially.

Tim Fehr – So it really means approve the change?

Scott McFarlane – Approve the change, yes.

Fred Oswald – There seem to be a number of CWMUs for deer and elk that are less than 10,000 acres. I guess that requires a variance in order for them to be an elk CWMU?

Scott McFarlane – Most of the ones that are less than 10,000 acres have been grandfathered in. In fact all of them up until these two we just mentioned. They were allowed to have an elk CWMU before the 10,000 acre minimum was stated. If they change ownership or acreage more than 34 percent or they do something that kicks them into the new application category then they have to start over and apply for a variance and if they haven't performed very well the CWMU most of the time I would think would not be recommended for that variance.

Fred Oswald – So in the case they are not grandfathered and they are less than 10,000 acres what criteria do you use to approve them as an elk CWMU? Why should they receive a variance?

Scott McFarlane – By rule they don't have to apply for a variance every year as long as they had a COR and operated the previous year. If they let that lapse they would have to apply as a new CWMU and would lose their grandfather status. About three or four years ago we put the in process to allow them to apply for a variance. Before if they let that lapse they could not get a variance but is in rule that we can do that now.

Sarah Flinders – I noticed that a lot of them are asking to increase elk permits. Is that due to added acreage or because of an increase in the elk herd?

Scott McFarlane – Some are because they did add acreage. Some are because the wildlife population increases. We have seen populations increase in particular in elk statewide.

Karl Hirst – On the two spit decisions you are recommending they go from three moose permits to one private permit?

Scott McFarlane – Yes, what we have to do is put this into a formula the same as a landowner association. The CWMUs and landowner associations within a limited entry unit constitute a percentage of the wildlife habitat for that species within the unit. For example if there are ten permits allocated for a unit and they have 50 percent of the land in that unit then they would qualify for 50 percent of those permits. What happened on this is the overall unit number had dropped and so we had to correspondingly drop the CWMU permits also. This is the second year

of their application. The two that were spit recommendations had two public and two private permits for 2012 and in order to keep the splits right for 2013 they requested two private permits and one public permit but we decreased permits for 2013 to one public and one private and for 2014 it went to one private and zero public permits.

Larry Fitzgerald – I would like to know a little bit more about the ones you denied. You said it was a boundary issues and it was a hard boundary to control.

Scott McFarlane – That was in the northeastern region. The region recommended denial of it because there are two pieces of property that were applied for as a CWMU. Neither one of the properties were large enough to constitute a deer CWMU. To join them they used pieces of residential property which technically fits the qualifications. In addition to that they have boundaries that were very hard to define and would be hard to enforce so they recommended denial of it.

Larry Fitzgerald – If it's private property the boundaries are already private and hard to enforce.

Scott McFarlane – What they try to do is make good enforceable boundaries. That is why we don't allow checkerboard properties or corner to corner properties and this was a corner to corner piece of property that was actually separated so they used 10 acres of residential to join it.

Larry Fitzgerald – Is anybody here representing that?

Scott McFarlane – All the split recommendations and denials have been notified that they can come state their case. Normally they will show up in the region where the CWMU is.

Larry Fitzgerald – So all the acreage variances have been grandfathered in but is it possible to put a new application in under the 10,000 acres?

Scott McFarlane – It's possible according to the CWMU rule to put a new application in and ask for a variance but so far we haven't had any of them do that. If they are under the acreage right now it is because they have been grandfathered in.

Larry Fitzgerald – But it is possible.

Matt Clark – Is the Deer Creek unit a new applicant and where it that?

Dale Liechty – It is an old CWMU that was discontinued years ago and they want to bring it back. Basically it starts on highway 89 at the Wallsburg turn and you head west to Deer Creek dam and then you cut south up over the mountain and comes back down Sunday Canyon in Wallsburg.

VOTING

Motion was made by Matt Clark to accept the CWMU management plan and permit numbers for 2013 as presented by the DWR

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

6) Landowner Permit Numbers for 2013

- Scott McFarlane, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – What are the parameters for qualifying for a landowner association permit?

Scott McFarlane – It is based on acreage. The landowner association has to have a minimum of 51 percent of the private lands within the unit. There are a certain number of limited entry permits that are allocated for that unit and whatever percentage of the land the landowner association has is basically the number they qualify for. If they have 25 percent of the land then they would qualify for 25 percent of the permits. There are other things that can come into play like if they have an unusual high amount of the wildlife that occupy their land then that can be adjusted.

Richard Hansen – Do these private lands have to be joined?

Scott McFarlane – No they don't have to be contiguous they just have to sign up. One of the provisions of the landowner association is also that they have to allow an equal number of the limited entry permit holders hunt on those private lands also unless they apply for a variance but to my knowledge I don't think any have.

Richard Hansen – Are there any of those on the Monroe?

Scott McFarlane – Yes.

Richard Hansen – So they have 51 percent of all the private land?

Scott McFarlane – Yes, on Monroe the Mountain Land association has 63 percent of the private lands and is for bull elk. They qualify for four landowner permits. They can sell the permits or divide them up amongst their members. It is a voucher they can do with whatever they want.

Richard Hansen – Is there a list of those private lands?

Scott McFarlane – On the application there is. They provide a list and all the private lands. The permits can be used on the entire limited entry unit.

Matt Clark – So are these much smaller than CWMUs. Why aren't these properties just put in CWMUs?

Scott McFarlane – One of the criteria is if they qualify for a CWMU they aren't eligible to be a landowner association. Some of these landowner associations have a lot of small landowners included in it. One of the benefits the Division sees from the landowner associations is a lot of times the damage payments go away because of the revenue the landowners make from the sale of the permits on these units.

Sarah Flinders – So they can sell the vouchers and does some of that revenue come back to the state?

Scott McFarlane – They have to pay the permit cost to us but the revenue they get from selling the voucher goes directly back to the landowner association.

Sarah Flinders – Are there any other benefits the state sees? Why do we give them these vouchers to sell?

Scott McFarlane – The incentive is to make the wildlife valuable on a piece of private property. The benefit to the landowner is they get revenue for it or they get to use it themselves. It is also providing compensation to them for providing habitat on private lands for wildlife. As I said before some of the benefits are we are able to increase populations in those limited entry units as a result of doing this. That is another benefit that would theoretically increase the number of permits available to the public and increase revenue to the Division also. The other benefit is that the landowners enrolled in this, any revenue they derive from the sale of these permits is automatically deducted from any damage payment claims that they would make and that is an agreement they enter into.

John Fairchild – Also the limited entry permit holders are allowed to hunt on their private land.

Tim Fehr – So how does the public find out what properties are in the association and which properties they can hunt.

Scott McFarlane – Basically they can hunt the whole unit. If it is posted no trespassing that would be their first indication not to go there because they would obviously not be in the association.

Larry Fitzgerald – I am involved in one of these and it is a good deal for the landowner that doesn't have enough property to go into a CWMU. It's not as wicked as you might think. The state still does get the revenue from the tag and the landowner makes something off the tag and as a landowner you can't run wildlife off your property so this gives you something for having the wildlife on your property.

Sarah Flinders – Are the landowner association’s paid by the state and are the CWMUs paid?
Larry Fitzgerald – It is a voucher that we can sell or use. It’s a give back to the landowners and I think they ought to help the landowners. Out on the west desert there is very little green grass this time of year and so the animals are going into the fields. Another question, since we went to this 30 unit deal isn’t everything a premium unit?
Anis Aoude – The general season units remain general season and they do not qualify for the landowner association permits.

Scott McFarlane – The CWMUs are not paid by the state. It is an agreement they enter into with the state but the benefit they get is an extended season and they can hunt multiple species at the same time. Basically for deer they have a 61 day season and for elk it starts September first though October thirty-first with extensions before that. The benefit the state gets is that it is private property which normally previously has had no public hunters on it and the public gets a certain percentage of those permits. The revenue that the state derives from that is also from the sale of the permits. The CWMUs like the landowner associations can allocate the permits to anybody. They can sale them or keep them for themselves, whatever they want to do.

Questions from the Public

? – I have a question about the landowner permits. On Vernon for example there are 37 permits. How do you find out who is in that association? A lot of that property is posted no trespassing.
Scott McFarlane – By rule if it’s posted it shouldn’t be in the association unless they have applied for a variance and I don’t think anyone has.
Tom Becker – The way I understand the rule is if the individual landowner has a permit that year then he has to allow the same number of tags as he has to hunt on his property. It’s not the association as a whole but it’s the individual landowners. The landowner chair knows who received the permits.
Larry Fitzgerald – The property you are seeing posted is probably not in the landowner association because you have to have 640 acres to be in the association.
Tom Becker – The 640 acres doesn’t have to do with the landowner association. The landowner association has its own bylaws that determine how they distribute permits.
Larry Fitzgerald – On the Vernon to qualify for a landowner permit you have to have 640 acres.
Tom Becker – Each landowner association has its own bylaws. The Vernon unit says you have to have 640 acres to qualify for a tag. They also have a lot of small landowners so they can combine their land to make 640 acres. If you want to know where you can hunt you can contact the landowner association president to find out who has permits.
Anis Aoude – The easiest way to find out where to hunt is to call the biologist and he can give you the name of the landowner association president because they are the only ones who knows who drew the tag within in the association.

VOTING

Motion was made by Larry Fitzgerald to accept the landowner permit numbers for 2013 as presented

Seconded by Kristofer Marble

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

7) Other Business

- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

Feedback on the 30 general season deer units from RAC members

Fred Oswald – I will start off by saying that I applied for open elk and deer in the northern region on the east canyon chalk creek unit and all of those in my party with the deer were successful. I think that was one of the few units in the state that was undersubscribed. My hunt went well this year. I killed a five point elk on the fifth day of the hunt and was pleased with the hunt. Our deer hunt started a little slow but like many of the rest of you we got some snow in the middle of the hunt which moved the deer around and we ended up also being successful. My hunt last year, I hunted every day and never saw a deer to shoot and this year I hunted 90 minutes and shot a four point buck. Life is good from the Oswald point of view. I can't offer any feedback really on the unit by unit because I was in one of those units that was undersubscribed so I didn't have any feedback in terms of how that unit worked. It is mostly private land and so you have to have access to the private land to really even apply for a permit.

Richard Hansen – On the Nebo we hunted with one of my boys and a grandson and he was successful in taking a three point. The idea about the youth hunt and all the opportunities, if there aren't animals there it doesn't matter how much opportunity you give them. That is how you hook them. This kid is hooked now. He had a great time. It's not fun to go tromping around the hills with grandpa for two or three days and see two does. Success makes all the difference. I also wanted to know if the Division has been dropping off moose on Nebo. You have, well they are showing up. These are the reports I have; a cow and two calves in Pole Canyon, there were two bulls they had to chase back up into the mountain above Mona, there were a cow and he said three calves in the Nebo Creek area and there was a mature bull in the Sawmill/Golden Ridge area. They seem to appear and then in a few years they all die off. We went down in the bottom of Sawmill after we had a little snow and unfortunately we saw more coyotes than we did deer. There were coyote tracks in the snow and they were trailing a doe and a fawn. Hopefully that predator program is going to work. By the way there are way too many hunters on Nebo. They concentrated in Salt Creek Canyon. There had to be over 1,000 people on opening day. When we went out that opening morning it was just like when I was a kid when there were 200,000 hunters in the state. It was beautiful weather but there are way too many hunters in that area.

Matt Clark – I drew a muzzleloader Wasatch tag. It was the first time I had ever been muzzleloading and I harvested a nice mature bull and had a great time. On the deer hunt I drew 17a, Wasatch Mountains, West. It was beautiful weather. I was with my two sons and harvested a nice buck too. We saw plenty of deer so as an avid waterfowler I was very impressed with big game hunting this year. My satisfaction rate was very high this year.

Karl Hirst – I didn't hunt deer or elk this year but in talking with people some people had a wonderful time, I think about 75 percent. About 25 percent said there were a lot of hunters where they are at. I would rate overall that people were pleased. As far as my fall, I had a ton of sheep points and drew a sheep tag this year and took a good ram so I was very pleased.

Kris Marble – I had a great year this year as well. I also drew muzzleloader bull elk on the Wasatch and was lucky enough to harvest a nice mature bull. I do dedicated hunter for deer but this year most of my deer hunt was spent scouting for elk. Specific to the changes to 30 units, from what I saw it looked status quo. I didn't notice a big difference. As far as the UWC membership goes and some of the feedback I have gotten there it has been a mixed bag from hunters. Some have said they drew the unit they usually hunt and there were more hunters than there were before the 30 units and some have said there are quite a bit less and some have said it's about the same. Amongst our membership it has been a mixed bag but nothing that seems to be consistent to be able to say good bad or indifferent.

Tim Fehr – I was a donor this year. The area I live in has a lot moose, a lot of elk and a lot of deer but it's also inside city limits or on the golf course. If you really want to go to the most

successful place it's the number 11 tee box at the Park Meadows Country Club. We did move some moose from the area. The organization I work for, our whole job is trying to keep the population alive so we can have a good hunt.

Sarah Flinders – I think we were the sacrifice for everybody this year because my son and I did not draw this year on either the elk or deer so we were a little bummed. We were glad to be one of the sacrifices and maybe next year it will be better. Last year we did the deer but in three years of putting in he has not drawn out for elk yet. We were successful in Idaho for him. Hopefully next year we will have some good luck for him.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

25 in attendance

Next board meeting December 6, 2012 9 a.m. at the DNR boardroom, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting December 4, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. at the Springville Public Library



2013 General Season Deer Hunt Dates

• Archery	8/17 – 9/13	28 Days
• Muzzleloader	9/25 – 10/3	9 Days
• Any Weapon	10/19 – 10/27	9 Days



2013 General Season Elk Hunt Dates

• Archery Spike Bull	8/17 – 9/6	21 Days
• Archery Any Bull	8/17 – 9/13	28 Days
• Any Weapon	10/5 – 10/17	13 Days
• Muzzleloader	10/30 – 11/7	9 Days
• Youth Any Bull	9/14 – 9/22	9 Days
• Late Youth Any Bull	11/30 – 1/15	47 Days

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Statewide

- Allow youth to purchase unlimited over the counter GS archery deer permits

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Southern Region

- Change the Fillmore Oak Creek South Unit from Limited Entry to Any Bull (Passed by the WB in the unit plan May 2012)
- Change the portion of the Beaver Unit west of I 15 to Any Bull (Passed by the WB in the unit plan May 2012)

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Southeastern Region

- Modify Henry Mountains deer, elk, and bighorn sheep hunt boundaries and the San Rafael South pronghorn hunt boundary to exclude Capitol Reef National Park
- Modify Book Cliffs South bighorn sheep and pronghorn hunt boundaries to match the deer boundary
- Modify the Book Cliffs Bitter Creek South LE elk boundary to match the deer boundary
- Modify Nine Mile Range Creek hunt boundary for pronghorn, elk, and bighorn sheep to match the changes on the Book Cliffs
- Modify the La Sal Mountains and San Juan LE elk hunt boundary to match the changes made to the GS deer boundary
- Modify the La Sal Potash bighorn sheep and the La Sal South Cisco Pronghorn hunt boundaries so they are the same

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Northern Region

- Change the Pilot Mountain LE elk hunt boundary to include some private land where depredation is occurring
- Add premium LE elk hunt on the Cache, Meadowville Unit to make it consistent statewide
- Add bighorn sheep hunt on the Pilot Mountains for 2013 per our agreement with Nevada
- Allow the harvest of either sex on the Ogden extended archery deer unit to be consistent statewide
- Clarify boundary descriptions to inform hunters that the posted area around the meadow in Hardware Ranch WMA is closed to hunting

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Central Region

- Add Late Any Weapon LE elk hunts on the Wasatch, Nebo, and Deep Creek units to reduce crowding
- Add premium LE elk hunt on the Deep Creek Unit
- Add a mountain goat hunt on the Nebo Unit
- Discontinue the late doe-only hunt on Wasatch Front Extended Archery area to be consistent with the Ogden area

Key Dates for 2013 Season

- Big Game drawing for Bucks, Bulls and OIAL and new dedicated hunter applicants:
 - Application period: February 1 – March 4, 2013
- Application period for bonus and preference points and application withdrawal period:
 - February 1 - March 11, 2013
- Results posted: May 31, 2013

Key Dates for 2013 Season

- Lifetime license questionnaire/Unit-selection deadline
 - Lifetime License holders will automatically be assigned the unit they had the previous year
 - Changes in unit selection must be submitted by March 4, 2013
 - Those that did not hunt in 2012 and fail to choose a unit by the deadline can obtain leftover permits if available

Key Dates for 2013 Season

- Shed antler and shed horn season dates:
 - Online course and completion certificate required: February 1 – April 15, 2013
- Dates when hunters may purchase or sell big game or its parts
 - Antlers, heads and horns of legally taken big game may be bought or sold: February 15 – July 31, 2013
 - Untanned hides of legally taken big game may be bought or sold: August 1, 2013 – February 14, 2014

Key Dates for 2013 Season

- Disabled hunters General Season hunt extension dates:

– Archery Deer	8/12 – 8/16	preseason
– Muzzleloader Deer	9/20 – 9/24	preseason
– Any Weapon Deer	10/14 – 10/18	preseason
– Archery Elk	8/12 – 8/16	preseason
– Muzzleloader Any Bull Elk	11/8 – 11/13	postseason
– Any Weapon Any Bull Elk	9/14 – 9/22	preseason
and during NER late youth hunt	11/30 – 1/15/14	postseason
– Muzzleloader Spike Elk	11/11 – 11/15	postseason
– Any Weapon Spike Elk	10/18 – 10/22	postseason




Thank You



- ### APPLICATION FOR CWMUs
- 8 New applications
 - 2- due to land-ownership changes
 - 1- increased acreage > 34%
 - 2- did not have CORs in 2012
 - 3- brand new applications
 - 10 CWMUs required renewal for 2013-2015
 - 8 CWMUs submitted change applications requiring RAC/Board approval
 - 4 CWMUs have moose permit reductions requested by DWR
 - 2 are split recommendations
 - 1 discontinued application- added into adjoining CWMU
 - 120 Total CWMUs for the 2013 hunting season

2013 CWMU OVERVIEW

Proposed CWMUs Statewide:	120
Northern	71
Northeastern	7
Central	13
Southeastern	16
Southern	13

- Over 2.18 million acres enrolled
- 97% private land
- 444 Private landowners participate in CWMU program

Numbers based on approval of DWR recommendations.

John Ross photo

2013 CWMU BUCK/BULL PERMIT RECOMMENDATIONS

	PRIVATE PERMITS	PUBLIC PERMITS
Deer	1983	262
Management	4	1
Elk	903	137
Pronghorn	74	53
Moose	49	31
Total	3013	484 (14%)

CWMU Application Recommendations by Region

David Whitten photo

NORTHERN REGION NEW APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	DWR REC.
Strawberry Ridge	New	24,043	deer, elk, moose, pronghorn	Approve
Whites Valley	New	8,824	deer	Approve
Sage Valley Outfitters	New	5,638	deer	Approve

NORTHERN REGION RENEWAL APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	DWR RECOMMENDATION
Junction Valley	Renewal	22,347	deer, elk	Approve
Rabbit Creek	Renewal	8,148	pronghorn	Approve
Pine Canyon	Renewal	5,005	deer	Approve
Wood Canyon	Renewal	10,868	deer	Approve
Bastian Ranch	Renewal	8,726	deer, elk, moose	Approve
Cotton Thomas	Renewal	11,830	deer	Approve

NORTHERN REGION CHANGE APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	CHANGES	DWR Rec.
Park Valley	Change	11,780	deer, pronghorn	Add pronghorn permit Change deer season dates	Approve
Deseret	Change	219,890	deer, elk	Add deer and elk permits Change deer season date Elk variance request 11/20	Approve
Double Cone	Change	9,694	elk	Bull elk permit split change	Approve
West Hills	Change	22,014	deer	Increase in public permits	Approve
Twin Peaks-Goose Creek	Change	15,528	elk	Increase in permits	Approve
State Corner	Change	14,006	elk	Increase bull elk permits	Approve
Hardscrabble	Change	15,993	elk	Change in bull elk split Increase elk permits	Approve

NORTHERN REGION DIVISION RECOMMENDED CHANGES

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	CHANGES	DWR REC.
Broadmouth	Change	10,337	moose	Reduce moose permits	Approve
Bear Spring	Change	12,459	moose	Reduce moose permits	Approve
South Canyon	Change	23,300	moose	Reduce moose permits	Split
Sharp Mountain	Change	10,800	moose	Reduce moose permits	Split

NORTHEASTERN REGION APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	DWR REC.
Crowfoot	New	5,547	deer	Approve
Circle Bar Ranch	New	9,417	deer, pronghorn	Deny

CENTRAL REGION APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	DWR REC.
Deer Creek	New	6,516	deer, turkey	Approve
Chrises Creek	Renewal	8,270	deer	Approve
Crab Creek	Renewal	10,200	deer, elk	Deny
Heartland West	Renewal	12,280	deer	Approve

SOUTHEASTERN REGION APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	CHANGES	DWR REC.
JB Ranch	New	9162	deer, elk		Approve – requires acreage variance
Summit Point	Change	37,586	elk	Increase elk permits	Approve

SOUTHERN REGION APPLICATIONS

CWMU NAME	STATUS	ACRES	SPECIES	DWR REC.
Grazing Pasture	New	6,700	deer, elk	Approve – requires acreage variance
Johnson Mountain Ranch	Renewal	13,200	deer, elk	Approve

LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION VOUCHER RECOMMENDATIONS



2013 STATEWIDE OVERVIEW

STATEWIDE 2013 LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION APPLICATIONS

- 14 applications received
- DWR recommends approval of 10 applications as received
- 4 split recommendations



2013 LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION BUCK/BULL VOUCHERS TOTALS

14 Landowner Associations

127 deer vouchers
3 management buck vouchers
77 elk vouchers
7 pronghorn vouchers

Numbers based on approval of DWR recommendations.

SPLIT RECOMMENDATIONS



2013 LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION BUCK/BULL SPLIT RECOMMENDATIONS-SRO

LOA Name	Species	Permits Requested	Permits Qualified	DWR Rec.	Reason
Pahvant Mountain LOA	Bull elk	7	5	5	Reduction in unit permits – LOA disagrees
Paunsaugunt Landowner Wildlife Assoc	Mgmt Buck deer	4	3	3	Reduction in unit permits – LOA disagrees
South Fork Sevier River LOA	Buck pronghorn	6	4	4	Reduction in unit permits – LOA disagrees
Indian Peaks LOA	Bull elk	3 Premium	3	3	LOA wants premium permits which are not allowed for by rule

