

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Love this! More data!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Been missing seeing antelope in the area of the cache I hunt... will be nice to get some back there.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** This is great! I like the proactive approach, and how the units selected are in close proximity to each other, so it should give some really good data in the end.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

As someone who hunted with a muzzleloader for decades before the inlines were even a "thing", I can definitely get behind this. The muzz hunt experience changed DRAMATICALLY when scopes were allowed, and while it won't revert to what it "was", it will bring it part of the way back.

Now, that all said, one of the concerns that immediately came to my mind was "old eyes"... I hunt with a gentleman who simply can't see open sights due to being in his 80s... It was mentioned that he could get a COR, and I'm sure he could, but that's an additional hoop to jump through, so I would support allowing a 1x red dot scope (only a red dot type scope though, no 1x crosshair scopes... he wouldn't be able to use that any more than he can open sights)

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Another great proposal... I have something else I'd like to see changed with the dedicated hunter program, and after I hear back from Bryan regarding it, I'll present that in an email, or an additional submission of this form at a later date.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** This seems more than fair to the landowners affected, and is a great compromise.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?** Same as the previous, it's a good compromise.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Leave the general muzzleloader seasons as they are. It's very unfortunate to be given the opportunity to use scopes to clarify an ethical shot and then have that taken away. The HAMS hunts are in place to give people the opportunity to hunt with more traditional/restricted muzzleloaders. Hunters have spent their hard earned money to invest in equipment and should be allowed to still be able to use it during a general muzzleloader season. Maybe there can be a possibility at looking at more limited entry hunts being no scopes but don't limit the general hunting seasons. Thank you for your time.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** \$50 late fee is ridiculously high!! Should be like \$10.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I dont like any of the proposed strategies being studied. 30-40% success rate in my opinion is an acceptable success rate we don't need to try and lower that.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Why make changes if it didn't show significant increase in success?!? They are basing the argument on something that doesn't exist. This is 100% a case of the squeaky wheel getting the grease. Any major change that isn't supported by a significant majority should not be made. Just like the camera ban this is a terrible recommendation that splits the hunting community up and causes more discontent amongst hunters than fixing any kind of percieved problem.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Overall good changes. I would only add lets do a dedicated hunter program for elk. The 3 season elk tag was amazing but was too popular, dedicated elk would be a much better option to increase opportunities without the problems the 3 season tag created.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

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

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think a trial on these ideas, while I don't love antler point restrictions, is very commendable of the division. I would love to see these take place in an additional region, not just the southern region to get a better data set.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Clearly there is a push to regulate ethics due to the lack of trust the division has for hunters to police themselves. Managing our herds socially has been the primary focus. While they focus on finding ways to decrease success to provide more opportunity, more and more hunters will become frustrated and stop hunting altogether. You need to have a resource first to even afford any opportunities.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** What you've been doing isn't working. Stop trying to manage our deer socially and focus on biology. Quit trying to do things that you've tried before and know doesn't work. You can't regulate ethics.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The majority of surveyors conducted by the division and online social platforms both unbiasedly show no favor towards removing scopes from muzzleloaders. Success rate data shows minimal impact with scopes. Data shows it's a small number of people shooting long range. The division is trying to regulate ethics due to the lack of trust in hunters policing themselves

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** More time and opportunity to hunt a resource that has been decimated due to multiple factors, isn't beneficial for our mule deer right now considering the current situation they face.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** We are past the time to limit the number of CWMUs in the state.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 9:11 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

You should leave the technology the way it is theirs a lot of hunters that have invested a lot of money into their muzzle loaders and a lot of hunters that need scopes to see the scopes on muzzle loaders have not changed the harvest rate any more than opening LE to over the counter

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 12:34 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Eliminating the legality of scopes on muzzleloaders is not going to fix a rise in harvest rates. I would suggest moving the archery hunts to dates during ruts, muzzleloader seasons should follow archery, and rifle hunts should be last. Also, consider making elk tags a draw and/or reduce the number of tags sold annually so that those who do draw have a decent chance of harvesting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

A few of the key takeaways for me:

- From your survey, half of Non-muzzleloader hunters support or oppose but roughly 60% of hunters who have hunted with muzzleloaders oppose this recommendation. (Sounds like the majority of people who want scopes removed are those hunters who are not going to be effected by this change.)
  - The Majority of those surveyed were okay with the status quo staying "as is" but DWR is ignoring that and is not okay with it. I don't feel like it was well addressed as to why the DWR isn't listening to the majority of hunters in the survey.
  - With scopes available, most hunters are not comfortable taking a shot over 200-400yds. ( I don't think this number will change with the removal of scopes.)
  - An increase of 2.6% success. (To me, this is not a substantial advantage to the take of animals)
  - Something that wasn't discussed that I think may be important was that the Muzzleloader hunt dates may have changed during the times they were looking at success rates.
-

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

There is no need to remove/limit scopes on muzzleloaders. How do we truly know the success rate for the muzzleloader hunt has increased when there is no mandatory reporting of a harvest to the DWR? For an example, let's just say that it is true the success rate did slightly go up once any scope was allowed. We can see that Archery and ALW hunts also had increased success in that same timeframe. What is the explanation for that?

Having a scope on a muzzleloader can lead to a more accurate and ethical shot, and any alternative to lessening the chance of wounding and losing an animal is a win. The crowds of people with aging and underperforming eyes are already suffering, why should we go back to limiting their abilities even more? It is still a primitive hunt with the current rules.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** While I think that as the research has shown hunting with a scope has only a nominal effect on hunter harvest the decision to take away scopes is the wrong one. I think scopes should still be allowed or if anything go back to 1x power only again taking them away all together is nonsensical.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** My only reservation with cwmu's in general is that while yes they do open some private land to public hunting the public is only given 1/5th the tags the private land owner stands to gain is there no way to move closer to a 50/50??

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:14 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 3:16 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Make it state wide if your youth or have a disability make it any buck. 18 and older 3 point or better. Shorten the season. And still reduce doe tags. Heck even close some units

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Forcing hunters to use primitive weapons on the Dutton unit for the next 3 years is obscene. It is one thing to restrict muzzleloaders what do force Archery hunters to switch to traditional on a general unit is most definitely not something I believe is right. Utah and Arizona are the only states that allow for scoped muzzleloader's. There is no other such state that is limiting Archery units to strictly traditional archery, as a hunter we can decide whether we want the scope on our muzzleloader, or if we wanna shoot a traditional bow, or a compound bow, I don't understand why this is even being brought up. Antler restrictions have proven themselves to be ineffective, so why would we initiate an antler restriction at all?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

After watching this video, and seeing the survey data, why are we removing scopes off of muzzleloaders? The data clearly shows there is limited to no impact. Forcing these changes on the public seems to be done in a effort to conform certain special interest groups, these groups should not control our rules. If people are opposed to using scopes on muzzleloaders, they can simply remove their scope and hunt with a primitive muzzleloader . This technology committee is a joke looking at the data you provided shows there's no impact, but yet the committee is adamant that there is change, it makes no sense. Looking into a traditional archery versus compound archery is another can of worms that is beyond understandable. Archery hunters can choose to hunt with traditional archery, and it has no impact whatsoever in comparison to compound archers archery is hard enough as it is.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** 50\$ is too much for a late fee my mortgage late fee isn't even that much!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I hate all those recommendations! Stop trying to reduce hunter success rates they aren't that high anyway.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Stop pitting hunter against each other. This proposal isn't backed by science or the majority of hunters.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly disagree with the puposed rule changes. Removing scopes off muzzleloaders will not stop irrisposable people from attempting "long range shots" and will infact make them less accurate and would in my opinion lead to an increase in wounded animals. Using the 2.6% increase in success when making this decision seems irrisponsible based off the fact that reporting is not manditory in the state of utah. If the division wants to make a decision they should wait for a year where mandaroty reporting is required. This will allow for actual data points and correct information when it comes to making decisons for wildlife in utah. I do not feel that the majority of the population is willing to spend the time and money required to achive accuracy at extended ranges with modern muzzleloader and that his rule would infact show no changes in success rates. I also feel that the amount of inmature deer being harvested would significantly increase due to people feeling the need to take any chance given with a restricted weapon.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I like the idea of removing multipower scopes on muzzleloaders. I do however support the idea of allowing 1x scopes on muzzleloaders. Reason being, I will have a child (12 years old) hunting big game for his year next year. I believe that having a 1x scope will allow him to obtain and maintain a better sight picture allowing a better shot placement than him trying to make the same distance shot with open sights. Less confusion for the young /new hunter. I think maximum shot distance potential with a 1x scope would be very similar to open sights, but give greater confidence to the non shooter of shot placement of the beginner hunter.

I also would like to propose a "traditional" muzzle-loader hunt, with similar technology restrictions to that of Idaho, or even with patch and ball requirements. Season dates being more optimal, but with an increased difficulty due to the technology disadvantage.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** From someone in the mountains every weekend. I've only seen two bucks all year. Doe and fawn population in my area is down at least 75% over the last two years. Get rid of the doe hunt. Drop the hunt till you get something tag. Double the tag price to keep funds coming in but reduce my hunt to every other year till the population recovers. Drop the 100 doe goal till you get a good 120% population goal to offset winter kill and over hunting. Eliminate spotters unless you give me my game cameras back on my own land. Eliminate out of state hunters. Eliminate guided hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** From someone in the mountains every weekend. I've only seen two bucks all year. Doe and fawn population in my area is down at least 75% over the last two years. Get rid of the doe hunt. Drop the hunt till you get something tag. Double the tag price to keep funds coming in but reduce my hunt to every other year till the population recovers. Drop the 100 doe goal till you get a good 120% population goal to offset winter kill and over hunting. Eliminate spotters unless you give me my game cameras back on my own land. Eliminate out of state hunters. Eliminate guided hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** From someone in the mountains every weekend. I've only seen two bucks all year. Doe and fawn population in my area is down at least 75% over the last two years. Get rid of the doe hunt. Drop the hunt till you get something tag. Double the tag price to keep funds coming in but reduce my hunt to every other year till the population recovers. Drop the 100 doe goal till you get a good 120% population goal to offset winter kill and over hunting. Eliminate spotters unless you give me my game cameras back on my own land. Eliminate out of state hunters. Eliminate guided hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 6:21 pm

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the technology  
recommendations?**      Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments  
about the technology  
recommendations?**      I'm fine with removing magnifying scopes, but I think we should still be  
allowed a 1x scope like before the change.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 6:51 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?**      Neither agree nor disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**      I feel like the youth general season deer should be able to be bought over the counter just like the youth general season bull tags. I also think that if that passes that youth should be able to hunt in all the areas excluding the limited entry/cwmu areas.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I think the data collection will help give better success survey, but also give another source to show how poor herds are.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** There's always opinions out there to change to these restrictions for all general hunts. It will be interesting to see how much this affects population and size.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** For less than 3% additional success, that's not enough of a gap to institute a change. When rifle hunters are shooting over 1000 yards injuring way more animals, the muzzy scopes shouldn't be the focus. The division needs to worry more about habitat and issuing too many tags and not worry about 500 bucks state wide.

Who cares if other states don't use scopes, set yourself apart and don't worry about falling inline. If you want to be like other states, they allow trail cameras, so bring those back.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Cwmu program is a good program. It would be nice to get a few more public permits for some of these but overall great program

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Im ok with the survey but \$50 late fee is too much.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Stop trying to make hunters less successful. We are supposed to be hunting excess deer if there arent excess deer then reduce tags dont make hunts harder.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I'm more ethical with scope its still a hard hunt even though I have a scope.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I support this proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I support this proposal.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I generally support this proposal. I think that the results will be similar to when we tried these management strategies previously. If the results are the same as before then I hope the DWR, the wildlife board, and members of the public that support things like antler point restrictions and shorter hunts can trust the data and stop campaigning for them.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do NOT support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders. The data presented in this video/proposal doesn't support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders either.

The data presented here showed that success rate increases have been a non-event since allowing scopes on muzzleloaders, it also shows that the majority of the public DO NOT support the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders. The RAC's and wildlife board should listen to this.

While I appreciate the data and effort it took to create this presentation, I think this proposal is an example of the technology committee making a recommendation for the sake of making one. The fact that its not causing an issue biologically and the majority of public opinion is to keep things as they are, should mean that we aren't wasting time on a proposal like this.

If the RAC's and Wildlife board push through the removal of scopes from muzzleloaders it will be another example to go along with deer permits this past season and trail cameras a couple years ago where the data and the public opinion say one thing but the RAC's and the wildlife board decide to do something else.

If for some unknown backdoor reason, the RAC's and wildlife board feel the need to make a change then I think scopes could be limited to either a variable scope that doesn't exceed a 9 power. Or a fixed power scope that doesn't exceed 4 power. But I still stand by the fact that I don't think there should be a change.

The excuses given in the video surrounding the difficulty wildlife officers might have checking scopes is ridiculous. It takes their focus to check my tag, or check if I have a round in the chamber while in a truck, or check my archery tackle. No different.

I also think the wildlife board doesn't want to be wasting time approving COR's for every single person who qualifies for a scope due to their vision. It would take a stupid amount of time. I think there is precedent to not do this as the wildlife board took the stance of not doing COR's for peep sight verifiers and clarifiers last year.

Lastly, the technology committee is concerning to me. Its not public knowledge who's on it. How long do they serve? Are they just on it forever? I feel like having this committee perpetually go on forever (which is different then the other committees we have that have a start an end date) creates an environment where the committee will meet to find/make up problems to create solutions for. Doesn't give me a warm feeling.

---

<p><b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?</b></p>	<p>Strongly agree</p>
<p><b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?</b></p>	<p>I support this proposal. I like the change to do away with the orientation and just put all the info on a web page. I also like shortening up the required hours for the first year.</p>
<p><b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b></p>	<p>Somewhat disagree</p>
<p><b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b></p>	<p>If the private land owners feel like they need more of their own draw then I would say that no matter what draw they pull their permit from they incur a waiting period and loose all points for that species in the public draw. They can continue to apply for that species in the private draw but every year they draw a permit in the private draw they would restart their waiting period for that species in the public draw.</p> <p>Example 1: A member of the diamond mountain LOA gets a bull elk permit. That member now has a 5 year waiting period in the public draw for LE Bull elk. If that member were to get another permit the following year His waiting period would start over again.</p> <p>Example 2: A private land owner gets a deer permit for his private property that is on a general season unit. That private land owner now loses all of his points for the public general season draw. We shouldn't allow people to be doing this, especially on LE Deer and Elk units when we already have a major issue surrounding bonus points.</p> <p>I also don't like private landowners complaining that they want more opportunity when they already enjoy every opportunity a public land hunter has plus a whole other group of opportunities. If they want more of the public resource then they need to be contributing more to the public at large.</p>
<p><b>Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?</b></p>	<p>Neither agree nor disagree</p>
<p><b>Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?</b></p>	<p>Happy to have LOA's that are actually doing their part and allowing public hunters on their land. Don't have a lot of patience for the ones that complain about it.</p>
<p><b>Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?</b></p>	<p>Somewhat agree</p>

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I don't think the Kimberly CWMU should be allowed to have a variance for elk hunting. I think that the RAC's and wildlife board should follow the recommendations of the CWMU Advisory committee and the Division and not allow this variance.

I would like the division to continue to remove public acres from CWMU's where possible and where public acres are accessible.

Other than those Items I support the proposal.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 25, 2023 9:47 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I personally only put in for the muzzleloader hunt specifically so I can hunt with the scope at an earlier time frame in October.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Just seems like you want to limit the hunting experience and still keep the money you get from hunters. This didn't work in the late 80s and 90s. This has not worked in Idaho.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The fun of the Muzzleloader hunt is to get close with open sights.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** The problem is mismanagement. Too many permits! Reduce the amount of permits by 20k. Then see if that's enough. May need to drop off by 50k. Too many people are out hunting which is making the younger deer population not able to reach maturity.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Muzzleloader is already at a disadvantage. There hunt is WAY TOO EARLY! You can't handicap muzzie hunters any more!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 12:05 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If the scopes only adds a 3% better success rate, why is there a need to "fix" something that isn't a problem. I view having a scope increases odds of an ethical kill shot, rather than an increase of success.

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 1:47 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Don't take scopes!!! Muzzy hunts and muzzy hunts with kids are hard enough as is. This will lead to many more wounded animals too. Just leave it alone, its not broken.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree with mandatory harvest surveys  
It will give the best data, should be a requirement

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I don't have an option on this matter

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I think this is a great step in the right direction to see if these thing can help and have a comparison's  
Listen to the people show them the data. Agree with this  
  
I don't agree with making seasons dates shorter. Hunting is my vacation time, no matter if I harvest or not, I enjoy the 8-9 day hunts.  
  
I highly disagree with shortening archery hunt dates with the success rate data.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In my opinion, with the success rates and data given, I think we should leave it the way it is considering the success rate went up 2.6 percent which is most likely due to increased tag numbers over those seasons.

I just don't think the data shown is enough to justify taking the scopes away from muzzleloaders. However I'd still hunt the muzzleloader hunts if it is taken away.

I think with 50 percent wanting to keep it how it is, and the other two sides split in my opinion the majority wants to keep it. I don't think scopes or technology is killing more or enough animals to consider it to be affecting the heat numbers.

With the amount of people not comfortable shooting out past 200 yards I feel it tells us most hunters are still practicing ethical hunting and aren't willing to shoot further than their personal capabilities.

I think allowing us to use scopes is unique, I don't believe it takes the fact away that it's still a muzzleloader and you still load the gun in the same manner. I think taking accuracy away could potentially make for an increase in wounded/unrecovered game.

I don't think the data is there to support taking that away.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I don't have any disagreements with these changes

---

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

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Don't disagree with these changes

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I live in Kamas and have a north slope tag, my wife has a Kamas tag! These northern units need to implement the same kinds of rules the deer population is struggling so bad and 90% of the dead bucks I see hunters harvest are young 2 point bucks. Even a change to a 3 point restriction would help the population especially after the heavy winter we had. I spoke with a lot of hunters and they all agreed that a point rule would be good as many other hunters were not finding bucks or deer in general this year. Please consider more than just a few units and look at the health of the units north or south.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** We need to address tech across the board, but this is a great starting point.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Landowner permits for sale have turned into outfitter raffles. Landowners should be able to transfer a permit, but not create a backdoor lottery for outfitters

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Utah should be cutting back CWMUs, not expanding them. The focus should be on opening land via trespass fee, or walk in access, not creating more corporate hunting .

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I strongly agree on concerning Bows that anything that amplifies should be not allowed however...when lets say a bow sight that has a range finder built into it this should be allowed, this is something that allows me to make a better shot and less chance of wounding an animal and losing it to waste..isnt that what we are after anyway ..its not amplifying anything its not giving me longer ranges its only allowing me to make a better shot at the time of the shot..if im allowed to have a ranger finder in my hand then why not on the sight itself come on thing about it...bow hunters already have a low harvest rate... and I cant even count how many deer and elk ive seen with an arrow in it that wasnt recovered and left to waste...

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

Strongly agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I would also like to suggest that if they are in a CWMU they should not be allowed to have cameras up after July 31...so what if it is private your providing hunts and its an unfair advantage, also no baiting on a CWMU again so what if its private your being part of a hunting business and the excuse I should be able to see whats on my property doesn't fly...so what then dont be part of the CWMU....

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If the success rate was only 3 % why change the rule? Let's look at how many deer get wounded because of bad shot placement with an open-sighted muzzleloader. When the rule was no scopes, I wounded several deer I never recovered, but I'm confident the deer perished. Since the new rule, I have harvested one (1) buck with my muzzleloader and the shot placement was great the deer did not suffer, all in all, the hunt was more enjoyable than previous years without optics. The real change needs to be allowing people to shoot any antlered deer they come across, the two (2) point slaying is what's damaging our hunting in Utah, and it needs to be addressed.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

These rules need to be on the Northern half if not all of the state. The northern half saw large death numbers in our deer due to a heavy winter. The only thing we should be considering is how to conserve our deer populations. The killing of small yearling bucks' year in and year out is more harmful to our buck to doe population and our mature buck population. The weapons we use hunting doesn't change anything its hunters being ethical and a conservationist at the same time. More hunters I run into in the field agree that an antler limit is needed either three (3) point or four (4) point restriction. These types of decisions frustrate hunters almost as much as you all change how I can hunt with the weapon I hunt with and if it can or can't have an optic. Please stop telling us what we can or can't have and tell us what we can or can't harvest, and please consider the whole of the state when making these choices.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If the success rate was only 3% better, why are you seriously considering changing it? Arizona and Utah are the only states allowing optics on muzzleloaders, this is a good thing! Maybe the success rate jumping 3% was because hunters actually harvested the animal, they were pursuing instead of wounding the animal, and never locating it. In my opinion, the DWR should focus on changing regulations to not have the small two (2) points killed every year. Every one of us sees it every year on every hunt, the yearling buck in the back of a side-by-side. These two (2) points are future 4 (points) and mature deer ready to mate and keep the population going. I think the problem lies with allowing hunters to harvest small immature bucks. This decision will frustrate some hunters but in 3 years they will be happy when they are seeing more deer, more bucks, and quality bucks. Also, I do not believe a change to muzzleloaders should be so quick, only 1 person I know got to do the survey, and I hunt muzzleloader and I never got an opportunity.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This would allow the DWR to more accurately track harvest rates and success rates.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I believe that a scope should be allowed but the scope should have restrictions. No turrets and the power of the scope should be limited. I have poor eyesight and the ability to make a good shot depends on the use of a scope. My thought is more game will be wounded and never retrieved if open sights are the only option.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I generally hunt in either the Monroe or Beaver units. I would fully support this type of study. I feel that it will likely help to improve the overall health of deer in the units as well as buck to doe ratios and age of bucks. Not only will this result in an improved experience for hunters, but for those who are just recreating and like to see wildlife.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I don't feel that restricting scopes on muzzleloaders will have the intended impact. Even with a scope your range is severely limited and in almost all instances you have a single shot opportunity. Instead I'd suggest more nuanced restrictions. Maybe limiting scope power, for example.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

After watching the video here a few things that bothered me

1. your survey size of 2500 people and a response size of 650 people is a very small percentage of the hunting public. But what the hunting public did respond with is that they wanted to keep scopes. The question needed to be asked, what range do rifle hunters feel comfortable at shooting. I believe that you would see similar results.
2. Changing the rules just to match what other states are doing is following, just to follow.
3. All the data shows an increase of harvest of 2.6% since the regulations changed that allowed scopes of all powers. by removing scopes completely the harvest rate will go down and the rate of woundings/not recovered animals will go up and then people will shoot another animal, and that will result in less animals overall. REMOVING SCOPES WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE OVERALL NUMBERS.
4. If this proposal is approved then you will see a lot of muzzleloader hunters change back over to the any legal weapon hunts and this will make point creep worse.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Mandatory reporting should be one every big game hunt every year. It's the only reasonable way to get accurate data. I also think random calls should be conducted. Unfortunately Some will try to lie on the survey and the only way to find out is random calls to verify the data reported. I'd also like to see more roadside checks in various areas. I'm not against greater enforcement. I've hunted for 55+ yrs, it gets worse every year with guys doing all sorts of illegal things. I'm so fed up with hunting here I'm going out of state from now on. It's a joke to hunt here.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Something has to be done, why not try.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I'm no an old hunter, I can't use open sights anymore. I'm not legally blind or anything, but trying to focus on small sights just isn't in my abilities. You're trying ban scopes on muzzy, but what about the high end high tech scopes on rifles that makes every Joe Blow hunter think they can shoot 1,000 plus yds !! There's set ups that use apps and your rangefinder to adjust your scope, why is allowed ???

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 10:13 am

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments**      No  
**about the CWMU recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I'm surprised reporting isn't currently required.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I agree with the 4 point rule, but it should be implemented statewide. This was my first year hunting and I went with someone who has been hunting for 50+ years. We drove ~300 miles around three corners and saw one two point buck. I think the population numbers are lower than the estimates and we were both shocked at how few deer were around.

If the point rule is implemented, I don't think the shortened season is necessary. Having a longer season is kind of nice since the hunt is a social activity.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I don't see a problem with scopes. You only get one shot anyways.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

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

Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 10:36 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Yes everyone should report their harvest.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---



**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I listened to a few of the presentations and read up on some of the others and my view may not be popular, but it's been awfully frustrating watching the herds suffer and I've kept quiet for too long. Throughout the videos you kept referring to the "biological and social side" - STOP! Managing the herds isn't a popularity contest! Force the changes that most benefit the animals and let those who don't agree go hunt somewhere else. Are you worried about revenue? How many true sportsman complain about not getting a tag when they see our deer herds starving to death on the roads in a harsh winter? How many of these guys are out shooting 2pts every year or taking unethical shots and wounding multiple animals until they finally recover one? How many of us have started paying more for tags to hunt in WY, ID and NV because we're sick of tripping over so many hunters crammed into limited public UT land to shoot every last yearling deer they can find??? I've hunted UT for decades with my brothers, nephews, nieces and children. Many years we don't even take a shot. Only the youngest hunters shoot young deer; the rest of us put the time and effort into actually hunting. I could go on for pages and I really doubt this is worth my time to continue, but it is ridiculous how the focus is on pleasing people more than preserving the animals. When you have a crazy harsh winter that kills all of the deer- SHUT DOWN THE █████ HUNT! Worried about losing money from the tags? Ask how many people would be willing to put their \$40 towards projects to help the herds recover! Don't send people up the hill to kill the last bucks that actually survived! Your studies indicate point restrictions increase waste and don't improve the deer herds? I agree, a lot of people suck and might leave a small buck if it was a 2 instead of the required 3- aren't these the same people that shoot that 2pt and then notice the 3pt standing next to him and shoot and take him anyway? Put more money into enforcement! Get guys on the mountain in these areas and have them contact people and make their presence known. Are some people going to get upset and complain about the DWR walking up to them and checking their tag on opening day? SURE ARE! Those are the same people wasting your deer and throwing fits if they don't get a tag; we don't need to accommodate everyone! Doing the right thing is better than doing the popular thing- no it's not a religious statement- it should be the way you guys make your decisions, because tiptoeing around is losing you guys the sportsman you should be trying to keep. We're either not hunting anymore or we're choosing to hunt other states. In summary:  
Point restrictions statewide unless you're youth or elderly  
Reduce the tags! Charge \$5/tag more if revenue is the concern, but the deer are struggling enough  
Close hunts on harsh winters- give the deer a break. Increase bounties on predators in those areas to help even further. We hunt the north and besides noticing the lack of deer, notice the increase in coyotes, lion and bears in those areas- address that issue!  
Get more officers out on the hill and make their presence known  
Stop catering to the problem 'hunters'

I could go on for hours, but we've sat at meetings and honestly don't see that the concern is authentic. We use to tell people we were hunters and thought we were 'cool', but a lot of times we don't even mention it anymore

though we have mounts and racks all over our homes- we don't want to be associated with that group anymore. If you keep catering to that type of kill everything/cry if I didn't get a tag/poacher mentality, you won't have a herd to manage in a few more years, but that's great that you want everyone to call in and report their hunt or you're going to penalize them- that's really going to turn things around. Cutting the season and shooting 4pt or better in the south is going to bring back the herds that starved or were hunted to extinction in the north also- good call guys.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory Harvest Reporting is a GREAT IDEA. Please send email reminders after the season is over to remind people they need to fill out their report.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Seems strange to introduce point restrictions when old data from UT and data from other states says it doesn't matter.

Implementing restricted weapons hunts on a unit for 4 years seems harsh for the people that hunt that unit, but I also understand you have to start somewhere to see if it works. Restricting weapons and season dates all at once is a real doozy for the people that like hunting that unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Your own data shows a small increase in success with scopes but you want to eliminate them just because the demand for the tag has gotten higher? You're still selling the same number of tags and killing roughly the same amount of deer, seems silly to remove an optic that lets people make more ethical shots.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** We could maintain higher pronghorn populations if we would manage wild and feral horses in all pronghorn habitat

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** We don't need to re event the wheel. I'm glad we are being proactive on this subject. However the major issues with Mule Deer in Utah is Human Encroachment on critical winter range habitat not how we are hunting bucks. We need to be able to hold a higher deer population and currently with the growth in Utah we are losing ALOT of available habitat for Mule Deer this includes highway mortality as well.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I feel that it would be appropriate to leave the muzzleloader hunt how it is. If buck harvest is slightly higher then offer less permits for that hunt. (harvest of bucks come with higher overall populations). It seems the data would suggest that having scopes on muzzleloaders have had no impact on overall deer population just bucks available on the landscape, that could be mitigated by how many permits are offered. I would recommend on adding a restricted muzzleloader hunt with open sights or adopting the "western rules" (Washington, Oregon and Idaho) with the exception of bullet types allowed. A 20% return is not a large sample size when trying to make these decisions based on surveys and It would be better to put it to a vote than what is being recommended. Or survey ALL muzzleloader hunters!!!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

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

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Public land that is landlocked would make sense to incorporate that into the CWMU. Public lands that are not landlocked doesn't make sense to incorporate into the CWMUs.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory reporting for all hunts has been needed for a long time. Just start it all at once no waving fees. If people don't pay attention that's their own doing.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Stop the doe hunts before you start augmentation. I don't think the state should augment a cwmu with any animals. What is the depredation plan for said areas and landowner conflict. It does no good to augment an area just to have landowners be able to kill them all within six months.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I would like to see the general season deer tag go up to \$100 with resident youth hunters being waved. What is considered a countable buck when you do your studies. If a 4 point is required does that mean you will only count 4 points on the buck to doe ratios. I would like to see restrictions be by the unit not by the whole state. You will have some units that will have more landowner conflicts and will probably need a higher success rate on the general season hunts. Also get rid of doe hunts or doe depredation.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** For muzzleloader hunting if the difference is only 3% of harvest keep the scope as they are. Or if you decide to ban or restrict scopes let the limited entry guys be able to use scopes if they want. There are some peeps sights that have turrets and windage adjustment will those be allowed as they make longer distant shooting easier? I would support having certain units or hunts have a restricted scope hunt but not the entire state. Utah making rules on hunting should be based on Utah numbers and Utahs hunters and not on other states allowing or not allowing things. I would like to see some units shrunk and managed for hams hunts while others are the same as they are. How many does does the division kill for depredation, is it more than 400 deer?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I like the changes I would like to see residents have the priority for this program.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

I would like to see doe hunts in deer ended. And if a landowner has a land owner tag it is only valid in the private property.

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

There should be a yearly dead line that if a LOA submits a voucher or a change that they must wait until the next year.

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

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

A cwmu should never have public land that is only for their use. The dwr needs to make corner crossing definitions clear as well as cwmu boundaries clear.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 11:59 am

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments**      This rule makes sense.  
**about the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---



**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I have some concerns with this one. My family has been hunting the Boulder unit for as long as I can remember (5 generations). We have seen it dwindle from a large family deer camp with extended family to a small camp with immediate family now to just the 2-3 tag holders.

I am currently in my second year as a dedicated hunter for the Boulder unit and have been in the program as often as I am drawn since it started in the 90s. I feel like this has come out of nowhere! I harvested last year, so I have been very selective this year and have passed on some great bucks because I wanted to hunt next year. Had I known these changes were coming, I would have changed my tactics. I am considering taking the refund, but have already completed all of my hours. Are the hours transferable to the next time I draw the program?

Antlerpoint Restrictions: I get the concept but not the execution. First of all, you already have lots of data for antler point restrictions. From your own presentation, "Didn't result in increases in mature bucks." Why do we need to try it again? I understand that people on social media are constantly calling for reduced buck permits and antler point restrictions, but they aren't biologists and don't understand that harvesting bucks has almost no impact on the overall deer numbers. (I studied wildlife biology in college). There are already tons of great bucks on the Boulder. I saw five bucks in the 30" range that I would love to harvest and a dozen more that I would have harvested on any other year.

Second: 4-point or better? I saw two different 3-point bucks this year that were over 30" wide and would have gladly harvested them if provided the opportunity. This has got to be lowered to 3-point or better. Or, better yet, make it a spread limit 15" wide or bigger. I have seen some monster 2-points that would be allowed to dominate the gene pool. I also believe that this should not be applied to youth hunters. It adds the stress of shooting the right buck that should not be part of their first years of hunting.

Shortened Season Dates: Again, I understand what you're trying to do. Reduce the stress on the animals and the harvest rates. However, your own data suggests that it does not reduce success rates and only reduces the time hunters spend in the field by a half day. This tells me that the congestion on the mountain would increase dramatically, thus also, increasing stress on the animals.

Restricted Weapons: I understand what you're trying to do with this one as well. The video seemed deceptive and didn't point out the specifics. I had to find the document to even understand what this entailed.

-I believe archery was tough enough with a compound bow. I've hunted it for several years and never harvested a buck. I'd be surprised if you even sold all those permits. I will not be participating in the archery hunt if this stands. I think archery hunting is borderline unethical anyway, with all the deer that are hit and not recovered. I expect this will go up.

-No inline muzzleloaders. I think taking the scopes off of the muzzleloader is enough. Please don't force us to buy new weapons!

-No scopes on rifles- Most of our rifles don't have open sights on them. I get it; the 800-yard-plus shots need to stop. Maybe restrict the scope to an old-fashioned 4x or 3x9 with no turrets or variables, just standard crosshairs.

I am a school teacher and father of four so I don't have a large income, and the new changes would require me to obtain new archery and muzzleloader equipment to participate in the three seasons like I usually do.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have felt scopes needed to come off of muzzleloaders for years (I have a scope on mine). I have heard way too many people bragging about 600-800-yard shots. My response is always "just get closer." Some of them back up and make it harder just for the "sport" of it. I feel something needs to be done with rifles as well. However, I do not support an outright scope ban on rifles. The 1,000-yard shots are so unethical.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Great changes. Thanks for making the program better.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 12:02 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments** I wish they would broaden this study to the whole state.  
**about the research study or the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** It seems like it will be much easier to make educated decisions relative to herd health with the additional data point of animals harvested.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I support all of these proposals on a state wide basis. I would like to see a three point or better rule applied to the Cache unit (where I reside and hunt). I also believe a combined shortened season and antler point restrictions solves the issue of selectivity for the shortened season. I strongly support restrictions on technology as I feel most people are very overconfident in their abilities to shoot at distance because of the amount of money they have spent on their set ups. I have witnessed the repeated missing and then wounding of animals at over 1000 yards while being between the shooter and the target animal while the shooting was taking place. The removal of scopes from both muzzel loaders and rifles is the best idea I have heard of when considering improvements to general hunter satisfaction even if it doesn't have a drastic effect on overall heard numbers. I am eager to see the results of the study.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** As a person that has hunted the muzzleloader hunt for the last 15+ years, I am grateful the committee understands the desire to separate the muzzleloader hunt from the ALW hunt. I agree that this is the main factor in disallowing scopes on muzzle loaders and support the recommendations.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** I strongly disagree with any proposal that reduces public access. In my opinion, if a landowner wants to hunt public animals, they should have to draw just like anyone else unless they are providing a legitimate benefit to the public in the form of access.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

I feel a landowner should be required to allow public access if they are receiving benefits in the form of tags. I don't agree with option 2.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Archery hunting needs to be limited to two weeks. Hunters should have to shoot a 3 point or better buck. This should also be looked at for elk on anybull elk units. They should stop killing as many cow elk on general anybull units.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Optics make a difference on ethical shots on animals, keep optics on muzzleloaders.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 26, 2023 1:49 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If a little more than half the people surveyed support no muzzleloader hunt changes, then why make a change? I believe most people are comfortable in taking a 200 yard shot, without or without a variable scope. The number of harvest is insignificant, and forbidding scopes will likely result in more deer being injured.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Antler restrictions have been proven to not work. Don't waste the time.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The data doesn't back up the need for the rule. AT NO POINT SINCE HIGH POWER SCOPES WERE ALLOWED, HAS THE MUZZLE LOADER HARVEST RISEN ABOVE 2016, IT HAS CONTINUALLY FALLEN. YOUR OWN CHART DATA SHOWS NO SIGNIFICANT INCREASE IN HARVEST FOR MUZZLELOADERS.  
I would be in favor of restricting scopes. Going back to the 1x is a great option. Even limiting to 2x or 3x would work.  
Going to no scopes would lead to more wounded animals and people guessing on their aim.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Generally speaking these changes are a step in the right direction. The muzzleloader hunt was always a unique hunt in the 1x days, so I like the idea of it being unique again. Also paralleling other states rules, As a hunter that hunts surrounding states like CO, and NM.

I don't see an issue with allowing 1x or open sights. I've shot both and a peep and globe sight has the advantage over the 1x when it comes to accuracy. Many hunters muzzleloaders now will have to be altered by a gunsmith to accept sights. Gunsmiths themselves can be a Real pain to deal with. Many people still have a 1x laying around from the old days, so I'm for letting those who want to use it have a quick fix, instead of having sights installed.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I feel having a good scope on my muzzleloader helps me make a better more ethical shot so that I either miss or make a kill and lessens the chance of wounding a deer or an elk. I feel people have had the scopes and made 250 to 300 yard shots now knowing their muzzleloader can make that shot I feel they will continue to try these shots without scopes and have a higher risk of wounding an animal with a badly placed shot with no recovery and move on to another animal. I just feel having a tool to help with shot placement is very important, and with the success rate in your own study shows it only increased 3% shows it hasn't created a major increase in the harvest of animals I just think it shows it helps make a more ethical shot placement.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I like the implementation of mandatory harvest reporting. However I feel like you either need to give the hunter 60 days with several reminder emails or text messages to fill out the report or lower the late fee to 25\$. The 50\$ fee seems way too steep.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** The only thing I want to add to this. Is why not capture the pronghorn that live in West Jordan and out by The Saltair and any other additional pronghorn on the west side of the Salt Lake Valley and use these to augment these proposed areas? These pronghorn are going to waste because they are causing a lot of accidents and losing their habitat quickly with all of the development. I will volunteer my truck to tow a trailer to move these pronghorn where ever the state deems they should go. I personally would love to augment the Cache units herd. I also need some dedicated hunter hours which could work as a project.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I am curious to know why DWR is only trying these out on units in Southern Utah. I would like to see these trials implemented in northern units as well. Has there been any consideration for a straight walled cartridge rifle hunt? I know other states are doing this mostly back east and it for hunting in well populated areas but It might be a consideration for limiting technology.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I hope tag numbers are adjusted accordingly with the new muzzleloader restrictions mostly for elk.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I am extremely unhappy with the Dedicated Hunter program with the price increase on the hours. The state made and every hunter who put in for the Dedicated Hunter program made an agreement that the expectation was 20\$/hr and now the state can just suddenly change it. Why cant I withdraw without a refund? I wouldn't have applied or participated knowing it would be \$40/hr. Why would you give those who drew this year or last year the opportunity to withdraw based on an antler point restrictions, or a weapons restriction? But those who were in the program when you changed the price per hours did not have the opportunity to withdraw.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Neither agree nor disagree

---

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

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** think this will be good you could add a management hunt in the future For the youth but you need to no the Rule does not state no inline muzzleloader it just says cap must be Visible

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I have muzzleloader hunted for over 30 year and this need to happen

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** You need to do more to stop poaching. Every animal should be physically checked. Chronic duplicate tag purchasers should loose their license.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** No antler restrictions, weapon restrictions, and shorter seasons. All you guys keep doing is taking our money and reducing our chances to get a tag, and harvest. Its not even a general permit...Its a DRAW! You did the dame thing with the elk hunt. More money, less time, crappy hunt. Your presentation literally said we tried this and it didnt work and we had more waste. How is that within your bounds of options.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** No scopes allowed. Otherwise its just another any legal weapon hunt. Dont include multiple topics/recommendations. You just ruined you feedback results because we have to vote once for multiple items.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Seems reasonable

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Im not interested in supporting landowners and cwmus until they support us. Changes always support them and more money. They Barely put up with is cuz they have to. Wish they'd treat us like people, not enemies

---



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

Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

Wont support anything pro cwmus until they support us. Helicopters, shooting guns, driving roads, fencing beyond borders, limited entrance days, all used to ruin public hunters hunt abiding by laws. You give them free land for use that they land lock! No! Buy it or its ours.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I really like letting the deer grow and giving the younger bucks time to mature and breed. I don't think shortening any more hunts is a good idea though. Here are my suggestions to add along with letting the buck mature;

We need to completely stop harvesting deer for at least the next 5 years. There are no deer. They are having a hard time recovering because every time they take two steps forward throughout the year, hunters knock them 10 steps back during hunting season. They then get hit again with the heavy winters. Maybe as an incentive to the hunters that would be angry over this, offer double the points. The con that I see with this though is poaching.

We need to do something to help our wildlife, because what we are doing, isn't working.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Data is important and I agree with this new proposal. However, it needs to be made so the reports can be submitted easily. Less barriers to entry. Make it easy for us to do this!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I DO NOT agree with the point restriction. Some deer genes will only grow 3 points. I harvested a large 3-point buck last year that was a mature buck and he measured 28 inches wide.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

We have been going on the general muzzleloader Elk hunt for over 20 years  
You will not stop people from shooting further distances by removing variable scopes your survey data is flawed you should have sent an email to every person who has gone muzzleloader hunting the last few years none of our group of 6 to 8 people that go every year were notified if you are doing it for wildlife management that is one thing but it seems like you are managing people and all you are doing by restricting muzzleloader hunters is saving a few more deer to be killed by rifle hunters

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory reporting may have the best impact on the actual state of hunting general season in Utah, thank you!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Thank you for trying something proactively.! I hope it gives us a path forward

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Thank you for promoting variety in hunting experience. I also think this will help with buck survival and likely point creep in some areas

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Keep LOs honest with regulation as well. Thanks.!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Next step: ANY CWMU tag (whether drawn, purchased, or gifted) should use LE Bonus Points. No one should be able to buy a CWMU tag every year AND clog up the LE draw system as well.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 27, 2023 12:50 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am strongly in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. I have powder hunted for over 20 years and would like to see it back the way it was before people were shooting animals at 500 yards with a muzzleloader. If hunters insist on using a scoped gun, there is an any legal weapon hunt they can use it on. Thanks

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I have several reasons to want to keep the scope and technology the same as in the past. I'm 76 years old and have trouble focusing with open sights. A scope gives me a clear picture and only one point to focus on. Some hunters have switched to high \$ muzzleloaders with increased long-range accuracy and will be pissed if you force them to remove the scopes. Many will still take the longer shot which will result in increased wounding and waste of resources--the same goes for older hunters and anyone else that will now take marginal shots with only open sights. If the overall affect on harvest is only 3%, then why do you want to make this restriction anyway? In my mind, scopes only give me a much better chance to make a more accurate and lethal shot and I see no overall benefit and only a lot of negatives to remove them.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This should have taken place several years ago

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** There are plenty of studies already supporting that point restrictions do not work!  
Everything else I'm fine with

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree if we are going to limit a weapon then no scopes vs 1x scopes would be best. Sounds like that is much more enforceable.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:25 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree with all changes except the weapons restrictions of the compound bows and muzzleloader. Why would I need to buy new equipment when bows and muzzleloader are generally harder hunts as it is. With Longbows and flintlocks people are less experienced and could lead to more errant shots and wounded animals. As with rifle, taking away scopes will only add more errors. I believe if it's just point restrictions and shorter season dates that majority of hunters will still hunt those units but will Not with the weapons restrictions

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 28, 2023 10:50 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am for the change to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders, but please allow 1x power scopes or red dot sights. I have 3 muzzleloaders now that have scopes, none of them have the capability to mount open sights. I could mount a red dot or 1x power scope though. Everyone I know that muzzleloader hunts is the same way too. I would have to purchase new muzzleloaders for myself and my family.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I like the shorter hunting days  
I like the weapon restrictions.  
I don't like that 1 unit will be the sacrificial lamb.  
I believe there needs to be more units across the state to implement these changes, not just the Boulder unit.  
Please choose 4-8 more units to restrict throughout the state.  
That will give better data than just 1 unit.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

The division should be making it harder for people to join the Dedicated Hunter Program. People that are complaining about the requirements are too [REDACTED] Lazy.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** You use a statistic that scopes don't substantially increase the odds of harvesting big game. If that is the case, why change the regulations? It seems that it is an opinion that scopes are bad which it is supported by you data that it is just a option that some people choose. It has little to do with harvest, so why change it? You are just causing extra costs to people to have their muzzleloaders converted to open sights and taking away choices. I could see if to many animals were being taken because of the technology. Let those the don't want scopes not use scopes. The half the same people would still hunt are probably a majority of people that are opposed to scopes. Seems like you are alienating the people the are ok with scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If scopes don't give much of an advantage (3%) over iron sights, then why get rid of them? In other words, there is not much difference between scopes and iron sights, so why penalize those of us that have scopes. I just spent a lot of money and time for my scope, rings, and set up. Is the DWR going to compensate me for these costs and the costs of new iron sights?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** It's a no brainer, we as hunters should help with conservation and mandatory reporting is one of the many ways we can do that.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Antler point restrictions have never worked, other states have them and they don't work, why would we think Utah would be any different.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Muzzleloaders are a "primitive weapon" this is why it has its own season. If we are to continue allowing scopes on these weapons we might as well combine that season with the any legal weapon hunt. I know plenty of friends and others that constantly talk about being able to shoot comfortably over 300 yards. To me that's a rifle. I agree we shouldn't make officers try to distinguish between low power and high power scopes, because that's impossible for them to enforce. Get rid of scopes or make it a rifle hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

The vast majority of muzzleloaders available at retailers and sold in Utah for the last decade or so have no provisions for open sights. They aren't even drilled and tapped for them. This is the result of a market for these rifles created by Utah's rules. This proposal to ban all scopes renders thousands of muzzleloaders useless and worthless. To make one compliant will cost hundreds of dollars. If we're going to dial back on the scopes, let's go back to the 1x rule or simple limit the max power of a scope rather than throw them all away. I don't recall hearing any enforcement problems with the old scope rules so the enforcement argument doesn't hold water. I personally don't think this committee has shown evidence that the scopes allowed today are resulting in high enough success rates to justify changing anything. For all we know the 1% or so increase in success is the result of better deer numbers. And how much of that data will be confounded but the trail camera ban? Well never know how much any change in technology impacted success rates because we keep changing the data set before we have a chance to see the results.

I think most people are going to give up on muzzleloading in Utah with the ever changing rules rather than spend the money for a new rifle or to have their old one retrofitted. When the interest dwindles well start talking about eliminating the season and replacing it with a second rifle season because muzzleloader hunting represents a minority of hunters as it is so angry should they need a season? Isn't that what lead to putting the seasons where they are rather than giving the folks with the primitive weapons the opportunity to hunt during the rut? Because we need hunts with rifles and near 100% success rates during those times so the outfitters and guides with the big money can make more?

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In response to the Utah Divisions proposal to remove scopes from muzzleloader:

- 1- Scopes on muzzleloader's have only increased success of the hunt by 3% and in the division's presentation, they indicated the increase may have been by having a higher number of bucks in the field.
- 2- Those with vision issues could apply for a COR to allow scopes on their muzzleloaders, but the details of the vision requirements were not presented. This could create more unnecessary costs and oversight issues. If you have invested substantial funds and time in developing a muzzleloader shooting platform, wouldn't that hunter also invest the effort to get a vision COR. What aging hunter doesn't have vision issues?
- 3- If this proposal goes through, you will still see long range shots with tang mounted peep sights and globe front sights being posted on social media. Will changes be made to eliminate those sights too?
- 4- There are already rules in place for the muzzleloader hunts and opportunities for others in the HAMS hunts.

Please consider leaving the current regulations in place.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Crap will wound 3 deer per person with out scopes just like when had 1x scopes everyone wounded multiple deer per year in stead of 1 clean kill . Don't want to hunt deer without scope I have old eyes can't see open sights.I will stop hunting deer in Utah .no scopes on Mount Dutton deer is crap dis agree .no one will want to hunt muzzleloader hunt anymore or good southern rifle units everyone I talk to says same thing . Everyone I talk to say hunt out of state.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** CWMU need to go back. To 5 days

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 7:35 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I agree but less restrictions on youth since it can be easy to forget. Maybe a fee if they forget entirely. Please don't ban the youth because a parent forgot to report. They shouldn't be penalized in such early years.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I believe in antler restrictions except on the youth and disabled. Youth and disabled can have a more difficult time finding that bigger buck. They should be allowed to take any size.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 8:18 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Magnifying scopes should never have been allowed, you should also require pure lead projectiles and loose power only. This is supposed to be a low tech hunt, and with all the tech it's become a single shot hunt requiring little skill.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 8:27 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I feel strongly that the use of scopes on muzzle loaders decreases the chance of wounded animals. As stated in the video most people are only comfortable shooting within 200 yards. Why not allow people to make a better shot within 200 yards vs wounding an animal with open sights. The hunt is still unique due to the limited range of the muzzle loader along with the time it takes to reload. I would be more open to restrictions involving the long range muzzle loaders vs taking away scopes.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 8:39 pm

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 29, 2023 10:56 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 10:48 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I don't agree with this recommendation.  
In the data presented, Blair noted that over 50% of survey respondents oppose limiting use of scopes and over 50% of survey respondents support keeping status quo.  
He also described some creative math which has harvest data showing a 2.5% success rate increase for muzzleloader hunters since scopes were allowed. Given the math used, this statistic has a low confidence factor and is insignificant.  
Despite public survey data and harvest stats that support keeping scopes on muzzleloaders the committee's lengthy discussions have led to a decision to simply follow the crowd and adopt other state policy. This is a failure to the stated committee goals and the public that they represent.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

The Dedicated Hunter program is described as a "service based opportunity". So why don't we require some of that service to be performed prior to the application period and be actual service (i.e. no buy-outs)?



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I'm all for the mandatory harvest reporting. The data probably won't change, but the public confidence will.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I really like the idea of trying some new hunting strategies. A major concern I have is the lifetime license holders grabbing a huge majority of the tags in the 4pt or better units. Pine Valley already has about 500, and I think it will more than double. I think there should be some sort of cap, similar to the Dedicated Hunter Program, around 15% or so.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

So, the technology committee recommended to restrict the use of range-finding bow sights that cost \$800-\$1,000. A small percentage of hunters were using these and were affected by the change. On the rifle end of things, riflescopes that do similar things were restricted. The Burris Eliminator (\$1,500+) and the Swarovski DS (\$4,000+) are the only two mainstream scopes that do that. Again, very few people were affected by this change, with the vast majority of hunters using regular scopes with a turret/dial system. Almost EVERY muzzleloader hunter in the state will be affected by this proposal, and per the DWR's own survey data, there's "Not a lot of support for change". Also, no majority was in favor of the muzzleloader sight restrictions, the majority was in favor of the status quo - their words! So who is really pushing for this? If someone is looking for a "unique experience", what is stopping them from using iron sights right now? It doesn't make sense to me to make such a drastic change, without majority support. The DWR survey says that "Most people aren't comfortable harvesting animals beyond 200 yards" That's because most people are still in the 200-300 range, and I know a LOT of people with long-range muzzleloaders capable of shooting a long way. People like to be accurate and ethically harvest animals! Was that not even part of the conversation? Do we purposefully want to reduce people's accuracy and effective ability to cleanly and quickly harvest animals? I don't think it's a good idea to go backwards there.

Here's the big issue I have and I would like the RAC and Board to discuss:

The technology committee recommends that we restrict the optics that allow muzzleloaders to shoot similar distances to rifles. What are we doing to restrict the optics and sights on archery equipment that allow them to shoot more than 100 yards, crossing into muzzleloader territory? Shooting those extreme distances with a bow is far less accurate, predictable and ethical than some shooting 500 yards with these new muzzleloaders. And people ARE doing shooting those extremely long-range bow shots, because their sights allow for it!

If you surveyed the general hunting public, a HUGE majority would say that people should not be shooting 100 yards (or more) with their bows. If we are going to restrict these weapons, let's do it equitably and fairly. Let's not pretend like archery hunters are exempt from their weapons pushing the limits of an effective and ethical range. No preferential treatment. I respectfully request the RAC's and Wildlife Board seriously discuss and vote on restricting archery sights to a maximum of 5 fixed pins and NO SLIDING or ADJUSTABLE SIGHTS. And only then I will be in favor of the proposed muzzleloader restrictions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Something needs to be done in the cache unit. If we have to wait until 2029 for this research from these trial units there won't be any deer left to hunt in the cache unit. We need antler point restrictions to at least 3 point or better for everyone over the age of 16. We saw so many tiny 2 points and even some spikes harvested this year, because that's all we could find to shoot. We hardly saw any does and even fewer fawns and only one 4 point deer during all 3 season hunts. We also need shortened hunting dates for all weapons to save the hunts in the future. Weapon restrictions should be heavily considered in the cache unit also, removing trail cameras has helped for fair chase, but weapons can shoot further than ever before. After the bad winters in 16-17 and 22-23 the deer herd is struggling. It's the worst we've ever seen it on this unit. There has been over building of homes on winter range needed during heavy winters. The deer have no where to go and just die. We don't have enough winter range to sustain the deer herd population, which is a huge problem and makes hunting close to impossible in this unit.

Can cache be added to the test units before we loose our deer herd up here?

---

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

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I feel CWMU's have generally hurt the public hunter. There should not be any CWMU with large areas of public land within them. Unless we give more tags to the general public. Forest service land was given to the Hardscrabble CWMU. It was explained to me that this made the area more even; the public lost property. Henefer Echo Wildlife Management traded 300 public land acres for in return for approximately 40 acres. Again the public lost land. It seems like the private landowners are the ones that are benefitting from the CWMU deals. The general public are the losers. If we keep up this trend we'll soon have no place for the public to hunt in northern Utah.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I was very interested to watch this presentation prior to selecting my position on this recommendation. I was glad to see that the harvest data for deer was available for the years without scopes and the years with scopes. No data was provided for Elk so most of my comments are directed toward deer hunting, but I assume the results would be similar for elk.

I was a little surprised by the fact that the increase in deer harvested with scoped muzzleloaders was minimal. Based off of the data presented, I have to ask why are we recommending to make changes and remove scopes?

Have scopes on Muzzleloaders drastically increased the harvest of Utah's deer herd based on the data? No.

If there is such a minimal difference in deer harvested, how are removing scopes going to increase opportunities for hunters? Based on the data if you issue more tags to provide more opportunities for Muzzleloader deer hunters, your going to end up harvesting more deer with or without scopes on Muzzleloaders.

Based on the data, Wildlife Managers should be able to meet the objectives outlined in the deer species management plan because the difference in deer harvested should be within a few percent with or without scopes on muzzleloaders.

Just to finish up, I think that being able to use a scope on a muzzleloader is a good thing and strongly disagree with the recommendation to not allow scopes on Muzzleloaders. I truly believe that utilizing a scope gives hunters of all ages a better chance of making an ethical shot. To me making an ethical shot is of the highest priority and I would hope that all hunters would think so as well.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Mandatory reporting is a good step to have better data to make decisions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** This is a good step to start researching changes, however the division should implement an antler point restriction statewide. The division should reduce days on all existing hunts, but add in additional primitive weapons hunts (ex. recurve bow) to disperse crowding and add opportunity.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Taking scopes off muzzleloaders is the right thing to do given advances in technology. Modern muzzleloaders with scopes basically make the muzzleloader hunts an additional rifle hunt.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** I agree with all the changes however still believe there should be a requirement to return the physical tag on a non-harvest.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

I strongly agree with the change to only allowing LOA tags to be hunted only on the private land enrolled, and not on public land. However, additional landowner permits should not be created. The LOA program is still unfair as a whole and should be eliminated. LOA's receiving tags solely on based on owning land goes against the North American model of wildlife management, and takes away from the public trust of wildlife. An additional landowner season further takes away from the public, and rewards only private landowners who have no obligation to enhance wildlife habitat. These are tags only based on owning property and are a threat to the future of public hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the LOA recommendations?**

The LOA program should be eliminated because it rewards only private land owners, and takes away from the public wildlife opportunity.

---

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

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

The CWMU program should be eliminated as it favors private landowners and does not give sufficient benefit to public hunters.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 30, 2023 5:12 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** 100% remove scopes from Muzzleloaders. In addition for future consideration, do not allow any inline muzzleloaders. Only traditional style muzzleloaders for any muzzleloader hunt.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I think this may be a good thing to increase Utah's trophy population but in doing so you'll eliminate anyone who's not a hardcore hunter. Speaking for myself, my wife and grandpa will no longer be purchasing tags. They're uninterested in weapons restrictions or being picky about size. That's not what hunting is about for them.

In addition, all three of those restrictions together will make it incredibly difficult to hunt. I personally won't be hunting in Utah anymore if those weapons restrictions pass. I think a better job could have been done clarifying what the weapons restrictions were. With muzzleloader scopes being eliminated as well as no BDC scopes or archery sights, there's confusion and I think more people would be upset if those restrictions were as broadly proclaimed as the 4 point restriction.

In short, I think the wildlife board is listening to the vocal few who are willing to hunt every third year with the chance of taking a big deer because they're going to hunt out of state on the other years. The silent majority that isn't die hard will be completely cut out if any of these changes pass, with the exception of a shorter season.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Make harvest surveys available in the UT dwr app

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** From the survey information that the division has gathered, it can be determined that scopes on muzzleloaders aren't a determination of success rates among hunters. Like was mentioned in the video, most hunters don't like to take long distance shots (over 200 yards) even if they do have scopes on their guns. Hunters that shoot "too far" with scopes will likely shoot "too far" with open sights, only difference is they are more likely to wound an animal and not effectively kill it when using open sights. Ethics play a big part in this conversation and they unfortunately cannot be policed or monitored. If this is passed based on effective range of a muzzleloader with a scope, then modern archery equipment and long range rifles are next on the docket.

Now that surveys will be mandatory, I feel that survey questions toward muzzleloader hunters should be more extensive to determine some factual data on the entirety of the group rather than a random selection.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

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

Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 8:26 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Seems to me like this is a huge step backwards and potential damage to our deer. I watched the presentation but for the life of me can not understand how eliminating scopes is the right answer. I'm 62 and my eyes aren't what they used to be, I can definitely make a much better and humane shot with a scope versus without. Don't understand this at all and certainly do not agree with your beliefs that this is a better plan. We're going to have many more wounded deer that hunters won't track that are going to suffer and die from this decision.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Somewhat agree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I agree with everything except for not allowing compound bows for rifle and muzzleloader hunters all that have to do is take their scope off their rifles and not purchase and additional gear for someone who is a archery hunter and they don't have a traditional bow they would have to go out and purchase one which is very expensive just to hunt yes a traditional bow is more challenging to hunt with but a regular compound bow is still very hard to harvest an animal with especially a mule deer that does not respond to calls every animal you see has to be stalked with in 70 yards for a humane shot I also think if you make people hunt with traditional bows you will find there will be way more shot and not recovered deer considering poundage can be way less and you have less control of where your arrow is going to go because you have no sight picture anyway I do agree with mostly everything except for banning compound bows

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 9:36 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Yes: I am responding to the no scopes rule for muzzle loaders

1) I am a 73 year old hunter. My eyes are not what they used to be. Scopes are essential for me to be an ethical hunter. I hunt muzzles loader because the weather is generally better. If this rule goes into effect I will have to stop hunting. I am sure many senior hunters will consider not hunting or just not obeying the rule

2) Blair Stringham and the committee did not make a compelling argument for the rule

a) approx 60 percent of muzzle loader hunters oppose the rule with approx 30 percent support

b) Very unclear what the measurable objective for this rule change is: Harvest percent has not changes (+2.5%) Hunters are ethical rejecting shots over 200 yards

c) survey did not ask if the no scopes rule goes into effect what will the 50 percent of hunter do? What percent will stop hunting or go out of state

d) Scopes make target identification much easier. Will hunting accidents increase, will doe kills increase?

e) I fear this is an agenda not data driven decision

It is clear to me that scopes on muzzle loaders currently does not present any problems. Other than tradition, what is the purpose. Will compound bows be outlawed for archery because of advanced technology?

This proposed rule will eliminate me as a hunter. I feel the need to ask for clarity on: What is the problem this is supposed to solve? What are the consequences if it is adopted? This appears to me to be a fear based attempt to cling to the past and stop even modest technology improvements

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this

Gene Miluk

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Other states do this and it is time that Utah does it too. Thank you! I agree with this.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I do agree with a point restriction. Big bucks will still be elusive and hard to find but should increase buck to doe ratio.

Increasing more archery tags would be great. Success is low but it gets us out in the field hunting. I would rather go hunt even if I don't see a 3 point or better. I would rather hunt every year and have the chance at a buck vs. not being able to hunt every year for deer in my home state.

I definitely agree implement this now. We need to save the deer population and try to increase people hunting. It is wild that we are down nearly 30,000 permits since 2018. Again I would rather be hunting and not take an animal because it is 3 or 4 point or better than not be able to hunt. Plus archery only units can help significantly increase the number of animals and mature animals.

I agree with the shortened seasons with the exception of archery. A 2 week long archery hunt is ridiculous. I see you don't want to just let archery hunters keep their long season of 4 weeks but you could argue that because success rates are lower than 1/2 that of rifle and muzzleloader.

What do you mean removing compound bows? That I DON'T agree with. It is a primitive weapon and distance is minimal at best. You still need to get close to the animal to kill it with a compound bow.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---



**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I agree with this presentation.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

You will end up having more animals wounded with open sights. I use the scope to help me visually see the target because I can focus the reticle and see the deer. Open sights it's a blur.

I only wear reading glasses, so even if I can qualify for the vision usage now you are creating unnecessary time for a conservation officer to come check me that I am legal.

Only a 3 percent increase of success certainly doesn't merit the change of no scopes.

I strongly do not support the proposed change.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** It works great in other states that I hunt, as long as it is use friendly the reporting system shouldn't be a problem.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Allowing scopes on muzzleloaders is not a significant problem that needs to be addressed in any way, when the law originally changed to allow them, success rates went up by a mere 5%. this is a ridiculous rule that will simply result in more injured animals as people will attempt the same shots, without the aid of magnification. Having a scope in most cases did not extend the reach of most hunters with the average muzzleloaders that 99% of us use. It simply made them more capable and accurate within that range. I am 100% against this recommendation as it solves nothing, and ruins the sport for many.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Does not affect me.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I would prefer that nonresidents were allowed to apply for cwmu draw permits.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

STRONGLY DISAGREE BECAUSE MYSELF AND THOUSANDS OF UTAH RESIDENT MUZZY HUNTERS HAVE INVESTED A LOT OF MONEY TO HUNT WITH THE TOP OF THE LINE MUZZYS, SO NOW ALL THAT MONEY INVESTED IS FLUSHED DOWN THE DRAIN.GUARANTEED IF YOU DO THESE CHANGES ME AND THOUSANDS OF RESIDENT HUNTERS ARE GOING TO HANG UP THE MUZZY AND START GOING TO OTHER STATES TO SPEND THERE MONEY ON QUALITY HUNTS.AFTER TALKING TO MY FRIENDS AND A LOT OF GUYS I WORK WITH EVERYONE IS SAYING THE SAME THING STOP HUNTING IN UTAH AND SPEND OUR MONEY ON A QUALITY HUNT IN OTHER STATES, LEAVE IT THE WAY IT IS....

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I feel that even though there may be some false surveys it's the best way to get more accurate on what's going on on the units.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Maybe not go in reverse on technology but put a cap on like a four Power Scope or lower, don't let variable scopes be used.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** I feel that cwmu should not use public property to be included. Too much public ground has been closed off to the general public for hunting.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

Why are we taking a couple of units and making them so restricted for weapons? Do we even have any data to support that enough hunters with the restricted weapons would even be interested in hunting these units? Furthermore wouldn't it just create an opportunity to apply for those units simple to get an easy to draw archery tag for the extended hunts? If the DWR is going this direction I think that they should either take away the opportunity to hunt the extended if you put in for these units or require the hunters to use the same restricted weapons on these units would require. Also I know several hunters that hunt with recurves and other restricted type weapons, but they like to hunt with family and friends that use more modern weapons and so would have to choose between a restricted weapons area or hunting with friends or family. Bad idea.

I have also hunted and glassed a lot in the Pine Valley unit and have seen some HUGE 3x3 bucks, if I understand the presentation correctly these animals would not be able to be harvested if the opportunity presented itself.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Why do you always have to pick on the muzzleloader hunters and who is really calling for this change? I know a lot of archery hunters that have floating pin sights and they shoot well over 100 yards frequently at animals. If you are moving this direction for muzzleloader hunters, I would hope the next step would be to restrict archery hunters to fixed pin sights with less than six pins. But I hate that the DWR continues to put one group of hunters against another...aka Archery against Muzzleloader. Why can't we work together as a united group? We end up playing right into the environmentalists hands when we become divided and restricted.

I watched the presentation and I don't think most muzzleloader hunters want to shoot over a couple hundred yards, however, in the presentation the DWR said the surveyed hunters majority want the rules left as they are the DWR has taken it upon themselves to recommend a change. Why? This is completely contrary to what the majority wants. I work in a profession where I sit at a computer all day and my eye sight deteriorates yearly, I will hopefully never be at the point where I would meet an exemption, but having a magnifying optic both for buck identification and shot placement is huge. I agree that having an officer in the field take time to look thru optics is both challenging and dangerous. So leave things alone. I dislike that the DWR continues to make changes and jumping around costing hunters money as we buy new allowed hunting equipment and then to just turn around a couple years later and have it restricted. Please make a decision and stick with it.

In the presentation the DWR states that Utah is trying to be more consistent with other western state muzzleloader requirements. Those states have regulations that are all across the board and yes the majority might not allow magnifying optics, but now the DWR has opened that door I think it should remain. We are different in Utah. If we are going to do what all the other western states do then please also get rid of the CWMU hunts because we are the only western state with take kind of program. We also have a unique approach on many other management practices in regards to wildlife and why are we picking and choosing where we want to be similar and where to differ.

My final thoughts are that the DWR has never checked my equipment while I was hunting and if they can't enforce the current rules and regulations how are they going to enforce new ones. Please stop making changes.

Once again if the surveys aren't calling for this change why is the DWR recommending it? Especially where success rates have been basically unchanged during the comparison periods. Stop putting one group of hunters against another.

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I fully understand that the division has a budget within the State of Utah to operate. But can't this funding come from another source without making it so challenging for the average hunter to afford being able to participate in the dedicated hunter program. With the multi season elk tags the volunteered hours are/weren't required and the fees were way more affordable.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

I disagree with anything that takes away access to public land and gives more hunting opportunities to private land owners.

---

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

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

It would be nice if any CWMU with public lands had to give more public permits for the acres they include even if they are non accessible.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
October 31, 2023 10:08 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 8:28 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Wow is all I can say. I use the scope on my muzzel loader to help see my target more clearly as I have eye sight issues. Why in the [REDACTED] are you so concerend with technology? We all use it every [REDACTED] day, wondeing how many of you on the board still have a [REDACTED] flip phone, you know OLD TECH? I'm sure every one of you have an updated cell phone why? Because we all are constantly updating in order to IMPROVE our daily lives, it allows us to be more efficient and productive in every aspect of our lives and how this effect hunting... simple.. it improves our suces rate. leave less wounded animals and can ensure a more ethical kill. If you're going to put a stop to this then you may as well put a stop to the people taking 1k and farther shots with their super duper long range set ups! I had to work a lot of overtime in order to purchase my inline muzzel loader and a decent scope for it to be basically just get the [REDACTED] finger! This state and the wildlife management has become a joke, I've lived here most of my life and have hunted since I was able to do so as a young boy, I've seen what was once a great state to live and hunt in become the [REDACTED] show it is today. We've become a huge embarassment and it's evident just by visiting a few of the local fb hunting groups. Stop trying to emulate what the surrounding liberal controlled states are doing and just leave what's not broken alone!!

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 9:43 am

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 9:50 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Without Cwmu's and there commitments to manage some of the wildlife, and giving opportunities to the public our Hunting as we know it are gone.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

With the increasing cost to participate in this sport, I feel changing the rules could be a hardship to some sportsmen who may have sold their open sight muzzle loader. Saved up and purchased a modern gun with no option for open sights spent money for a reasonable scope to take advantage of past rule changes. I feel at a minimum 4x scope should be allowed. I personally would like no change to the scope rule. In the past Utah has claimed to embrace technology based on that thinking I feel a 4x scope would be a reasonable compromise.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 2:24 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

Your own stats don't prove that taking scopes of a muzzle-loader is worth it. A ethical shot should be top priority. Why not look at all equipment then, turrets on rifles seem to make 100 yard snipers in the field is that ethical or fair to the animal? Opens sights are difficult for a lot of us old folks to use, i hope we can still use scopes in the future.



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study?** Strongly disagree  
**Do you agree with the recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** Antler point restrictions do not work. Never have never will. I don't think you are addressing the right issues here. automobile /deer collisions and predators are probably taking a much larger toll on our herds than hunters do. It seems that you focus too much on the buck population and not enough on increasing the number of does. They are the producers. I really think this is totally inappropriate.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** The only thing that removing scopes from muzzleloaders will do is increase wounding loss. Scopes are essential for more accurate shot placement. This technology committee seems to be a solution looking for a problem that does not exist. They are really trying to overthink this. The muzzleloader rules as they are are good and should be left that way. There should be no comparison with Utah law to other states. Most states across the entire country do allow scopes. We have it right for our state. All of your data seems to support leaving rules the way they are currently. Muzzleloading seasons are already quite restrictive compared to the rifle and archery hunts. Less than optimal season dates and only one weekend in the hunting seasons. Leave our scopes where they belong. On our muzzleloaders

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 9:30 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I love the idea of a trial year with the fee waived. Also strongly agree with mandatory reporting to get accurate data to make better decisions.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Agree with transplanting antelope to areas that need a boost in population as long as it does not drastically impact populations in areas where antelope are removed from.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

1 - 4 Point Minimum - I am in favor of this in hopes that some younger bucks will get the chance to mature on public ground. To be transparent, I've followed this in my own hunting since I was 15 years old so this does not change how I hunt.

2 - Shorter Season Dates - In favor of shortening seasons dates, especially archery season (I am an archery hunter). I'd prefer that time is removed in August and kept as is in September. It's too hot in August for most hunting and chances of souring meat are high in the heat anyways.

3 - Restricted Weapons - ABSOLUTELY NOT in favor of some of these proposals. As an avid archery hunter, removing the option to hunt with a compound bow is asinine. Yes, there are some people who can shoot out to 100 yards but those people are very few. Most hunters I know will not take a shot past 50 yards. Success rates are low as it stands today, and I believe the 19% reported will be lower when mandatory reporting is passed and more data is gathered. I worry that removing compound bows would increase wounded animals and animals that are not recovered. Also, this creates a financial burden for archery hunters in the state that would have to buy new equipment. Not to mention how this would hurt bow shops (both owners and employees will lose their jobs if you pass this) throughout the state. I am in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders. That hunt was never meant to have folks shooting 400+yards with a muzzleloader. On rifles, no problem with scopes but I'd suggest removing adjustable turrets or limiting zoom power to 12x to reduce the long range shooting. Many rifles that are sold today do not even come with the ability to add iron sights. They're tapped for scope mounts and that is it.

Side note that I really hope you listen to and read - If you make any of these changes for the general hunts, the same changes should be made for limited entry and CWMU hunts. I know that they provide a lot of funding to the state but if you're going to impact the blue collar hunter, you need to even the playing field with those that are dropping \$20k on an elk hunt.

If the goal is to increase populations I believe the state could spend money in a few areas such as protecting winter ranges and doing more habitat restoration. We cannot keep building on all of the winter range and then wonder why the animals don't make the winter. More WMAs in areas that need it throughout the state. I'd be willing to pay increased tag fees if I knew the money would buy more state ground that is protected for winter range.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

<b>Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?</b>	Correlation is not causation as it relates to scopes. But I am in favor of removing scopes from muzzleloaders as a way to prevent people from making 400+ yard shots. Yes, I saw your chart. I can list ten people right now that are consistently and accurately shooting their muzzleloaders over 500 yards. Maybe they are the only ten in the state but they are crazy accurate. I think removing scopes keeps it a "primitive" hunt from the rifle hunt as it would reduce yardages. Very few people will take a 200 yard shot without a scope. Most would be 100 yards or less. If not, you're going to see an awful lot of wounded deer roaming the hills. Or even worse, deer that are not recovered.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?</b>	Do not plan to participate in the program.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?</b>	Do not agree with special limited entry tags for landowners in a LE unit.
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?</b>	Neither agree nor disagree
<b>Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?</b>	Somewhat agree

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 11:13 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

In this video you pointed out that adding scopes on muzzleloaders led to "no major change". But what you forgot to ask is whether the shots placed were cleaner and more humane, and it clearly is. The majority, like myself, are making cleaner, and more humane shots while still invoking the limitations of muzzleloaders. What I've seen at the Lee Kay range even with scopes 3" - 5" groups are common, not this extended range 600 yard nonsense. And this idea of cheaper precision muzzleloaders on the market is just not happening. Everything has gone up, period! Same with muzzleloaders, especially a niche market such as "long range muzzleloaders" people get excited and spend spend, well the market responded with increasing the price over double. So your information someone added is not real, and the powder that's now 3x times the cost in 2 years proves that, just look up Blackhorn 209. I was purchasing 10oz of it for \$30 two years ago, now they dropped it to 8oz for \$80. That is the overwhelming preferred powder of precision shooting. That's not cheaper in any way!

This removal of scopes from muzzleloaders is plain ignorant IMHO! Hunters already voted that they were perfectly fine. The idea that you guys think people are actually making 300 - 600 yard shots with them at game and harvesting is ludicrous. Nobody is doing that, and your charts show that! Go to Lee Kay and see for yourself. Even with scopes the majority of people can only obtain 3" to 5" groups at the 100 yard range.

Very few ML hunters tune their load to get good groups, and even then most all shots are under 200 yards anyway. The BC on these bullets are just not that good and barely have increased for hunting bullets. You can't use precision paper bullets on game, so this long range is plain nonsense.

And what about the hunters that bought rifles with scopes, they do not have iron sights, and were never tapped for iron sights. This is a financial burden put along the people by a committee that doesn't look at all the relevant facts. You can't just flip the rules every 5-7 years with no reliving gain and expect the people to modify all their expensive equipment on decisions with no major changes obtained, it's a burden on the people.

It's absolutely ridiculous to allow scopes, then remove in a few short years, especially when it was voted on by all the hunters including regular rifle hunters and approved previously by the people. All this does is force people to make even more unethical and inhumane shots. We simply have to get close, and that has never changed, and never will change.

So the experience has not changed, and even with new changes to bullets and muzzleloaders there just hasn't been the significant changes to warrant these proposed changes.

You say it yourself, when you say we can still use scoped muzzleloaders in the general rifle any weapon. It's okay to use them then, but they still are limited, which again is no major change. So again the muzzleloaders are in

fact handicapped by their choice when compared to a centerfire rifle.

The fact of the matter is the only thing that changes is the game will suffer more inhumane shots, and more unethical suffering of game for no major change. I edge any of you to meet and head over to the Lee Kay during the lead up to ML season to see for yourself actual results before voting on any changes, instead of reading advertisements and listening to manufactures trying to sale their product with no recipient or actual data a "long range muzzleloaders". It's not like factory rifle bullets that you purchase, quite literally every single componant is hand picked and unlike rifles there is no standard in barrel size. So while one .50cal measures .447" inside diameter while another .50cal measures. 506" and everything between. It literally is a gamble to even make a 1" group at 100 yards. It all comes down to animal suffering and rifle hunters complaints in your ears, not actual data.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 1, 2023 11:40 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Agree with the changes that are proposed

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This survey was a hand picked to skew the data to favor the removal of scopes on muzzleloaders...Period!

In August 2015 surveys were emailed to more than 77,000 general season deer and elk permit holders in Utah, and more than 19,000 responses were received, according to DWR. The outcome of that survey was overwhelming to add scopes on muzzleloaders which should have been.

This time you guys only picked to survey muzzleloader hunters. You did this because it is a well known fact that medium/older muzzleloader hunters do not like inline rifles and scopes at all. It is well known there is a huge following of traditional hunter groups. And among those inlines were not the prominent choice. Once scopes were allowed, only for the last 6 years, more modern hunters came onto the field, but nowhere near the amount of traditional hunters. So your numbers are skewed from the start of this so called survey.

This hand picked special survey to get hand picked results was done to get the rifle hunters and traditional hunters out of your ears. It has nothing to do with facts that no major change has occurred to warrant any change to the current regulations. And further becomes a financial burden on the people that followed your rules and now must change their rifles to get iron sights mounted. Muzzleloaders come tapped with either scope, or iron sights, but not both.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is a long overdue change. A+

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I mostly agree with this proposal, but one area I am not in favor of is Antelope Island, I feel they need to get a handle on the very over abundant coyote population before putting more animals out there.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I commend the DWR for this out of the box thinking, and am willing to see how these proposals shake out.

A couple of issues that I am not a fan of, for the restrictive weapons hunts, I feel the archery restrictions are vastly over kill. Archery is already a very low success rate that I feel moving to long bow tech is to far. To me a fair restrictive hunt for archery would be to limit hunters to a 3 or 5 pin NON SLIDING site. to me this would help to reign in the archery equipment and lower success some. As I said its already very low compared to rifle and even muzzleloader.

I also feel that the muzzleloader restriction is to much, I feel that removing scopes as your have with rifles would be a fair take for that weapon type.

To me you went too far with your restrictive weapons definitions, I was ok with-it last year as a proposal, but only because I thought it would be used to add and additional hunt rather than completely replacing a hunt especially something as big as a whole general season unit.

One other issue, the proposed archery season is to start the first weekend in September, I feel you should keep the original start date in August as one of the draws to the archery hunt is hunting velvet bucks, if you move the hunt to September the velvet is not as pristine as it is getting ready to be rubbed off.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

This is a very disingenuous proposal, all of the feedback shows that the majority of hunters, and especially muzzleloader hunters do not support this change.

This is not a biological issue, the success rate did not see a significant jump, I see no reason to change the current rules. Hunting with a muzzleloader even one of the new ones is not even remotely close to the same as hunting with a rifle.

The DWR, or the Tech committee never did give a good valid reason that they feel this rule needs to change. I fully reject this proposal and I hope that you on the WB will as well.

KEEP SCOPES ON MUZZLOADERS.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

I agree with most of this, the only thing I do not like is them automatically adding a year to the program if the hunter draws a LE tag.

I personally had this happen to me as I drew a LE deer tag on the second year of my Dedicated hunters enrollment last year, this allowed me to be extra selective this year as I was able to hunt for a bigger buck this year knowing that if I did not kill one I could extend my dedicated to next year. But in the chance I did find a buck I wanted this year (which I did) I would still be able to use last year (the year I drew LE) as my no kill year. This allows me to now put in for a general hunt next year and either build a point or draw a tag.

Ultimately if you do this you will essentially be taking away a year of eligibility from the people that draw a LE tag while in the system. We all want as many years as possible to hunt, this rule would take a year away from someone depending on how it is implemented.

Everything else looked good.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

It does not say in this video, but in the new rules that passed last year, the people buying a voucher would have access to the entire LOA per the rule. I am wondering if that rule would still be in effect for Option 2 of the LOA rules?

Something to think about.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

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

Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?**

I feel the public hunters do not get enough of the tags, should be 20% go to the public.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 1:38 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 1:40 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed changes to the**  
**taking big game rule?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the proposed research study?**  
**Do you agree with the**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 6:20 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** Great program

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 6:39 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This is a great idea.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** I don't agree with the point restrictions, already did it in Utah and it didn't work. Hurts people harvesting for meat.

I strongly agree with shortened seasons, as long as archery is moved to starting in September.

I disagree with the limited weapons. I think it will lead to poaching on limited unit, pressure/worse draw odds on nearby units. Go back to no scopes on muzzleloaders, no electronic bow sights. Rifles are hard to limit effectiveness but a shortened season may help with that.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I am in support of low power or 1x scopes.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Strongly agree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:37 am

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

I am for trying point restrictions but think that regulation should be implemented to allow for the taking of 2-points and 3-points (2x2, 2x3, 3x3), since there are some bucks that will never grow any more points than that throughout their entire life, which would put them under the point restriction. I do not agree with potentially restricting compound bows since the success rates are already low for archery, and by doing point restrictions will lower success rates even further. I am for having certain seasons for "restricted weapons", or rotating which units have weapons restrictions for muzzleloader and rifle every 3-5 years. I think that inline muzzleloaders should still be allowed under the restrictions but have the "no scope" restriction. I do not agree with taking scopes back off of muzzleloaders completely (the reason for rotating which units have restrictions) since it only had "roughly a 3% increase" in hunter success on the muzzleloader hunts. That is not a substantial enough increase in success to negatively impact populations, especially if the other proposed changes are implemented. I somewhat agree with the shortened season dates but worry that it will only increase the problem of crowding. For archery, I would suggest that instead of just shortening the season to 2 weeks from 4 weeks, the 4-week archery season should be split into two 2-week seasons, an "early" archery season and a "late" archery season. This could increase hunting opportunity, would help reduce potential crowding issues, and allow hunters the opportunity to choose a more specific time of year that they are probably already currently hunting for archery deer. Extended archery season would not start until the end of the "late" season archery, so the "early" season archery hunters would have to wait 2 weeks after their hunt to be able to hunt the extended archery. I feel my suggestions would be just as effective as the currently proposed changes, but still allow for a variety of hunting opportunities for the hunters who hunt in Utah. Creating any further restrictions will most likely only result in a reduction in the number of hunters who will hunt in Utah, both resident and non-resident hunters. I think that hunters would start looking for other, better, hunting opportunities in other states, as I already know of several who already dislike hunting in Utah, and currently hunt in other states because of the current restrictions as well as the management of our wildlife resources.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I do not agree with removing scopes from muzzleloaders, since the approximate increase in success rate is not really substantial enough to negatively impact herds, especially if combined with the other suggested changes/restrictions being proposed. I do agree that the definition of what a muzzleloader is needs to be better defined, in-line muzzleloaders should still fall under that definition. I dislike with the term "long range muzzleloaders", as really the effective range of any muzzleloader is really only approximately 300 yards. As stated, most hunters don't feel comfortable shooting past 200 yards with a muzzleloader, and that's ultimately because of accuracy, velocity, and energy past that distance is reduced enough that it isn't an ethical shot past that distance, too much can go wrong. Even with the increase in muzzleloader technology, that effective range has not increased. The suggested restriction of "no scopes on muzzleloaders" would also only decrease the amount of muzzleloader hunters in the field. Even though it's an option for the any-legal-weapon hunt, I do not know anyone who hunts with anything other than a rifle during the any-legal weapon hunts.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** If you want to help Utah big game, eliminate the taking of CWMU deer during November regardless of tags per acre. If the general public doesn't get to hunt during the rut, private landowners and CWMU's shouldn't either.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** My only concern is that by removing scopes completely, you may eliminate older hunters from the hunt completely, due to not seeing as well. I think a better compromise would be to allow 4x scopes without turrets, which would keep shots around the 200 yard range you mentioned in the video.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Please eliminate the ability to buy the hours. I am in the dedicated hunter program in Morgan/South Rich/East Canyon/Summit, and I would gladly take a refund on my final year and not hunt due to a complete lack of deer.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU recommendations?** If you want to help Utah big game, eliminate the taking of CWMU deer during November regardless of tags per acre. If the general public doesn't get to hunt during the rut, private landowners and CWMU's shouldn't either.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Way too many rules and laws, there's TONS of power trip DNR officers that will try to get you for anything, trying to give us a ticket/take ducks for not having a stamp signed? Officers should not be paid commissions. They have also talked about how they bet money to one another to see how many tickets that hand out that day, this is very wrong and wish they could shine some light on this problem

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 3:56 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly disagree  
**regarding the technology**  
**recommendations?**

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am writing mostly about scopes on muzzleloaders. There is only a 2.6% increase on hunter harvest with using scopes versus not using scopes and I suspect that there is less wounding by hunters using scopes. I can't see any biological reason to disallow using scopes. Voting to not allow scopes on muzzleloaders won't increase our big game herds at all.

I am over 70 years old, it is almost impossible to focus on both the front sight and the rear sight at the same time. A scope really helps me make a better shot on an animal, especially in low-light conditions. We hunt spike elk with muzzleloaders a lot and it is hard to keep track of the legal bull in the herd when you have a spike and another yearly that has little forks and the two bulls keep moving around and changing places in the herd.

I was at a board meeting back when it was still a two-board system where they voted to allow one-power scopes. There was an older gentleman on the Board that liked to hunt with a muzzleloader, but he couldn't see very well so he wanted to use a scope. He didn't think the other board members would support the use of scopes so he made a motion to use 1 power scopes and it passed. He didn't realize that a 1 power scope makes things farther away than they really are, and the crosshairs were so thick and heavy that they covered up almost a whole target and it made it really hard to sight them in. That is why hunters pushed to use regular scopes.

I don't like the idea of people shooting at the ranges that they claim. The trouble is that you can't legislate common sense, morals, or ethics. It doesn't matter whether you are shooting centerfire rifles, archery tackle, muzzleloaders, or shotguns, people shoot at animals farther away than they should. I never shoot at an animal over two hundred yards and rarely over a hundred yards. I don't have one of these new log-range muzzleloaders and don't plan to buy one.

Basically, most muzzleloader bullets have very poor trajectory so the only way that you can shoot them very far is to have a muzzleloader with a very powerful scope that you can dial to compensate for longer yardages. If you have a muzzleloader with a scope that you can't dial up to compensate for the yardage it will turn it back into a short-range rifle again.

I would hate to see you vote to disallow scopes on muzzleloaders but if you feel that you want to make a change. I suggest that you change the current rule to say "Only a fixed power or lower scope is allowed for hunting big game in Utah". that will stop all this really long-range shooting but still allow us a rifle that we can see better with and be a truly ethical muzzleloader. I think will be a compromise that hunters like me who are just trying to be able to see better but not really shoot farther. People that are my age have plenty of issues with hunting as they get older, please don't make it harder than it already is.

Thanks for your willingness to serve for the good of wildlife and sportsmen.

Paul Niemeyer



Past Southern region RAC chairman  
Past Utah Wildlife Board chairman

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** I strongly agree that this will help the dnr be able to generate more data and gather more accurate harvesting surveys.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** I agree with the augmentation programs being added with the pronghorn because there has been a obvious change in the pronghorn number in the past few years. Although , would cutting back on tag number be beneficial to the pronghorn so they have more of an opportunity to grow

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?** After reviewing the videos and reading through the memorandum I disagree. if some of the changes have been tested in the past and proved to not increase the amount of total deer population why go back ? As well as if the dnr if proposing changes in southern utah and truly believes in this program why wouldn't the dnr test these changes on any northern utah units after strong winters and deer numbers lowering in northern utah I would like to see what would've proposed for the northern Utah and not just focus on southern utah. I disagree with the changes to weapon restrictions because if there was only a slight increase in harvested deer why would dnr take away a more ethical and accurate way of killing an animal. I think that there needs to be less deer tags given out or to pause deer hunting in general and to put a better push on Hunting and lowering predator numbers. As a young person that has a lot of future in Hunting I would like to see better changes that is going to benefit the entire state and not just focus on half of the state at a time.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I disagree with this because to have it the ability to make a muzzleloader a more accurate and ethical weapon with a scope could allow hunters to make better shots and to lessen loss of game. That being said I do think that muzzleloaders with scopes should be a general season weapon hunt because you still are not going to have the range and ability to shoot out to ranges with a muzzleloader as you are going to with a rifle I think that if most people are not comfortable with shooting any further with a muzzleloader then 200 yards with scopes then nothing should be changed. I think that scope allows the hunters to be more accurate and ethical with taking game.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?**

Strongly agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?**

Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?**

Somewhat agree

---

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

---

Somewhat agree

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 7:32 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** I don't the the change to the muzzleloader hunt is a good Idea.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 8:00 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?** Leave it the way it is

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?**

I am not opposed to having a mandate for reporting harvest, but a \$50 fine is ridiculous. That is about as much as the tag is for a typical permit. Why not just put a hold on putting on putting in for hunts until it is completed. If a fine is implemented, I would like several emails or text messages as a reminder and we can report others in our group.

With the use of technology, why not add an option on for app to have digital license. We have digital license for fishing license, why can't the same be implemented for deer or big game animal. You simply take a picture of the animal after it is harvested and the picture automatically is implemented into the license so the tag would be completed and that information is uploaded for harvest information. This would be easy to implement with the ridiculous fees you will be collecting for non reporting within 30 days.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

If Utah wants to continue to compare itself with adjacent states for hunting, that it better realize that we have substantially sub-standard hunts than adjacent states. I know know many people who leave to the state to hunt due to the lackluster big game compared to Idaho, Colorado, or Montana. So lets leave the comparison to other states out of this. the muzzleloader is the best game hunt we have. It got better with being able to use better scopes than the 1x. For people like me that have terrible vision without glasses, I don't like to shoot with my glasses on. I enjoy the scopes since its easier to see which deer has the antlers rather than going back and forth with the binoculars. If some people enjoy the traditional hunt, than they can continue to hunt with open sights or 1x scopes but quit changing the hunts for the worse. I have enjoyed the muzzleloaders hunt more since we changed to better scopes several years ago.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the research study or the recommendations?**

All surrounding states have went away from these archaic point restrictions. I am old enough to remember the point restrictions and it did not work. Hunters still shot small bucks and left them to rot because they didn't look at points. We lost so many young bucks because of this. Young bucks make up the largest portion of the buck population and the largest bucks make up the smallest. You will be putting all the pressure on the smallest population of bucks and those are the mature animals that are doing your breeding. Increasing bucks numbers does not enhance the deer population. Doe numbers and their health is the best way to have a healthy deer population. If the smaller bucks are not harvested in some way, their numbers increase the buck ratios and carrying capacities for the winter and summer ranges, alternately impacting the survival of the does. We can never get back to deer numbers and the hunts of the 1960's and 1970's. Utah has grown too much, ranges have decreased in productivity, equipment has dramatically Ganges, hunters care more about killing than actually hunting, and we seem to rely on social and political factors to drive big game conservation than actually letting the science and biologists do their job.

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any additional comments about the technology recommendations?**

I am pleased to see scopes being removed from muzzleloaders. When this weapon received its own season, it was an additional opportunity for hunters and very low success at 6-7%. Now we see that it's almost at 30%! I think this is a good move forward for hunters. It will make them hunt. It will make regulations similar to other states and drop the success towards where it should be.

I do not like the removal of the bolt restrictions for crossbows and air guns. These weapons require penetration to kill. Reducing or removing the restrictions will go against penetration as guys shorten bolts and reduce weights to get more speed but less penetration. Basic science teaches this principle. This is stupid to do because an archery guy says that we don't follow the same things as other states.

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

November 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
November 2, 2023 9:18 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Strongly agree  
**regarding the CWMU**  
**recommendations?**

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the proposed changes to the taking big game rule?** This seems like a tax on hunters.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed pronghorn augmentation sites?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed research study? Do you agree with the recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the technology recommendations?** Strongly disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed rule changes to the Dedicated Hunter Program?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the landowner permit rule?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the LOA recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---