

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 12:36 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I represent nonprofit Chairbound Sportsman and have a general comment in support of the CWMU offerings for nonprofit hunts of big game species. Over the years many of our members with disabilities have had successful hunts and this has been a great benefit for their self confidence and rewarding outdoor experiences. Please keep these ongoing and consider adding cow elk hunts as well. Regards Kenneth Vaughn Board member 801-499-9770

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 5:43 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I've been a public hunter on a cwmu unit and killed the biggest deer of my  
**recommended changes?** life and had the best hunt to date.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 5:50 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** Fantastic program for both the struggling private property owner trying to  
**recommended changes?** keep from selling the ranch as well as the general public having access to  
typically better manage property couldn't support it more thank you

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 5:54 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I've been a public hunter on a cwmu unit and killed the biggest deer of my  
**recommended changes?** life and had the best hunt to date.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 6:00 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I fully support the CWMU program and appreciate the opportunity to hunt  
**recommended changes?** well managed private property.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 6:17 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these** I'm a public hunter and haven't drawn. I have been an observer with  
**recommended changes?** someone who has drawn though and had an amazing time.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 6:19 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Strongly agree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I am looking forward to the day that I can draw a deer tag on one of the CWM use that border my hometown I currently hunt general season public property there are a much higher quality of deer on the CWMU's I think it's a fantastic program. Thank you.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 9, 2024 9:42 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---



Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 10, 2024 2:20 am

**Which best describes your position** Strongly agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 10, 2024 8:02 am

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat agree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these**      I responded earlier but i had a bit more time to read and study this.  
**recommended changes?**      I agree with the antlerless population harvest tools portion.  
I do not agree with the use of atv, horses etc portion because i feel it is too  
much overreach,, this is private land.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the latest cougar harvest and management information?** I support the continued trapping of Cougars

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?** I am against any kind of trade lands. These trades never favor the public hunter. It is confusing trying to find the trades on the DWR website and they are not shown on Onx. With the many mapping systems available, OnX ,Gohunt ect, there is no need to trade lands for a recognizable boundary. People can accurately navigate the boundaries. A lot of these CWMU operators want trades because the deer and elk move off of the CWMU onto public lands adjacent to the private. By trading lands, we are taking opportunity from the public hunter. I would like to see Zero land trades. If a CWMU can't make it with 100% private land, then they shouldn't get an approval to operate.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?**

One of the purposes of the conservation tags is to make money for wildlife. Covy said in his presentation that some of the recommended changes are to "Maximize conservation permit revenue". I find this disingenuous with the way things are currently. The UDWR is leaving money on the table. One sure way to Maximize revenue is to eliminate the In-person Validation of applications at the Western Hunting Expo. Currently an applicant must physically travel to Salt Lake City to be allowed to apply for the 200 permits taken from the public drawing. How is that fair to the people that live in Blanding (308 miles) or Vernal (175 miles) or St. George (305 miles) let alone Nonresidents. If we are truly trying to Maximize revenue, then we need to get rid of the In-person Validation and go to online applications. There is even data that supports this. In 2021, because of the pandemic, people were allowed to apply for the 200 tags online. That year there was 21,680 applicants. That's over 2000 more applicants than the next highest year which was 2023 and had 19,565 applicants. In addition, the number of Nonresident applications in 2021 was 161,187. The next highest year was 2023 at 97,853 applications. that's a difference of 63,000 applications which equates to \$315,000 we are not getting just from Nonresidents because of in-person validation. (These numbers come from the 2023 DWR audit. The most recent I could find)

These are public permits, and they should be made available to ALL that want to apply, not just those that have the time and means to travel many hundreds of miles and take a day off from work. I would highly recommend that the RAC and Board make a motion to eliminate In-person Validation for the 200 public permits at the Expo. This would be a sure way to Maximize Revenue on these public permits.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 14, 2024 10:57 pm

**Which best describes your position** Strongly disagree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---

**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

I am disappointed in the Advisory Board and the recommendations that they made or failed to make. Here are a few questions or comments I would like suggest.

First I want to say there are many people over the 20+ years of the program who have benefited. There have been many stories of positive experiences. At the same time, the public gave up too much to the landowners.

1. The tag split needs to change. 90/10 is hugely disproportionate to the value each brings to the table. The landowners bring the land. Without the animals, the land has no value in harvesting wildlife. The Public brings the animals. Without the land, there would be no place to harvest the animals. Each is dependent upon the other. The split should be created by the saying 'if you split it, the other gets to chose'. There is a COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT UNIT. We need to create a better split. If the landowners come up with the split, 90/10 for example, the public get to choose which number they want, 90 or 10. If the public chooses the split, then the landowners get to choose the number.
2. The public gets too little for the amount the landowners get. The landowners get 12 weeks to harvest their tags. The public gets 5 days? The landowner gets guaranteed tags, the public gets in a lottery? The landowners get to hunt with a rifle for 12 weeks, the public gets 5 days?
3. Changing the split will have an impact on point creep due to more bucks and bull tags going into the public draw.
4. Why is it when the landowner gives up 10% of the bucks and bull tags and goes to 80/20, they increase the antler less tags by 40-50%? Why would they not just get 10%?
5. Change the season dates of the CWMU to coincide with the general and LE hunts. This would help all the general public land by dispersing the animals thru the entire landscape rather than them congregating on private land.
6. Allow public hunters 2 weeks to hunt the private land.
7. Why would you give the extra antler less tags back to the landowner when they chose the 90/10 split?
8. Create a roster of people who can respond at a moments notice to harvest antler less animals. This creates more opportunity.
9. Why the disparity of what the private landowner gets and the general public?
10. If the landowners want to exit the program, then they can sell all their tags and hold their hunts in the same time frame as the rest of the state. This potentially could lead to a decrease in the cost of the tags due to everyone having to hunt at the same time.
11. Change the split. If the landowners want to charge more for their tags to make up for the difference, they can. If they chose to not participate any longer, then they can hunt with the rest of the public.
12. Make it so every tag sold thru the CWMU process eliminates the persons points. This should also include the sportsmans and other conservation tags. This helps with point creep.

We can do better.

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 15, 2024 9:08 pm

**Which best describes your position**      Somewhat disagree  
**regarding the recommended changes to**  
**Administrative Rule R657-37?**

---



**Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?**

Glad to see the CWMU rule being addressed but I do have some comments.

Cons:

1. While I do like the majority of the plan to help CWMU's reach their cow harvest. I don't believe in any circumstance that the CWMU's should be given private antlerless elk permits even if they are just giving them away. The majority benefit to the public of the CWMU program is that they get 100% of the antlerless tags if a CWMU chooses the 90/10 bucks/bulls split. If a CWMU needs to be given cow permits because they aren't meeting their quota then I suggest they be moved down to a different tag split which will then give the private land owners more control over the cow tags without sacrificing the public's share of the deal (the 50% partner in the CWMU program). Whenever tag splits are brought up the CWMU's tout that the public get all the antlerless tags and therefore there is no reason to change the splits. I would hate to see the public's benefit be given away without splits being adjusted accordingly.

2. Along those same lines, I'm saddened to not see anything addressing CWMU's that don't have any antlerless permits to give to the public. There are 56 CWMU's that are receiving buck/bull permits in 2024 that offer no antlerless tags to the public. Only a handful of these have elk permits. The rest are deer only or deer/pronghorn units. These CWMU's don't offer antlerless tags for good reason because they don't have elk, and our deer management plan tries to steer away from hunting doe deer too much. Nevertheless, these CWMU's are taking advantage of a 90/10 split which maximizes their benefit and minimizes the public benefit simply because of where their units are located. I would recommend that all of the CWMU's that don't have antlerless permits to offer are required to either do an 80/20 split or give 1 additional antlered tag per year to the public, whichever is greater.

3. I would like to see something recommended to the wildlife board to require the DWR to keep the hunt planner updated. I attempted to contact all 125 registered CWMU's this spring in preparation for the application period. There were several instances where the contact information provided on the hunt planner was incorrect (both emails and phone numbers). Also the information about the CWMU's (rules, number of guests, etc) was incorrect in almost every instance. The general public has a lot of issues with the CWMU program but I truly believe that at least half of that is because of misinformation or a lack of information, and having the hunt planner incorrect or providing bad contact info doesn't help. I would like to see the DWR directed to review/update the hunt planner every time a COR is renewed. If they are already supposed to be doing that I can tell you it isn't happening.

4. I think the public should be given 5 minutes to comment on this item since there is so much being crammed into one presentation.

Pros:

1. Super happy to see the guest policy being addressed. I think that has been a long time coming and is a reasonable compromise. Public hunters can either be guided and bring one guest, or they can have up to a car full of people that has to stay with them. Makes much more sense than what has been done in the past.

2. I support the changes with trade lands and contiguous acres and think they will be good things for both the public and private.

3. As mentioned a bit above, while I don't agree with everything being proposed for the antlerless elk harvests I am happy to see some of the other tools being proposed to help with antlerless harvest to help get some of these elk herds under control.

4. Glad to see the CWMU advisory committee helped out by giving them a little more direction. They do a great work.

Please take a real look at each of these issues and don't just pass everything through like is usually done with CWMU proposals. These are important issues to everyone. If you don't feel like you understand the program, please educate yourself on both sides so you can make informed decisions.

**Which best describes your position  
regarding the proposed changes to  
Administrative Rule R657-41?**

---

Strongly agree