

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 8, 2024 2:17 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 8, 2024 3:13 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 2 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

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

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?

I used to think these permits were a great thing, but I've come to see them for what they really are. They are selling public permits to the highest offer. We have effectively stolen from the poor to give to the rich. I don't trust most of the groups that get these permits. They are not transparent or honest. I'm asking the State of Utah to discontinue this program. I recognize that these permits generate a lot of funding for habit restoration and other projects-but the system is broken and everyday Utahns are getting the short end of the stick. Arizona pulling its governors tag from the hunt expo is just the beginning of the conservation permit meltdown.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 8, 2024 6:57 pm

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

Do you have any comments about these Love hunting with family
recommended changes?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 8, 2024 8:24 pm

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

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? This program is a great program and I would hate to see many if any changes That could cause some CWUM's to get out of the program

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 8, 2024 10:14 pm

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

Do you have any comments about these Seems like a fair program
recommended changes?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 12:32 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 3:00 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?

I think there were some great things that came out of the CWMU rule committee but because the committee was stacked with individuals who were a voice in favor of the CWMU association instead of a balanced group, the committee recommendations fell short in a few areas. Here are my thoughts.

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 cow 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 benefit to the public (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 2 of the 56 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 are not elk CWMU's, 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 to the public each year, 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 this is supposed to be happening already I can

promise you its not taking place.

I do have some things I'm very much in support of in the new rule changes and wanted to put a few of them below.

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 and brings a family hunting element to CWMU's that wasn't always there previously.

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. I think its great that they're giving the CWMU advisory committee some help by offering better guidance and direction. That committee does 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

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 5:44 pm

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

Do you have any comments about these Been involved in the CW program for 25 years. It's the best program I feel
recommended changes? in the western US for the Public Hunter and the private landowner. I am
very much support this program. Thank you.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 5:47 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 I appreciate the opportunity of being able to hunt on private property and
recommended changes? support the CWMU stands for

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 6:06 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 6:12 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 look forward to the day that I can hopefully use my points on the CWMU
recommended changes? that is near my town. They have much better animals on it than the public
ground that borders it that I hunt , I think it's a great program.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 9:21 pm

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 9:24 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 9, 2024 10:13 pm

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

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

Neither agree nor disagree

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

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

I agree to most of the changes, I don't understand why guided hunters need a guest if the guide takes care of getting the harvested animal out, I also don't necessarily agree with the public being able to use atv/utv on the private land as they most often fail to respect where they are allowed to use them. This has proven to be the case on public land for a long time.
