Do you have any comments about the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?	I'm concerned with the weapon percentage on the parker. They want to try a higher split. giving 60 archery permits is not good. You bow hunt antelope different than any other species. Have that many permit holders fighting for water holes will be a
	nightmare. Going from 14 archery permits last year to 60 this year is definitely not a good thing for archery antelope hunting on that unit.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Cinnamon Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Strongly agree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?	I don't know where the biologists are doing their counts, but I think yall are up in the night if you think the deer numbers or buck numbers are that high. Deer on the ogden unit are far and few between. On wasatch East, I'll be out for a week and hardly see a deer anymore. More sportsman would rather have higher
	see a deer anymore. More sportsman would rather have higher chance at success rather than an over crowded mountain with no deer.

Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?	The Morgan-South Rich herd was devastated by the heavy winter a couple years ago and a couple years before that, except for on private lands which this area is overwhelmingly. On the private lands it was still hit hard. You underestimated how bad and didn't lower tags sufficiently after the winter. This is reflected in your dismal harvest rates the following year. As I recall, not a single late season muzzleloader limited entry buck was harvested. And now you want to increase the tags for the general season and the late season limited entry muzzleloader season???? Aren't you the ones that changed the harvest objectives based on the study BYU did citing that animals reach basically their maximum antler growth by a certain age and so many hunts were adjusted to reflect this? Do the math, follow your own recommendations. The herd was destroyed a couple years ago and so there hasn't been sufficient time for the mature bucks to come back. I have hunted this unit for nearly 30 years, it is not close to being back. You are increasing the tags too soon
	close to being back. You are increasing the tags too soon.

Do you have any comments about the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)	I've now been following the wildlife board and rac meetings for the past 8-10 years. The one thing that doesn't make sense to is the big increases and then big decreases in tag numbers the following year. Incremental increases makes more sense. If something happens to the herd like a disease or large winter kill then I understand the tag cuts. In this instance I am referring to the big increase in cow bison tags. I can almost guarantee in 1-2 years were going to see a dramatic tag cut on bison tags in the Henry Mtns now. When the Wasatch Elk Limited Entry hunt had giant increases in tag numbers the quality of the hunt went way down. Now its a glorified over the counter tag. Not something I want to use bonus points on.
Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?	The last five (5+) years we have been worried about the deer population on the Cache. Extreme measures have now been taken by restricted weapon hunts. In my opinion you should see what harvest success does with the primitive weapons before you increase tags by 20%. Increasing tags defeats the purpose of the restricted weapons. You dont know if harvest success will decrease by 20% or less. There are other factors now, the risk of does being wounded or killed goes up a lot. If the state is truly trying to help that deer population I think you should do no increase or 10% or less increase. Help the deer not the budget.
Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?	Somewhat disagree
Do you have any comments about the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	I dont see what the risk is with the spinal column. If hunters are bringing a kill back home. They are taking it to a butcher.
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	Strongly agree

Form Name:

April 2025 RAC Proposals Feedback

Do you have any comments about the bull elk permit recommendations?	I've now been following the wildlife board and rac meetings for the past 8-10 years. The one thing that doesn't make sense to is the big increases and then big decreases in tag numbers the following year(s). Incremental increases makes more sense in my mind. If something happens to the herd like a disease or large winter kill then I understand the tag cuts. Fishlake will become the new Wasatch a glorified over the counter tag with these giant tag increases. Fishlake is a special place there aren't many places outside of a national park where you can see elk from the road. When the Wasatch Elk Limited Entry hunt had giant increases in tag numbers the quality of the hunt went way down. Now its a glorified over the counter tag. Not something I want to use bonus points on. I am worried Fishlake will become the new Wasatch for limited entry elk with these large tag increases. I feel there is a balance between seeing elk while your hunting and overcrowding a unit. The dramatic tag increases I feel doesnt help that balance.

Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Do you have any comments about the antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)	I feel all antlerless moose tags should be moved to archery tags. I like the move making some of the antlerless moose tags archery only tags. I feel you could probably give atleast 1 archery antlerless moose tag per moose unit. Maybe an ethics course for hunters to target antlerless moose without calves.
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?	Somewhat disagree
Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?	Expo tags should stay at five dollars. Everything doesn't need to increase in price.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?	Strongly disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?	Strongly agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Do you have any comments about	Cache unit open sights will wound more deer that are lost and die
the buck deer permit	anyway. People will take shots far outside their capabilities
recommendations?	

#### Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?

#### Strongly disagree

the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?

Do you have any comments about This is the closest video I could find that would be close to my topic. I was sent a notice out a month ago or so that I guess would be considered Weapons restrictions for Improved hunter opportunity/satisfaction. I hunt the cache area. I don't know who is making these decisions but I haven't seen anything in my 50 plus years of hunting that is as dumb as this. You are making people have to go out and spend money on new equipment just to hunt if they want to. I am so sick of the way this board makes decisions. If you want to bring the herd count up do it like you have been, limit the amount of permits you give out. Don't make people by equipment they don't have. You guys are ruining the hunting experience for Utah hunters. Also there was no mention as to how many years these restrictions will go.

Do you have any comments about	I fully understand that buck harvest doesn't drive populations, but
the buck deer permit	some of the permit allocations don't make practical sense despite
recommendations?	the formulas.

Is the DWR just selling permits knowing that people will buy them and never see or shoot anything?

Morgan's 2024 population estimate is 2,450 deer with a 27.7 buck to doe ratio meaning that by the DWR's own estimates there are only 532 bucks in the unit (all ages, not just mature deer). Yet the DWR is issuing 1,600 general permits to hunt 532 total bucks????? This doesn't even consider the CWMU or late muzzle tags that are being issued in the unit!

This situation is also happening on other units. Chalk Creek - 7,150 population, 32.4 buck to doe = 1,750 total bucks (yearlings and all), but issuing 2,200 permits East Canyon - 2,700 population, 31.1 buck to doe = 641 total bucks (yearlings and all), but issuing 1,900 permits Kamas - 2,350 population, 14.5 buck to doe = 298 total bucks (yearlings and all), but issuing 1,250 permits

If the DWR is wondering why there is so much dissatisfaction and hatred for them, this is a big reason. What is being sold is illusory. The DWR posts some numbers that look favorable on the surface, but hides the reality that there really isn't a buck out there for people to hunt. In some areas there is only one two point for every five or six hunters to try and find. It is a good thing that a lot of the general hunting population is responsible enough to eat their tags each year rather than decimate the buck populations as the DWR is inviting them to do with the crazy tag numbers.

The DWR may think their formulas and decisions are driving the buck to doe ratios in these units, but I very much doubt that. I suspect that the buck to doe results in these units wouldn't be much different in an unlimited over the counter allocation. What can be seen is responsible hunters not shooting yearlings and choosing to protect the herd even when they are issued a tag. The DWR's models don't take hunter preferences into account (especially not private land hunter preferences). In units where the DWR cannot seem to get buck to doe ratios to 15-17 no matter how may tags they issue should be an indication that the models are incomplete or have a fundamental flaw. In those units the hunters are speaking by their actions and trying to tell the DWR that they don't want a unit with hunting conditions that equate with a 15-17 buck to doe ratio. Most of those hunters are self-regulating the ratios higher despite the DWR's efforts to flood the field with hunters.

My request is to be more responsible in tag numbers and issue far fewer and take into account the ratio of tags vs. bucks on the landscape in your models. There shouldn't be more tags issued than there are bucks to hunt, and there definitely shouldn't be 2 to 5 times the amount of tags issued as there are bucks.

At some point the DWR should also consider adding a different buck to doe ratio classification for those mostly private land units. The Chalk Creek unit for instance is more than 50% CWMU and only issues about 200 buck tags for that acreage and yet is going to issue 2,200 general tags for the other 50% of the unit this year. This makes no sense and causes tremendous conflict in management as well as makes it impossible for a biologist to manage for or hit any target. How can the DWR manage directly neighboring properties so differently to such extremes with a straight face? How can the DWR expect this to not create conflicts? This is not good science or policy. I would expect a department that purports to make decisions based on biology, education, and science to realize that this type of conflicting management in neighboring and intertwined properties is clearly not biologically sound.

This conflict in having to manage adjacent properties so differently is because the biologists do not have the tools to properly manage the mostly private land areas in the deer management plan. This needs to change. The DWR's models may work great for the public land units, but they don't work correctly on private land units.

If the DWR is bent on managing everything based on a buck to doe formula, then there needs to be a 30-35 ratio (or anything greater than 18-20 as a first step) in the deer management plan for units with high concentrations of CWMUs or high concentrations of private lands. That is the only way to manage these units fairly and complementary of the properties within them, and in a way the citizens in these units desire them to be managed.

I write all of this despite knowing that it will fall on deaf ears because it requires a different way of thinking, it would actually take into account citizen preferences, and doesn't fit the old buck to doe models and theories.

### Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?	The reasoning for limiting the Cache Limited Entry Muzzleloader deer tags doesn't make sense when taking in the context of all tags on the unit. The reasoning for keeping the number of muzzleloader tags low was to let the animals have a chance to recover from the previous winters. It doesn't make sense when you look at adding several hundred tags to the general hunt only 10 days earlier. In order to keep the reasoning consistent and fair, I recommend either cutting the number of general tags (goes against why they wanted restricted weapons) or increasing the number of limited entry muzzleloader tags to levels consistent with other general units and give more opportunity for limited entry hunts.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any comments about the buck deer permit recommendations?	I would like to voice my opinion that I would like more bucks per 100 deer. NOT LESS. I believe we should NOT do the restricted rifle units and rather implement a point restriction. We also should NOT increase tag numbers for deer state wide. Keep them the same. Also DO NOT implement the rule where you are able to change tag numbers up to 20% without public feedback.
Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any comments about the antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)	Don't decrease Cache tags. Get rid of all landowner tags.
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?	Strongly disagree
Do you have any comments about the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?	Get rid of all landowner tags and instead create a youth private lands hunt where these private land owners can allow youth to shoot these animals. Private land owners should NOT be allowed to take the public wildlife.
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?	Strongly agree

#### Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?

Do you have any comments about the antlerless permit recommendations? (Mention the species, if applicable.)	Lived in Utah for 30 years. 7 months ago moved out of state. Avid sportsmen, sick of UDWR mis managing there game, with a large amount of funding. Catering to private landowners. And as soon as something gets good we "Give more opportunity." But end up over killing and over hunting everything.
	Doe pronghorn permits, doubling??? I thought we learned with what we did to the cache, North Rich unit 10 years ago. Almost completely wiped out the unit, causing closure of the unit.
	Throw a bad winter on top of it and you will be shutting down more hunts.
	Couple that with CWMU's in the box elder unit incorporating Huntable and Accessible public lands into CWMU's???
	Corner crossing, public lands accessible off of county roads, or fly in options are now shut down to benefit. Landowners, wealthy, and just 10% of public sportsmen. Do not raise doe tags
	Short term gain long term loss.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-5?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck deer permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the once-in-a-lifetime species permit recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the bull elk permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the buck pronghorn permit recommendations?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the antlerless permit recommendations?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU antlerless permit recommendations?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-43?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-55?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Little Montes Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Willow Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Upper San Rafael WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Neither agree nor disagree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Cinnamon Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Swan Creek WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Timpanogos WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Strongly agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed Spencer Fork WMA Habitat Management Plan?	Somewhat agree
Which best describes your position regarding the proposed South Sanpete Valley WMAs Habitat Management Plan?	Somewhat agree

Which best describes yourStrongly agreeposition regarding theonce-in-a-lifetime species permitrecommendations?

Do you have any comments about<br/>the once-in-a-lifetime species<br/>permit recommendations?<br/>(Mention the species, if<br/>applicable.)Thanks for everything you do in managing wildlife in our state. I<br/>would like to see an archery only moose hunt.