

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

Strongly disagree

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

I do not think CWMU's should be allowed to just wrap public land into their private property thus making it trespassing for access to public land, in essence all your doing is giving them more land free of charge, yes it's opened 2 million acres to public hunters but the rules they put on you for access is completely ridiculous, you can't scout the property at all before your dates, the dates given are only offered after their paying clients have hunted the land and now you want to just give them land surrounding their land so we can't access that as well. NO NO NO NO NO

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

Strongly disagree

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

I strongly disagree with one change. It is completely absurd that if a hunt is canceled, that the hunters hours are nonrefundable or non-transferable!

It is not the hunters fault the hunt was canceled, So why should he/she be punished on top of not being able to hunt? If the hunter put in the 32 hours and drew the tag, they should absolutely be refundable or transferable! If they surrender the tag, we'll, they are out of luck! If it was out of the hunters control, 100% refund of hours is in order!

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

Somewhat agree



**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

There are many people who enjoy these so called "public lands" who have no interest in hunting or fishing and should not be forced to purchase a license to access public land. Also, both Representatives who sponsored this bill live outside of Weber, Salt Lake, and Davis counties. So how is it that people who won't be affected by the bill can create, sponsor it, and ultimately push it through? Shouldn't the people they represent also be affected by this non-sense bill? If the DWR is going to enforce this, it should be statewide and not punish those three counties just because their populations are higher. Make every Utahn pay to access public lands, or no Utahn to pay. We certainly didn't need another tax or fee imposed on us and to target lands that are supposed to be open to the public is beyond ridiculous.

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Somewhat disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

I am strongly supportive of requiring a license to access to WMAs. However, WMAs are multi-use areas, and are a valuable resource to bird watchers, kayakers, bikers, and other recreational users. Requiring licenses for individuals seeking access to WMAs is a great way to generate funds for conservation of these areas. Requiring hunting/fishing/combo licenses could create confusion amongst non-sporting users, and could falsely inflate hunting/fishing license sales, making it difficult to track who and how people are using these areas. I would be more supportive of a WMA specific license, which has the added benefits of delineating sporting vs non-sporting use, generates additional funds for the conservation of these areas, and eliminates confusion as to who and how these areas can be used.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

This is ridiculous, we should not need to hold a valid hunting or fishing license to access this PUBLIC land! What a bunch of greedy people, always needing more MONEY!! The purpose of wildlife land is to provide shelter to animals during the winter, not keep people from access/hiking on it in the summer. You should not need to have a HUNTING or FISHING license to go and HIKE! This is extremely FRUSTRATING and I am furious that we have elected such STUPID PEOPLE to represent us! You guys are OUT OF [REDACTED] CONTROL!! My Dad no longer hunts but he did for his entire life, and now you are going to require him to have a VALID hunting license to out on a hike with the rest of the FAMILY, WOW JUST WOW! The representatives that put this bill into AFFECT don't even live in the areas that this is affected. WHAT A JOKE! Get your [REDACTED] TOGETHER!!!

---

Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU recommendations?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about the CWMU recommendations?

The CWMU program needs to be 100% private land hunts. Do not allow tags that already can be sold at any fee to be used on constantly shrinking public lands. Passing this will incentivize further landlock of public lands.

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

Public lands are supposed to be open and accessible to the public. This will cut off access to those who are unable to spend the money to purchase a fishing or hunting license. It takes away our right and ability to access these lands for hiking with our friends and families, especially those with small children or those who cannot afford the license. It comes across as just one more way to milk the public dry of our funds. Better idea if you want to raise money, bring in the lottery and use those funds for managing the areas, repairing roads, public education, etc like the states around us do. But even if you do not want to bring something like that to the state, please stop taking away our access to public lands. There are other avenues to go down to raise funds. This could be detrimental and harmful to the poor families of our state. (And as a side note, one of these areas is land that my grandpa literally grew up on and we have gone there for years to learn about my grandfathers life, he can no longer hike those simple routes with us. Taking away our access to Middle Fork takes away that connection to our past).

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?** Never will pay to enter and observe wildlife!! If I was hunting or fishing, different story.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the conservation and sportsman permits rule?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?** Somewhat agree

---

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

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?** Somewhat agree

---

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?** I agree, but there should be a wildlife viewing license at a reduced rate, a sticker for the car, orr be able to use the national park pass to enter. It's a little steep to pay \$40 to see birds.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

Visiting Causey Reservoir for paddle boarding (90% of use) should under be circumstances require a hunting/fishing license. I have never heard of such a requirement. This is a gem for residents on the Wasatch Front. A free, dog-friendly, non-watershed lake that really makes the summer 100% better in this dry, hot region. The effort to make the outdoors more expensive and therefore more exclusive are fundamentally un-American. Causey Reservoir doesn't belong with the other places on this list. It's primarily for paddle boarding. Thank you.

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

I understand the need for more funding, but isn't there a better way? We love to go, especially to Farmington Bay, for bird and eagle watching. I would much prefer to pay a fee each time I entered rather than have to buy a fishing license, which I will never use. This seems like you're excluding those that just want to enter and enjoy the property in favor of those there to hunt and kill wildlife!

---

Form Name: May 2025 RAC Proposals Feedback  
Submission Time: May 4, 2025 12:31 pm

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

Somewhat disagree

---

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

Hi,  
  
For Ingham Peak, what/where are the trade lands being opened up for public access? I could not discern them in your map in the presentation. Please respond to dmcarolan@gmail.com.

The other three CWMU seem like good decisions, no-brainers.  
Thank you.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Neither agree nor disagree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

While I am all in favor of people who hunt or fish in wildlife/waterfowl management areas needing to be licensed, and also realizing that the license fees help cover maintenance costs for these areas, I am deeply disappointed that this prohibits access for hikers and birdwatchers who have had access to these areas in the past. I have hiked all of the paths around Farmington Bay. What I carry in, I carry out (lunch and water). The only litter I have seen has been spent shotgun shells, despite the signs asking hunters to pick up their shell casings. Please do not exclude people like myself who just wish to enjoy the open beauty of the wildlife areas! I would be willing to pay a small gate or entry fee to have these areas remain accessible to others besides hunters and fishermen. Thank you.

Susan Murphy, Ogden

---





**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

This is absolutely insane. You can not force people to have a hunting or fishing license to enjoy hiking, viewing and picnicking in the mountains. Please explain how this is not over stepping by the government? I shouldn't need a hunting license unless I plan to hunt, I can't even believe anyone thought this was a good idea. This feels less like conservation and more like revenue generating bureaucracy that treats citizens like we have to buy back our freedoms.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

I am in support for locations where recreational access is light and preservation protects wildlife, but not all locations fit that description. Some of the locations, such as Causey Reservoir, are highly used by individuals not seeking to hunt or fish.

---

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?

Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any comments about the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?**

There are numerous significant issues with the language in SB-149 when it was passed. Many of them have improved, but many of them continue in this final draft form as presented to the RAC boards.

The reason for this issue is that Outfitters are regulated by Federal, State, SITLA, and Private Land Management Agencies. Each of these agencies has its own Laws, Rules, and Regulations. The problem is that the Feds don't talk to the State, don't talk to SITLA, don't talk to private landowners. So, the initial draft of SB-149 was unbelievably incorrect in its language, and its design when considering the "Business of an Outfitter and how Hunting Guides fall under that Outfitter and his business. The original bill, even after having been signed, gave Hunting Guides the independent privilege to provide Guide Services on their own. This has NEVER been in accordance with the Law, and a "Hunting Guide" cannot even obtain the necessary "Special Use Permits" to conduct Guide Services on Federal Public Lands. There still exists language in this R657-72 that allows or at least implies that a Hunting Guide can conduct Guide Services independently. Additionally, there is absolutely no need, purpose, or reason for creating the additional Trade of "Spotter". An Outfitter is legally authorized to utilize "unlicensed personnel as long as they do not represent themselves as a "Hunting Guide". -This used to be, and still should be, a part of the process of becoming a Hunting Guide, where an applicant for Hunting Guide Licensure had to complete a 1-year apprenticeship before he/she was eligible to apply for their Hunting Guide License. Creating the role of "Spotter" does absolutely nothing but further complicate the O/G industry. As an Outfitter, I use my "hunting guides" as my 'spotters' and so does every other Outfitter in the State.

R657-72-3-(2): An application to operate as an outfitter must contain:

(d) "all necessary federal permits to operate on federal land" <<== (This is too vague). -Edit to state, "must contain at least (1) current, active special use permit issued to the Outfitter by any Land Management Agency"

(e) "attestation that workers' compensation insurance and commercial liability insurance to cover employees and clients has been obtained" <<== (There is no State Law that requires an employer to provide workers' compensation for "Contracted 1099, seasonal employees).

(3)(a) "Guides and spotters must obtain a certificate of registration for each outfitter they intend to work for."

\*\*\*I Very Strongly Assert and recommend that a Hunting Guide or Spotter is only allowed to obtain their C.O.R. under (1) single Outfitter. The ability to operate under multiple Outfitters, which each have their own Special Use Permits from various Land Management Agencies, creates an issue that is difficult to monitor and/or identify. If a hunting guide is registered under Outfitter #1

and that Outfitter has special use permits for, say, the Manti and the Nebo, then that Hunting Guide is given authorization by Outfitter #1 to conduct Guide Services on both of those Special Use Permits. Say Outfitter #2 only has a Special Use Permit for the Fishlake, but he hears from a Client that they drew a permit for the "Manti". All that Outfitter#2 has to do is to reach out to a Hunting Guide that operates under Outfitter#1 and offer, \$\$\$\$ incentives to guide a Client on the "Manti" and if he is stopped he can just use the Special use Permit Authorization that he has from Outfitter #1 to operate on the "Manti". IT IS CRITICAL THAT A HUNTING GUIDE IS ONLY ALLOWED TO OPERATE UNDER (1) SINGLE OUTFITTER. I CANNOT EMPHASIZE ENOUGH THE LOOPHOLE THAT THIS CREATES. IT UNDERMINES, FOR INSTANCE, THE FACT THAT THE "MANTI" HAS A "CAPPED" NUMBER OF OUTFITTERS THAT CAN OPERATE ON IT. And this is only the beginning of the problem. Allowing a Hunting Guide to do this is how Outfitters currently jump through "loopholes" and operate on any hunting unit in the state for any species during any season. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT THIS LANGUAGE BE CHANGED.

R657-72-4 (3) An application for renewal must contain:

(b) an accounting of:

(iii) If a guide, a list of the spotters is retained.

\*\*\* Identified as a major mistake. It is not the "business" responsibility of any Hunting Guide to report this to any land management agency in his/her "Annual Actual Use Report." If this is allowed, then every "Hunting Guide" will have to have their own licensed business and associated -1099 contract "Spotters". Again, don't create the Trade: "Spotter"

R657-72-5 (a) "no more than two registered outfitters, guides, and/or spotters may be assigned to a client at any given time while hunting protected wildlife. ==>> IT HAS NEVER BEEN LEGAL FOR A HUNTING CLIENT TO HIRE MORE THAN (1) ONE OUTFITTER TO PROVIDE GUIDE SERVICES FOR ANY SPECIES ON ANY HUNT IN UTAH. THIS ONLY SETS THE STAGE FOR "CANNED HUNTS".

ALSO, LANGUAGE NEEDS TO BE ADDED:

C: An Outfitter or Hunting Guide may recruit and inject additional support staff to include additional "Hunting Guides" or other unlicensed individuals in the extraction and recovery of a game animal. This is authorized for this purpose only in recognition of the health risk that is imposed on only (2) personnel to perform this task, and additionally to avoid the potential loss and waste of animal products due to increased exposure time to outdoor elements, which increase decomposition time and quantity.

R657-72-5 (2) (a)

\*\*\*The Client's Hunt Contract as finalized by the Outfitter and signed by both parties (may be digital downloads on a mobile device).

\*\*\*The "copies" (may be digital downloads on a mobile

device) of the "Special use Permits" which authorize O/G operations in any given land area.

R657-72-6 (1)

(a) intentionally obstruct, hinder, interfere, or attempt to obstruct, hinder or interfere in lawful hunting, fishing, or trapping by a person who is not a client or an employee of the outfitter, guide, or spotter.

\*\*\*Such current operations can be identified as an active Hunting Guide in a "Spotting Position" that is an "overlook spotter" for any current, active, on-the- ground pursuit. Or identification of a "ground Hunting Guide" that is in the active pursuit of a game animal and declares that as such if approached by any other Outfitter or Hunting Guide to include any "D.I.Y. Hunters and their active pursuit operation"

#### "ADDENDUM A" POSSIBLE "DEFINITIONS"

##### INCLUSIONS/MODIFICATIONS FOR CLARIFICATION

"Outfitter" includes any person who, while engaging in the acts enumerated herein:

- (1) advertises or otherwise holds himself out to the public for hire.
- (2) provides facilities and services for consideration; and
- (3) maintains, leases, or otherwise uses equipment or accommodations for compensation for the conduct of outdoor recreational activities that are known to involve inherent risk limited to the following: hunting big game fur-bearer animals or birds

(4) has been issued and has a minimum of (1) one "Special Use Permit" from any Federal or Utah State Land Management Agency (Federal: USFS, BLM, State: Utah State Parks, SITLA.

Any firm, partnership, corporation or other organization or combination thereof operating

as an outfitter shall designate one (1) or more individuals as agents who shall, together

with the licensed outfitter, be held responsible for the conduct of the licensed outfitter's operations and who shall meet all of the qualifications of a licensed outfitter.

"Hunting Guide" is any natural person who is employed by a licensed outfitter to furnish

personal services for the conduct of outdoor recreational activities directly related to the

conduct of activities for which the employing outfitter is licensed.

Any such person not

employed by a licensed outfitter who offers or provides facilities or services as specified in

subsection (b) of this section shall be deemed in violation of the provisions of this chapter,

except:

(1) any employee of the state of Utah or the United States when acting in his official capacity, or

(2) any natural person who is employed by a licensed outfitter solely for the

following activities: "packer" or one who is employed by or contracted by an

Outfitter specifically for the purpose of "packing, through the use of equine

animals or otherwise, physical items that are consistent with and/or typically

found in a wilderness camp environment and/or the carcass; or meat and/or antler products

of a harvested game animal, caring for, grooming, or saddling of livestock, cooking, woodcutting, and transporting people, equipment, and personal property on public

roads shall be exempt from the provisions of this chapter.

"Special use Permit": (Federal USFS or BLM): A written permit, term permit, lease, or easement that authorizes use or occupancy of National Forest System lands and specifies the terms and conditions under which the use or occupancy may occur. "Special Use Permit" (Utah State Parks): A written permit, issued through an application process for conducting commercial operations, guided tours, or offering services within a Utah State Park.

"Special Use Permit" (SITLA): In Utah, a special use permit is an authorization issued by the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) for certain non-exclusive, short-term, and generally low-impact uses of trust lands. These permits are necessary for commercial activities on trust lands, such as commercial guiding, filming, and temporary workspaces, to ensure that the land is used in a manner that benefits the beneficiaries and protects the land for future use

<b>Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?</b>	Strongly agree
---	----------------

---

<b>Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?</b>	<p>As a person who uses leekay dog training area year round I don't agree with this on that site we have people who use this ground from out of state and i feel like it's going to affect our hunt test numbers</p> <p>Thanks for your time</p>
---	--

---



**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?**

Somewhat agree

**Do you have any comments about the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?**

I think it's nice to see you guys are doing a solid to the DOPL in helping them with their issues and upkeep of outfitters. Although I do not agree with the super high fees and the renewal every year. It looks bad on the states part seeing that they are all about the money from an outside perspective. This will hurt a lot of newer outfitters and guides wanting to have a passion and business within the industry. Obviously the animals come first although the state needs to give the outfitters a little bit of leeway considering you guys are easing the prices of non resident tags drastically.

I hope to see a good common ground between the guides, outfitters, and the state. It's not just about the money it's about the passion and the families supported by the business along with the memories and services provided to individuals who seek it.

---

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

Strongly disagree

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

Once somebody has drawn a dedicated tag, they should be allowed to hunt the unit as it was drawn regardless of changes made by DWR. It's extremely unfair to change the rules in the middle of the game. For what it's worth, this is coming from somebody who has never even applied for a dedicated tag and never has plans to.

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the proposed outfitters, guides and spotters rule?**

These are great changes. Outfitters and guides need to be wrangled in a lot and this is a good start. Next step, remove the exemption from registration for those who operate solely on private property. They should be held to the same standard.

**Which best describes your position regarding the new license requirements to enter WMAs?**

Strongly agree

**Do you have any comments about the new license requirements?**

This is great! All who utilize these areas should be financially supporting them. All too often we see certain groups funding things for the public at large who many of which contribute nothing.