

Central Region Advisory Council  
Springville Jr. High  
165 S. 700 E. Springville  
March 24, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

## **Motion Summary**

### **Approval of the Agenda**

MOTION: To approve the agenda as written  
Passed unanimously

### **Approval of the Minutes**

MOTION: To approve the December 16, 2008 minutes as transcribed  
Passed unanimously

### **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009**

MOTION: To reduce the proposed central region deer permit numbers by 1,000 (remain the same as last year)  
Failed 2 to 6

MOTION: To approve the recommended general deer permit numbers statewide  
Passed 6 to 2

MOTION: To approve elk permit numbers as presented  
Passed unanimously

MOTION: To accept option one for bison recommendations  
Passed 7 to 1

MOTION: To accept the remainder of bucks bulls and OIAL permit recommendations as presented  
Passed unanimously

### **10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list**

MOTION: To accept the 10-year transplant list as well as the Antelope Island transplant  
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council  
Springville Jr. High  
165 S. 700 E. Springville  
March 24, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Members Present**

Micki Bailey, BLM  
John Bair, Sportsmen  
George Holmes, Agriculture  
Doug Jones, Forest Service  
Ed Kent, Chair  
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Vice Chair  
Jay Price, Elected  
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive  
Allan Stevens, At Large

**Members Absent**

Calvin Crandall, Agriculture  
Byron Gunderson, At Large  
Richard Hansen, At Large  
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, excused

**Others Present**

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board member

---

1) **Approval of the Agenda (Action)**

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Doug Jones to accept the agenda as written**

**Seconded by Duane Smith**

**Motion passed unanimously**

2) **Approval of the December 16, 2008 summary (Action)**

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Fred Oswald to accept the summary notes as transcribed**

**Seconded by Jay Price**

**Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

4) **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (Action)**

- **Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

John Bair – What is the average age on the Henry Mountains for the last three years?

Anis Aoude – 55 percent, 48 percent and 38 percent. The three year average was 47 percent.

Allan Stevens – You said there was a number of units that didn't meet the buck to doe ratio objective. Are any of those in the central region?

Anis Aoude – Yes. The Nebo and the Stansburys and those will be a five day hunt this coming season. They will likely come out of that because the last couple of years.

Allan Stevens – Is that still planned for the second weekend?

Anis Aouse – Yes and we will monitor that to see how well it works. It may or may not reduce harvest. If we find that is not working we may have to amend the plan and do something differently.

John Bair – As far as deer population objective where is the central region overall?

Anis Aoude – We really don't have our population records for this year yet.

John Bair – What were they last year?

Anis Aoude – I don't know. We don't deal with populations when we deal with bucks and bulls because it is really based on buck to doe ratios not population numbers. Buck to doe ratios track populations really well. If you are overharvesting the bucks on a low population then your buck to doe ratio would drop.

John Bair – Wasn't that quite a discussion in the southeastern region?

Anis Aoude – Yes but they were discussion amongst themselves. If they would have let me have a word in edge wise I would have told them that buck to doe ratios track populations really well.

Craig Clyde – A little clarification on that. We are putting together our population models and going through those. I don't have the percent for that but because of the winter we had last winter our deer numbers are down and you will see that from the buck harvest as well like Anis said.

Allan Stevens – On the elk age data, with the requirement to send in teeth now are pretty much all of the teeth being analyzed?

Anis Aoude – It is still not mandatory to send in the teeth but we do get a very high return. 85 plus percent are turned in which in a biological system is a dream number.

Allan Stevens - But do you sample all the teeth that come in?

Anis Aoude – Everything that comes in gets sent out.

Allan Stevens – There are some rumors on internet discussion boards that the division is hand picking the samples they send to get aged.

Anis Aoude – Everyone who sends in a tooth can go in and check the age. We do look at the information on the harvest surveys for those who don't send teeth in. The harvest survey includes how many points and the size of animals taken so we look at all that data. It is not just tooth data.

Allan Stevens – I just wanted to clear that up.

Anis Aoude – It is a pretty high number and I am confident that it is a representation of what is happening out there.

Doug Jones – You said we are 1,000 permits below the cap for the northern region. It seems the numbers are the same as they were in 2008.

Anis Aoude – We recommended that last year anticipating high winter kill. We set our numbers this time of year and we had already had the winter and we didn't know how many we had lost.

John Bair – If you estimate that our population numbers are down why would we stay at cap for the number of buck permits. Wouldn't it be smart to hold those back a little bit?

Anis Aoude – No because even though populations are down buck to doe ratios are where they need to be and that is what we manage our permit numbers on. If we see a decline in buck to doe ratios that would mean we are over harvesting the bucks. All we are worried about here is how many bucks we harvest and really how many you have in

the population when you are harvesting bucks. You actually want to harvest more bucks if you want to grow the population. You only need enough bucks to breed the does. To maintain surplus bucks doesn't make sense if you are trying to grow a population.

John Bair – If you are below objective.

Anis Aoude – We are not below buck to doe ratios.

John Bair – If we are below deer population objective that means there is room for more deer.

Anis Aoude – Right, so you should kill more bucks so more does can have more room out there.

John Bair – But if we are not at our cap then there is room for more bucks.

Anis Aoude – But why are we not at our cap? Something is limiting the population.

John Bair – You think it is the bucks?

Anis Aoude – It is habitat and if there a buck out there then there is one less doe.

John Bair – I am going to disagree with you on the fact that we have enough bucks to hold our population.

Anis Aoude – What do you think is limiting then?

John Bair – Like you said habitat but we don't have enough deer to be limited by habitat.

Anis Aoude – It is limiting. If they die in a bad winter habitat is limiting.

John Bair – But we still are okay with putting that many more hunters out there to hunt a deer herd that is not at objective.

Anis Aoude – The population is not at objective but there are enough bucks out there to support the level of harvest.

John Bair – I don't think there are a lot of people that are happy with our deer hunt right now. You show me your survey that says half are happy that means half are not.

We will disagree on that one.

#### **Questions from the Public**

Ken Strong – So if there were only 1,000 deer left in the central region and 50 percent of them are bucks then it's all right to go kill those bucks so the deer herd could grow?

Anis Aoude – As long as you maintain 15 bucks per 100 does, yes.

Ken Strong – It doesn't make sense.

Anis Aoude – But it does.

#### **Comments from the Public**

David Bailey – Farm Bureau – comment card read

We support the committee's option which is option two. The agreement with UDWR and the committee was to take the post season numbers to 275. We believe the division needs to stick to their agreement and work with the committee if they feel like the permit numbers needed changing. Even option two puts fewer hunters on the mountain than last year. UDWR undermines the committees work when they neglect to call the committee together when a change is proposed or needs to be looked at and discussed. Both the south and the southeast RACs supported option two. Taking the post harvest bison to 275 this year will give the habitat a good chance at recovering to where it needs to be. It will also give the land managers the time to monitor the resource and give adequate feedback. Please support the Henry Mountain bison committee and Farm Bureau with supporting option two. Farm Bureau supports the division's recommendations on the rest of the bucks and bulls proclamation.

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – On the bison recommendations we support option one. It gets us to the number we are talking about. The habitat is in excellent shape. There are fewer livestock in the area than in years past because of the grazing allotments. That mountain can support the bison that are there now. The number was agreed upon with the bison committee. Option one will get to that number and at the same time keeps a steadier number of tags each year which keeps the hunters satisfied. Option one is better for the division and also for the hunting public.

On the bucks and bulls and the central region deer cap I would ask personally that we cut more tags from the central region. We did lose a lot of deer two years ago. I asked for 2,000 last year and the board gave us 1,000 which we have had for a few years and our numbers have stayed steady and our deer herd still hasn't grown. I don't see a problem with staying 1,000 permits below cap like we have had the last couple years. The division doesn't need the revenue and people are not asking for the permits back. In my position I hear a lot of people saying why don't we take more tags out. There are a lot of dissatisfied hunters in this region. I know some of you hear the same thing. I would ask that the RAC vote to leave 1,000 tags out of the central region.

Ed Kent – So your proposing that we reduce the proposed number of tags in the central region by 1,000.

Dave Woodhouse – Yes, leave it at the same number as last year.

### **RAC Discussion**

John Bair – Out of anything that we hear about as sportsmen the quality of the deer hunt is number one. We do manage on a buck to doe ration but still to blame the winter kill on too many bucks, that dog just don't hunt. If there is room for more deer there is room for more bucks. We are not at our population objective. To add permits we are selling tickets to a movie that ain't showing. If our deer population isn't where it should be then our hunter population shouldn't be increased. I would think 1,000 tags is not that big of a decrease to keep a little pressure off the deer.

### **VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to reduce the proposed central region deer permit numbers by 1,000 (remain the same as last year)  
Seconded by Duane Smith**

Allan Stevens – I think we need to stay within the parameters of our plan. Why have a plan if we are going to go outside the plan. It was only last year that we passed the new deer plan for the state. There was a big committee and lots of people had input. In my mind by saying we should decrease the number of permits by 1,000 we are not really managing the herd from a biological perspective. We have set parameters in the plan. The time to set biological parameters is in the plan. We need to follow what the plan says we need to do. Maybe buck to doe ratio is not the way we want to manage but that is what is in the plan and I think we need to follow that.

Duane Smith – I have a tendency to agree with John on this. It is fine to say we are going to stay with the plan but if the plan is perhaps flawed then that is not fine. I understand the concept of carrying capacity. If we are at carrying capacity then what Anis said is true. We are better off having does eat what forage is there. The fallacy seems to me is that we don't know what our population number is or our carrying capacity. We don't know if we are at or near carrying capacity. If we are not at carrying capacity then we

can have more deer if range isn't limiting. I have not heard that we are at carrying capacity.

George Holmes - I though I heard we are above carrying capacity because we had a lot of winter kill.

Anis Aoude – The tricky thing about carrying capacity is it does vary from year to year. When you do get a hard winter all the deer are concentrated on what is left. There may be room for growth but populations will grow faster if you have fewer bucks so the does can take advantage of whatever forage is out there.

George Holmes – So during the hard winter you don't have extra bucks eating the food that is available.

Anis Aoude – Exactly.

George Holmes - I would recommend we follow the plan.

John Bair – Did we have a hard winter? Last year we came off a hard winter and we stayed with 1,000 fewer permits. If we just came of a winter that is not classified as a hard winter and we want to save a few bucks now would be the time to do it.

Ed Kent – Call for vote.

**In Favor: John Bair, Duane Smith**

**Opposed: Micki Bailey, Allan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes, Fred Oswald, Doug Jones,**

**Motion failed 2 to 6**

**Motion was made by Jay Price to approve the recommended general deer permit numbers statewide**

**Seconded by George Holmes**

**In Favor: Micki Bailey, Allan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes, Fred Oswald, Doug Jones**

**Opposed: John Bair, Duane Smith**

**Motion passed 6 to 2**

**Motion was made by Doug Jones to approve elk permit numbers as presented**

**Seconded by Allan Stevens**

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

John Bair – Looking at the bison situation and both options get us to the same place but option one is more consistent with what we have been doing.

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept option one for bison recommendations**

**Seconded by Allan Stevens**

Jay Price – I find it interesting that the region where this is located voted for option two.

Allan Stevens – I was down on two or three bison hunts this year and if we go with option two I don't think we will get to objective. With that many more hunters you are going to have a lot of unsuccessful hunters and we are not going to affect the bison herd as much as we think we will by increasing those numbers. The quality of the hunt is important. These people have waited a lot of years to build up enough points to draw a

bison permit. You can increase numbers on paper but with that many people on the ground people won't harvest.

Doug Jones - I agree, if there is too much pressure the animals won't get harvested.

Fred Oswald – Anis, is there a reason why those options weren't taken to the committee?

Anis Aoude – The main reason was time. We get the data about a week before our recommendations have to go out to the public. The second reason is it was probably an oversight. The committee was formed to make the plan they weren't formed to make recommendations every year. We felt we had two ways to get to the objective.

George Holmes – Basically either option follows the plan?

Anis Aoude – Ultimately yes.

Ed Kent – Call for vote.

**In Favor: John Bair, Micki Bailey, Allan Stevens, Duane Smith, Jay Price, Fred Oswald, Doug Jones**

**Opposed: George Holmes**

**Motion passed 7 to 1**

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the remainder of bucks bulls and OIAL permit recommendations as presented**

**Seconded by George Holmes**

Doug Jones – With the disease issues with big horn sheep why were the permit numbers increased?

Anis Aoude – The disease issues were on the Wasatch and that unit is now closed. The increase in permits is on the Newfoundlands.

John Bair – On the rest of the sheep herds aren't we still managing those rams fairly conservatively?

Anis Aoude – Yes probably too conservative but that is what the public has wanted all along.

**In Favor: all**

**Motion passed unanimously**

5) **10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list (Action)**

- **Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

#### **Questions from the RAC**

Ed Kent – Where a lot of the population for the central region is here and Salt Lake and Tooele counties would you like us to make a motion to approve the Antelope Island transplant as well?

Dave Olsen – That would be entirely up to the RAC. I think it would be a good barometer if you wanted to do it however the action is in Davis County.

Fred Oswald – Are sharp tail and other grouse compatible? Do they live in the same habitat?

Dave Olsen – They overlap in their habitat spatially however they don't compete readily for any of their food or space with the exception of if you had sharp tail and sage grouse overlapping when their broods are young they do target insect life heavily.

Fred Oswald – Does the ten year plan suggest that you are going to be working with a lot of private landowners?

Dave Olsen – That would vary by county but yes.

Fred Oswald – If landowners agree what do they get out of it?

Dave Olsen – We want to put together a Canada conservation agreement with assurances for landowners and other folks who sign on that gives them some assurances. This agreement has to approve by the Fish and Wildlife Service. What that does is provide landowners assurances that if the species does get listed that they would not be required to do any more than what they already agreed to do in the agreement. If they do sign on and it does help the species then it helps preclude listing however if it does go sour and there is a listing landowners don't have to deal with it as heavily as they might have had to.

### **RAC Discussion**

Ed Kent - Do we want to include antelope island in our recommendation?

### **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Doug Jones to accept the 10-year transplant list as well as the Antelope Island transplant**

**Seconded by Fred Oswald**

**In Favor: All**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.**

**35 in attendance**

**Next board meeting April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 9:00 a.m. at Department of Agriculture building on Redwood Road, SLC**

**Next RAC meeting April 28<sup>th</sup>, 6:30 p.m. at the Central Region Conference Center 1115 N Main, Springville**



**Northern Regional Advisory Council**

**March 25, 2009**

**6:00 P.M.**

**Place:** Brigham City Community Center

**RAC Present**

Darwin Bingham  
Mark Marsh  
Robert Byrnes  
Lee Shirley  
Bret Selman  
Ryan Foutz  
James Gaskill  
Paul Cowley  
Ann Neville  
Brad Slater  
Bill Fenimore  
Shawn Groll

**DWR Present**

Jodie Anderson  
Brian Maxfield  
Clint Brunson  
Ron Hodson  
Darren Debloois  
Dave Olsen  
Randy Wood  
Kent Hersey  
Anis Aoude  
Justin Dolling  
Craig McLaughlin  
Kirt Enright  
Roger Stringham  
Kevin Labrum  
Scott Davis  
Scott McFarlane

**Wildlife Board**

Ernie Perkins

**RAC Absent**

Jon Leonard

**Meeting Begins: 6 p.m.**

**Number of Pages: 11**

**Introduction:** Brad Slater- Chair

**Agenda:**

Review of Agenda

Review of Dec 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009

5-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list & Sharp-tail grouse transplant proposal for Antelope Island.

Sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain

\*Regional Update was removed from the Agenda.

**Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

**Motion:** Cowley-Approval of agenda.

**Second:** Ann Neville

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

**Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Dec 17, 2008 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Accept the Meeting Minutes.

**Second:** Marsh

**Motion Carries:** For 9, 1 Abstention. 1 RAC member still is coming.

**Item 3. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009**

Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

See Handout

**Public Questions**

Byron Bateman- Will the Rocky Mountain statewide plan be done?

Aoude- We are currently working on it. We are hoping to have it ready by next fall.

Bateman- Have they elected the people to sit on that?

Aoude- No. We are not planning on having a committee for that one.

Bateman- We have expressed concern that we want to be a part of that.

Aoude- There is a plan that we are modifying. We will get input from all of the groups.

Jerry Woodland- Fewer deer and lower success rate in the northern unit, yet you give more licenses in the northern unit than any of the other units. Can you tell me why?

Aoude- The number of permits are based on the number of deer in the region. They were set in 1994.

Woodland- They were set in 1994?

Aoude- That is when the initial cap was put on.

Woodland- You also showed data that there were 17 bucks per 100 doe?

Aoude- That is an average.

Woodland- Where and when were those counts taken?

Aoude- They were all done post season.

Woodland- Can you tell me specifically?

Aoude- No. Every unit has between 500-1,000 deer classified on it.

Woodland- I live in the northern unit and I have yet to count more than 6 bucks per 100 doe. I guess my question is where were the counts taken?

Aoude- Everywhere in the northern region. Classify the deer where they find them.

Slater- So would it be representative that each unit has a number, and from that number of unit totals you make that observation?

Aoude- Right.

Woodland- When you do that survey, there must be some place that you have surveyed. I guess I would like to ask where that is?

Aoude- There are 4 biologists and they each have their units and go different places.

There is no one place.

Woodland- Where did they go?

Aoude- Where the deer are.

Slater- So do you want to know more by region specific?

Aoude- I do not have that information nor can I get it to you by tonight.

Woodland- I would like to know where specifically they got the count for 17 bucks per 100 doe in the northern region.

Cowley- I am wondering if there is someone from the northern region who actually participates in some of those counts and can help us?

Randy Wood- You don't go to one spot. You try and get a random sample over the whole unit. Which particular unit are you looking at?

Woodland- Northern.

Wood- We go on every unit. Does that help?

Woodland- No.

Slater- How many units are there in the region?

Wood- 8.

Slater- Can you tell us those.

Wood- Box Elder, Cache, Morgan and over to the Wyoming line.

Woodland- I live in Cache so that is what I mainly observe.

Wood- They are sampling deer in the Cache on the east side of Bear Lake. In Rich County from Garden City to Woodruff and from Blacksmith Fork Canyon up above Hardware in Logan canyon across to the Idaho line. Wellsville is in the Cache and they sample Wellsville also.

Woodland- Do you include animals found on private property versus public?

Wood- Yes.

Woodland- *(Could not hear question)*

Wood- I have to look at the herd unit. We do sample deer on private and public land.

Spencer Gibbons- I live by Mr. Woodland and I understand where he is coming from. He is concerned about the Cache unit in particular. Maybe we could point him to the right people in the deer working group. The objective numbers were set a while ago. How are these tag numbers working in relationship with the Cache where we continue to see a decline in the buck to doe ratio?

Aoude- We don't continue to see a decline in the Cache. Last year was below objective. I don't know how that plays with the Cache deer working group.

Cowley- In this case, the proposal was to keep it at 1000 permits below what it was in 2004.

Aoude- Because it was an unforeseen event of a winter mortality.

Wood- In the new deer management plan statewide, we do move down to unit by unit on a 3 year average.

Aoude- If the Cache continues to be below next year, it would be recommended to have a shorter season.

Bret Buchanan- Mortality count on moose in the Ogden unit after last winter?

Aoude- No, we don't have mortality counts.

Buchanan- If buck to doe ratios are low, is there a reason we don't reduce tags more than 1,000?

Aoude- Buck to doe ratios are not low region wide. They are only low on a couple of units.

Buchanan- So you think the 1,000 would be adequate?

Aoude- Yes. That 1,000 is just a precaution.

Kurt Wood- Why are there more tags given in the north when the numbers were down?

Aoude- The cap was sent in 1994 and they were allowed different numbers for each region. We are recommending cutting the permits because of the unforeseen mortality to deal with it for this year and then if it remains a problem next year, we will not reduce the number.

Kurt Wood- Counting deer in private as well as public land.

Aoude- We do have private land units that we classify and keep separate. The rest of the classifications are public land units. Those units are classified separately.

Doug Justensen- Numbers of deer for winter kill in the northern region.

Aoude- Numbers are below objective on a lot of units.

Justensen- Is there something we can do to help bring those numbers up?

Aoude- Lowering buck permits is not going to help increase your deer herds.

Justensen- Is there something we can do as the public to help?

Aoude- Yes, there are multiple projects. Get involved and help out where you can.

Mike Laughter- When we are as far below on some of your objectives, how long will it take before it is a problem?

Aoude- The reason we are below objective is because something is limiting.

Laughter- We are 15,000 below in some areas.

Aoude- Maybe our objectives are too high. We may never reach those objectives unless habitat improves or conditions are better.

Laughter- Reducing tags increases bucks but if there is such a distance between the objective and the deer that we actually have, is it a competition?

Aoude- It is. If there are more bucks, fewer doe will make it through the winter.

Resources are always limiting.

## **RAC Questions**

Foutz- Population objectives on the Cache, Morgan, South Rich and East Canyon. We should have 25,000 on the Cache, 12,000 on Morgan and South Rich, and 7,000 on East Canyon. The 2008 preliminary population objectives are 13,700 on the Cache, 6,100 on

Morgan South Rich and 6,200 on East Canyon. We are at about 60% of objective on those units.

Aoude- Yes, roughly.

Foutz- What is the lowest threshold that the division can go to on a population before you will recommend to cut permits in the northern region?

Aoude- It is not based on population; it is based on buck to doe ratio.

Foutz- Let's say in the Cache, we are supposed to have 25,000 and we currently have 13,700. Would you still recommend the same amount of permits?

Aoude- As long as buck to doe ratios were above 15.

Foutz- Is that fair to the public?

Aoude- It is fair to the deer population. We manage deer.

Foutz- I represent the public.

Cowley- The original caps were set in 1994, has the division looked at how much the loss of winter range has affected those units over the last 12 years?

Aoude- We have looked at that. We need to look at the objectives on these units.

Cowley- It seems our objective may be too high.

Aoude- Any time you recommend a decrease in objective, it never flies because people want more deer.

Cowley- Mathematically you can calculate out what a range should be able to support.

Aoude- Theoretically.

Cowley- Then either improve the range or find additional winter range. That needs to be taken into play.

Aoude- You are right, it does.

Selman- When you count bucks per 100 doe, you are not counting fawns?

Aoude- Right.

Selman- I think that for some might get confusing. Some of us might be counting fawns.

Shirley- I have heard for 10 years now that there are not enough deer on the Cache.

When is the state going to go to a unit by unit deer permit? Why don't we break it up like other states do? So if there is only 13,000 deer on the Cache and how many bucks?

Foutz- 1,300.

Shirley- Why don't we go to a unit by unit system?

Aoude- We just redid the statewide plan and that was one of the options but the committee opted not to go that way.

Neville- Is there a population size that remains viable and has the ability to grow? Is there a calculation?

Aoude- We are nowhere near it anywhere for deer in the state.

Neville- I am not talking about the state.

Aoude- On any unit.

Neville- Is that the reasoning behind you can always go to the buck to doe ratio?

Aoude- Right.

Neville- Even if it is in the thousands, it is still a viable population.

Aoude- Yes. To grow a population, you need fewer bucks and more doe.

Byrnes- Bison population objective was negotiated with groups that represent that area?

Aoude- Those were objectives set by the BLM before this new plan was put forward.

Byrnes- Was the 275 set with the BLM?

Aoude- That is the old objective.

Byrnes- Have they given approval for you to jump the gun on the growth of this herd?

Aoude- There is an objective in 2010 to go to 305. The objective needs to be met by 2010. We don't need BLM approval; BLM does not set the permits.

Byrnes- Have you discussed it with them?

Aoude- No, not specifically.

Cowley- Moose permits and hunting. Transfers in and out of state. Is any of that brought into the permit discussion?

Aoude- Yes. Last year we moved bulls so we added that number of permits.

Cowley- Did we subtract permits from the Ogden unit?

Aoude- We did this year.

### **Public Comment**

Mike Laughter- Mule Deer Foundation- Propose division reduce general season deer tags in the northern region by 5,000 permits.

Slater- So you are asking to reduce 5,000 permits?

Mike Laughter- Reduce 5,000 off the cap.

Foutz- Why do my numbers differ from Mike's?

Laughter- I got mine through the Cache working group 2 Monday's ago.

Foutz- Could someone here answer that?

Darren Debloois- I am actually not sure where you got the 10,000 because my estimate was 15,500.

Laughter- *(could not hear comment)*

Debloois- I must have misspoke then.

Foutz- Why did we go from 9 to 10?

Laughter- I heard it was 10.

Debloois- I have my computer, let me look.

Foutz- For clarification, that was just misspoke, 3,500 tags roughly?

Byron Bateman- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- Support bison Option 1. Request northern region reduction of 5,000 buck deer.

Spencer Gibbons- Utah Farm Bureau- Encourage council to consider Option 2 with the bison plan.

Mark Glauser- Bonus points, want to put in for all species. Don't like to lose points for all that I have worked so many years at. Can that change?

Ron Hodson- You only lose bonus points if you don't apply for anything during a 3 year period.

Glauser- Even though I am putting in for mountain goat, I do not get my bighorn sheep taken away?

Hodson- Correct.

### **RAC Discussion**

Slater- There are 2 or 3 key issues. I don't know if the council would like to address all of these issues or if you want to break them out.

Foutz- Maybe we should do big game numbers as one. I would like to recues myself from one so if you could do big horn sheep as one.

Slater- We will address them individually.

Foutz- Just to have bison to be taken out of the big game plan.

**Motion:** Selman- Adopt Option 2 on the bison permits.

**Second:** Bingham

### **Discussion on the motion**

Fenimore- Is the winter range all private land?

Aoude- No. The winter range is still public land. Bison are on the winter range in the summer time and that is when the damage occurs.

Foutz- Option 1 is the way to go as it spreads hunters out.

Bingham- People want more opportunities. They enjoy the opportunity of bigger and more. If there are problems, then damage control will be involved.

Cowley- Same opportunity just spread over 2 years.

Marsh- Number on how many AUM's on that unit total?

Hodson- The division holds a number of AUM's that we have purchased over the years. The division has enough AUM's to run around 600 bison but we have never chose to go that. I cannot tell you the total AUM's for bison and cattle.

Byrnes- We have gone over the bison plan. This is brought about because of conditions that consist there. Everyone needs to cooperate and I think there is a management plan in effect. The BLM should be consulted on a change. I would like to see everyone come together on an agreement.

Gaskill- I am not really sure if the land owners want more bison killed. This seems to be more of a social issue. I will oppose Option 2.

Foutz- In the spirit of working together with agricultural down on the Henry Mountains with conservation groups for sportsmen, we have already exhibited that in many ways. I think option 1 will provide sportsmen a better hunting opportunity.

Bingham- I don't believe that hunters often realize the value of the private enterprise. The hunters will never know the difference between 15 permits. I believe Option 2 in this case would work out best for the hunters and sportsmen.

**Motion Fails:** For 2, Against 9.

**Motion:** Foutz- Reduce mule deer permits in the Northern Region by 5,000.

**Second:** Selman

### **Discussion on the motion**

Fenimore- I think it is remarkable for these organizations to ask for a reduction by 5,000.

Gaskill- I think it is misplaced. I don't believe that reducing the number of bucks by 5,000 is going to greatly increase the deer herd in the northern region.

Foutz- This issue has come up every year in the northern region. We have come to nothing and have never done anything significant. We need to look at how we are going

to vote and represent the public. We need to start somewhere. I think we should reduce by 5,000 permits.

Shirley- I support the 5,000 also. We need to start managing our deer by units.

Selman- Shorten season.

Bingham- Concerned about deer killed on the highway. Someone should have to tag those deer.

Shirley- Are we going to have tags for road kill now?

Neville- Hunter success rate. How many animals were actually taken?

Aoude- 190.

Neville- That is all of the animals taken that year?

Aoude- 3,364 were taken in the northern region.

Neville- Is that the amount of tags?

Aoude- There was 22,000.

Neville- So that was 19%. If you lower that to 17,000 and they got 20%, what is that number?

Cowley- Approximately a thousand.

Neville- That is all males?

Aoude- Correct.

Byrnes- We might not improve the buck to doe ratio but a lot of people are concerned about the quality of hunt they are seeing. If we reduce the number by 5,000, maybe we can push the process. I will vote for it.

Cowley- Same concern with the math of the numbers. We should be able to make a rough estimate to bring that number to a more realistic value to get a better understanding where you are at percentage wise. Loss of winter range has been substantial. We seem to have an overly high objective.

Foutz- Look at this from a social perspective. There is a reason there are 15,000 tags left over.

Shirley- How is this going to help?

Foutz- We have to do something. Someone has to show me that this is wrong.

**Motion Passes:** For 6, Against 5.

**Motion:** Marsh- Accept DWR recommendation for Desert and Big Horn Sheep as proposed.

**Second:** Gaskill

**Motion Passes:** For 10, 1 recues.

**Motion:** Neville- Accept the remainder of the DWR recommendations including Option 1 of the bison and any remaining species.

**Second:** Cowley

### **Discussion on the Motion**

Selman- I am still hung up on this bison thing and I wish I knew more about it. Farmers and ranchers in this state are a great resource for this wildlife. It seems to be option 1 and



option 2 ends up being the same thing anyway. I would like to see those problems addressed.

**Motion Passes:** For 9, Against 2.

Byrnes- Northern region buck and bull hunt. Not to reduce that hunt.

**Item 4. 5-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list & Sharp-tail grouse transplants for Antelope Island**

Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

**Public Questions**

Mark Glauser- Will the transplants be a reserve to develop a good flock and transplant them to other places?

Olsen- Yes.

Glauser- How many birds do you plan on having at Antelope Island before you can transplant them to other places?

Olsen- We would just have to monitor the population.

**RAC Questions**

Shirley- Has setting up new Sharp-tail territories worked in the past?

Olsen- It has never been attempted in Utah.

Shirley- There is a very healthy population of coyotes out there. Are you going to do any predator control?

Olsen- There is no predator control possible.

Selman- You transplant male birds in fall and bring females in the spring?

Olsen- We would like to get started this spring putting birds out there, whatever we can catch.

Selman- Do they play recordings for them?

Olsen- They have not done that up in the Northwest.

Selman- Have they done that with Sage-grouse?

Olsen- There was research in Wyoming. Sage-grouse have not been very successful.

Selman- What will happen if the CRP contracts are not renewed.

Olsen- That is one of the reasons we want to get going now while we have a population in fairly good shape.

Fenimore- Is there sufficient habitat on Antelope Island?

Olsen- I don't think it is ideal but we feel it is good enough to give it a shot.

Fenimore- Has West Nile Virus hurt the Sharp-tail's.

Olsen- I don't think anyone has really checked into that anywhere.

Byrnes- Is there any concern about transplanting Sharp-tail's in areas where Gunnison existed?

Olsen- Colorado has been transplanting and trying to re-introduce Sharp-tail's throughout their range. There is no known competitive factor other than brooding habitat.

Cowley- Where in the listing process this species is? Any discussion with Fish and Wildlife Service's whether those will be treated as experimental populations or treated as existing populations?

Olsen- Those discussions are just beginning.

Cowley- Right now it has gone through the 90 day and found it had substantial information presented?

Olsen- Years ago it did. The new petition has not received any action yet.

Cowley- So it is still in the 90 day finding?

Olsen- I guess so.

Gaskill- How did you arrive at this list and how it is prioritized? Do we go all the way through the Northern Region before we go to the Central Region?

Olsen- Each region was asked to look at the distribution map and from that map; areas that they thought looked ok for Sharp-tail's. From that, we put a list together.

Gaskill- Do you see it more of an experiment than a management plan?

Olsen- Sure. We are hoping that Oregon and Washington are going to be successful.

**Motion:** Fenimore- Recommend the Divisions recommendations for the transplant list and the Antelope Island proposal.

**Second:** Shirley

### **Discussion on the motion**

Cowley- Do you feel like if it started to be successful, your list is long enough or would you recommend additional locations?

Olsen- If that did occur, we would come back and ask for a new list.

Cowley- What do you think of minimum viable population size for this species is?

Olsen- Generally with Sage-grouse, they look at about 300 to be able to establish a hunt. Around 150 birds is typical.

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

### **Item 5. Sage-grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain**

Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Shirley- How far do they migrate?

Maxfield- They have moved 18 miles. There is a male that has moved 25 miles.

Shirley- So they will spread?

Maxfield- We had one hen that moved 40 miles between 2 spots.

Bingham- What is the problem with junipers and pine? Does it take away their healthy habitat?

Maxfield- It is a structure issue. They don't like to go in that dense area.

Bingham- They like to see the sun.

Maxfield- Yes.

Gaskill- Why do you think that if they are not expanding now, if you put a few more in that they will expand?

Maxfield- Sage-grouse have high site fidelity. Once they learn an area, they tend to go back to those same areas.

Gaskill- Since this is good habitat, why did the population reduce?

Maxfield- When we had the large population, there was a lot of vegetation. The habitat is in good condition now.

Gaskill- It is still perplexing.

Maxfield- We are just giving them a jump start. Over time, they will start using all of the areas again.

Gaskill- Is this coming out of DWR funds?

Maxfield- This has been funded partially by the Forest Service and partly by Endangered Species Mitigation Fund. Local sportsmen groups also helped out.

Fenimore- Fence marking projects. Have we tried this in these areas to help these populations?

Maxfield- We are trying to drop fences.

**Motion:** Gaskill- Approve this project as presented.

**Second:** Fenimore

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous.

Meeting Ends 8:55 p.m.

**NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED**  
**Western Park, Vernal/March 19, 2009**

5.BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009

**MOTION:** to split the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL permit numbers for 2009 for RAC review by species

Passed unanimously

**MOTION:** to accept UDWR's deer recommendations, excluding the Northeastern Region increase of 1000 general season buck deer permits. Voted to Stay with the 13,000 like in 2008.

Passed unanimously

**MOTION:** to approve the elk permit increase as presented by UDWR.

Motion passed 3 to 1

**MOTION:** to accept the pronghorn permit numbers as presented by UDWR

Passed unanimously

**MOTION:** to go with the numbers presented by UDWR on once in a lifetime, and Option 1 for bison

Passed unanimously

6.5-YR STATEWIDE SHARP-TAIL GROUSE TRANSPLANT LIST:

**MOTION:** to approve the potential transplant list proposed by UDWR for sharp-tailed grouse

Passed unanimously

8.SAGE-GROUSE TRANSPLANT PROPOSAL FOR ANTHRO MOUNTAIN

**MOTION:** to go with UDWR's recommendations for sage grouse translocation as presented

Passed unanimously

## **NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

**Western Park, Vernal**

**March 19, 2009**

**Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 8:15 pm**

### **RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ron Winterton-Elected Official  
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor  
Bob Christensen-Forest Service  
Floyd Briggs-At Large  
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen  
Beth Hamann-Nonconsumptive

### **EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Amy Torres-Chair

### **UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Karl Breitenbach-At Large  
Dave Chivers-Agriculture  
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture  
Carlos Reed-Native American  
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen

### **UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Anis Aoude-Big Game Coordinator  
Dave Olsen-SLO Wildlife Coordinator  
Craig McLaughlin-SLO Wildlife Sec. Chief  
Gayle Allred-NER Administrative Aide  
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach  
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Pgm Mgr  
Brian Maxfield-NER Sensitive Species Bio.  
Natasha Gruber-NER seasonal employee  
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Bio III  
Dax Mangus-NER Wildlife Bio II  
Derrick Ewell-NER Wildlife Bio II  
Clint Sampson-NER Law Enforcement

### **WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Del Brady

## **1,2 AND 3. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA AND SUMMARY AND OLD BUSINESS: Bob Christensen (Acting Chair)**

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to accept the agenda, summary and old business**

Second by Rod Morrison

**Passed unanimously**

Bob Christensen read the Dedicated Hunter Rule change in requirement to attend RAC meeting is no longer required. The online Wildlife Orientation Course replaces it.

## **4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson**

Regarding the budget, money's tight but we were treated pretty well by the Legislature. DWR took a 1.2 million dollar hit, but we think we can absorb that and not have to lay people off. We have an approximately 55 million dollar budget statewide; 8 million is in general funds. We took a 15% cut on those funds. About half of that was money to pay sportsmen for access on SITLA lands, so I'm not sure what will happen there.

We have some expansion plans in the region: We will be getting two new Conservation Officers; one in Duchesne County and we're adding a Book Cliffs C.O. Part of the funding for these positions came through Quagga mussel money.

The bison transplant has been big news. Most of the animals are staying where we want them so far, especially the animals from the Henry Mountains. The same holds true for the bighorn sheep released in Lake Canyon.

The Daggett County Moose Pond has undergone improvements. The pond had silted in. We received a Scenic Byway funds grant of \$60,000 and \$30,000 from habitat funds to dredge it. What was one inch deep is now six or seven feet deep, and a walkway goes all the way around. The ribbon cutting will be held in conjunction with the Forest Service June 6, Free Fishing Day, on the first Saturday in June.

**5. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009: Anis Aoude (ACTION)**

See handout

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to split the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL permit numbers for 2009 by species**

Second by Rod Morrison

**Passed unanimously**

Deer General Season

Propose adding 1000 general season buck deer permits back to NER

Deer Limited Entry

Book Cliffs, etc.

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

Kenny Labrum: We need to leave the 1000 tags off of Northeastern Region's total. We're not seeing an increase in numbers. Also, the five day hunt will put more pressure on other areas.

Brad Horrocks: I agree we need to leave the tag numbers where they were at last year. The unit needs help. There's not room to have another 1000 hunters up there. There are no deer.

**Questions from RAC:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: The sportsmen I've visited with are unhappy with the numbers and want to NOT add 1000 to NER. The quality and quantity is too low to have an increase.

Floyd Briggs: The information presented is contradictory. The hunter success is down, the percentage is down and we haven't increased the hunters. We're already on the bottom end of our objective now. If we increase by 1000 it wouldn't be good.

Anis Aoude: The only unit below objective is the Vernal unit.

Rod Morrison: On the Paunsaugunt hunt do you think 15 is too many?

Anis Aoude: I think it's too few. It was calculated. If anything, it's on the low end.

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to accept UDWR's deer recommendations, excluding the Northeastern Region increase of 1000 general season buck deer permits. Stay with the 13,000 like in 2008.**

Second by Ron Winterton

**Passed unanimously**

Limited Entry Elk:

Recommend 13% increase in Limited Entry permits

**Questions from Public:**

Kenny Labrum: Looks like the trend is going down back toward the objective. Are we afraid we'll go too far?

Anis Aoude: No.

Kenny Labrum: Anthro Unit showed two tags that were not listed in the proclamation.

Anis Aoude: It shouldn't be in there if it isn't in the proclamation.

Mitch Hacking: I'm confused. These limited entry show a 13% increase. Isn't there a spike hunt that will be in there?

Anis Aoude: There will be spike hunters in there but they will be taking spikes only. This year's spike harvest will not affect any of these units.

Mitch Hacking: But there will be an increase in hunters.

Anis Aoude: Yes. Hunters will be fairly diffused with spike hunters because they will be hunting throughout the whole state.

Mitch Hacking: ¾ of the hunters could go into the Book Cliffs.

Anis Aoude: Down the line we can adjust permits if it does. We already have 10 units with spike hunting that hasn't affected the bigger bulls. The best way to distribute hunters is to let them distribute themselves.

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Questions from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: On the archery spike hunt, if you buy one and you can hunt a spike in the Book Cliffs, can anybody hunt a spike hunt in the Book Cliffs?

Anis Aoude: That's correct

Rod Morrison: I'm concerned about what that's going to do to the limited entry hunters.

Anis Aoude: They are shut off the last five days of the season when limited entry groups are in there, which is also closer to the rut. There may be additional changes in the future. We're working on the hunt structure for future years.

**Comments from RAC:**

**MOTION by Ron Winterton to approve the 13% elk increase and recommendation as presented by DWR.**

Second Beth Hamann

**Favor: Ron Winterton, Floyd Briggs, Beth Hamann**

**Opposed: Rod Morrison**

**Motion passed**

Pronghorn

9% increase mainly on Parker Mountains

**Questions from Public:**



None

**Questions from RAC:**

Floyd Briggs: Did we just have a transplant in Bonanza? And there's a hunt in that area?

Charlie Greenwood: It was in the Book Cliffs and Anthro, a supplemental release from the Parker Mountains.

Rod Morrison: Are we increasing the numbers in the Anthro and Book Cliffs?

Anis Aoude: No.

**Comments from Public:**

Zack Meham. On all limited entry permits, you know how on the maximum point holder, the permits are rounded down?

Anis Aoude: I don't really know how that's set up. If you want to make a recommendation, you can.

Zack Meham: The way the bonus point system works, if there's an even amount, 50 % go to the hunters with the most points. If there's an odd number, it is rounded down. I would like to not see it rounded down but give the extra permit to a hunter with maximum points.

Clay Hamann: Aren't those who are non-successful put back into the draw?

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Zack Meham: I'm afraid down the road it may affect the big bulls.

Anis Aoude: It won't, because there's a surplus of bulls so it wouldn't affect them.

**Comments from RAC:**

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to accept pronghorn numbers as presented**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**

Once-in-a-Lifetime:

Bison:

Add extra permits over two years to smooth the transition back to the target number.

**Questions from Public:**

None

### **Questions from RAC:**

Floyd Briggs: I noticed on goat numbers on the North Slope, the counts are down.

Anis Aoude: Yes, goat numbers are down everywhere but on the west units. So we only increased permits in the west units. We think it's because it's the first time in 10 years the goats have seen a hard winter.

Scott Sowards: What is the objective for the management moose hunt?

Anis Aoude: High bull/cow ratio above 50, which we usually do, but we consistently get an age of around 5. It doesn't matter how many permits we set, the average age always seems to be around 5. There will be a comment period on a moose plan we're looking at. We're looking at having a bracket of ages where some can be managed for trophy sizes but it seems like the hunters are dropping the first big bull they see.

Rod Morrison: How are the rocky mountain bighorn sheep doing?

Anis Aoude: They either issue 12% of total rams or 30% of class 3 and 4 rams counted. In flights. Populations are doing well but they're basing it on their flights. In any population, where you're harvesting for maximum antler size or horn size you're going to have animals dying of old age. If you reduce, you'll also reduce quality.

Rod Morrison: DWR dropped the number of permits on Daggett Three Corners and I approve of that. There is poor moose quality on the unit.

Anis Aoude: It's not always the number of tags you issue. Sometimes the habitat has something to do with it. Sometimes it's good to take more animals to improve the habitat in the area to improve the quality and antler size.

### **Comments from Public:**

Scott Sowards: I harvested a moose last year and I feel the quality of the moose are good, but I feel like you should get better than a 2- or 3-point moose. I'm glad for the changes taking place. Once in a lifetime isn't a premium hunt but it's an opportunity. I saw 26 bulls but most of them were just bulls, nothing great. People who have a once in a lifetime tag deserve more than an average bull. The habitat may have something to do with it. I'm glad they've backed off on permits. It's too late for me but maybe it's not too late for my kids. Looks like we're trying to make some positive steps.

David Bailey (Utah Farm Bureau): I spoke with some of the members of the bison committee who said they were not included in this decision to have two options. The Division, for various reasons, didn't get the committee back together to check with them. The Utah Farm Bureau wants the second option to get the bison hunt down to 275 in one

year, not over a two year period. Not sure about the monitoring of the habitat so wanted to make sure the habitat exists for the following year.

Kenny Labrum (SFW): On that unit, there have been a lot of habitat work improvements and we've also purchased AUMs for the buffalo down there. SFW would like to see Option 1 as presented by the Division.

David Bailey: I was not aware of that.

Scott Sowards: During the once in a lifetime moose hunt, they close the hunt during the primitive weapon deer season. Why couldn't the moose hunters wear camo and use primitive weapons and continue to hunt?

**Comments from RAC, discussion and motion.**

Floyd Briggs: On the muzzleloader hunt on the moose hunt, would that decision have to be for 2010?

Anis Aoude: Yes. It's a good idea but it would have to be for 2010. We cut it in half because of the muzzleloader, so they would have to use a muzzleloader at that time.

Floyd Briggs: I'm confused with the Bison plan on the Henry Mountains.

Kevin Christopherson: Option 1 is easing into the 275 number in response to hunter pressure and BLM concerns about available campsites. Option 2 would get 30 additional hunters out there this year.

Anis Aoude: The grazers would like to get down to 275 now and then come back up to give the habitat time to recover. Our rationale is for hunting pressure concerns.

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with the numbers presented on once in a lifetime, and Option 1 for bison.**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**

**6. 5-YEAR STATEWIDE SHARP-TAIL GROUSE TRANSPLANT LIST: Dave Olsen (ACTION)**

See handout

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Questions from RAC:**

Floyd Briggs. I see Daggett Three Corners is on the list. I'm not a bird hunter but you reintroduced turkey in Sheep Creek two years ago but my concern is when we introduced the turkey that wasn't limited entry hunting, and I think a lot of them were taken during the hunts. Are we doing anything to protect them after they're transplanted?

Dave Olsen: There's a limited season and by limited permits. In between reintroduction and hunting, they would fall in like any other species that we would have to keep track of through general patrols.

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments and discussion from RAC:**

Floyd Briggs: Are we approving the transplant list?

Dave Olsen: Yes. We'll bring it back to you with more details in the future.

**MOTION by Floyd Briggs to approve the list proposed by UDWR for sharp-tailed grouse**

Second by Ron Winterton

**Passed unanimously**

**8. SAGE-GROUSE TRANSPLANT PROPOSAL FOR ANTHRO MOUNTAIN:  
Brian Maxfield (ACTION)**

Anthro Mountain greater sage-grouse translocation project  
See handout

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Questions from RAC:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC and discussion:**

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with UDWR's recommendations for sage grouse translocation as presented.**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**

Rod Morrison: I appreciate the hard work the Division has done on all these transplants they have done this year.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Richfield High School  
Richfield, UT  
March 17, 2009  
7:00 p.m.**

**REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

**MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as submitted.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009**

**MOTION: To accept the deer permit numbers as presented except for a 10 percent cut across the board for permits on the Paunsaugunt unit.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**MOTION: To accept the DWR's elk permit numbers as proposed with the exception to leave the Monroe Mountain unit as it was last year and to have the Wildlife Board reconvene the statewide elk committee when scheduled.**

**VOTE: 6 in favor 4 against**

**MOTION: To accept the pronghorn permit numbers as presented.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**MOTION: To accept Option Number 2 regarding bison permit numbers (to reduce population to 275 adults post season 2009 and increase to 305 post season 2010) and that the bison committee reconvenes and works on the bison plan.**

**VOTE: 9 in favor 1 against**

**MOTION: To accept the remainder of the OIAL recommendations as presented.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**5-YR STATEWIDE SHARP-TAIL GROUSE TRANSPLANT LIST**

**MOTION: To accept 10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list as presented.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

**SAGE-GROUSE TRANSPLANT PROPOSAL FOR ANTHRO MOUNTAIN**

**MOTION: To accept the Sage-Grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain as presented.**

**VOTE: Unanimous**

Draft

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Panguitch Triple C Arena  
Panguitch, UT  
July 8, 2008  
7:00 p.m.**

| RAC Members Present   | DWR Personnel Present  | Wildlife Board Present | RAC Members Not Present |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Dell LeFevre<br>Rex Stanworth<br>Steve Dalton<br>Chairman Jake Albrecht<br>James Edwards<br>Paul Briggs<br>Sam Carpenter<br>Gary Hallows<br>Steve Flinders<br>Cordell Pearson<br>Clair Woodbury | Douglas Messerly<br>Natalie Brewster<br>Teresa Bonzo<br>Lynn Chamberlain<br>Anis Aoude<br>Dave Olsen<br>Fred Pannunzio<br>Cody Jones<br>Wade Paskett<br>Brian Maxfield<br>Vance Mumford<br>Gabe Patterson<br>Jim Lamb<br>Jason Nicholes<br>Dustin Schaible<br>Sean Kelly | Paul Neimeyer          | Jack Hill               |

Jake Albrecht called the meeting to order at 7:00pm

Jake Albrecht: I'm the chairman of the Southern RAC, and at this time I'd like to make a couple of introductions. I'd like to recognize Paul Neimeyer with the Wildlife Board and he's also the chairman. I don't see Tom Hatch yet, but I'm sure that he'll be coming in shortly. Tom's in Hawaii? He wanted to have the meeting over there? Okay, we'll excuse him then. Can't think of a better place. We also have with us Anis Aoude was the big game coordinator and Dave Olsen was with the Wildlife program coordinator, as well as many other DWR people. I also see Commissioner Wood from Wayne County in the audience. We welcome him. I'm going to start on my right with Gary Hallows and have them introduce themselves and who they represent.

Gary Hallows: Gary Hallows, agriculture, Loa.

Steve Dalton: I'm Steve Dalton. I'm an at-large representative. I'm from Teasdale.



Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab. I represent sportsman.

Rex Stanworth: Rex Stanworth from Delta, and I represent at-large.

Jim Edwards: Jim Edwards from Delta, and I represent the sportsman.

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor with the Division of Wildlife. My staff and myself act as executive secretary to this committee. We're nonvoting members.

Cordell Pearson: I'm Cordell Pearson from Circleville. I represent at-large.

Clair Woodbury: I'm Clair Woodbury from Hurricane. I represent the public at large.

Paul Briggs: Paul Briggs with the BLM in Cedar City, represent the BLM.

Steve Flinders: Steve Flinders, represent the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, I want to go through the meeting order a little bit and then we'll go through the agenda. The first part is introducing the RAC, which we just got through. And then on our agenda Heather Perry is going to talk just a second about dedicated hunter. We'll go to approval of the minutes, approval of the agenda, the Wildlife Board update. And then in our meeting we'll have a wildlife presentation, which will be presented first, and then we'll have questions from the RAC, questions from the public. And then we'll have comments from the public. And these are comment cards and some of the DWR people have a little 4x8 comment card, we need to fill those out, put your name on there and what you would like to talk about. Tonight we're going to try something a little bit different; we're going to have the presentation, which will be deer, elk, pronghorn, once in a lifetime. After the presentation we're going to have comments and questions on the first item, which will be deer first. So on your comment card if you have more than one that you'd like to comment, put deer, elk, pronghorn, and then we'll kind of keep those in order. And the reason for that is we'll have comments and questions on deer over here and then we'll have comments that, for example on buffalo, and we're going back and forth. And I'd like to kind of keep those separate so that we kind of keep our train of thought about what's going on with people's questions and answers. After we have the RAC discussion on the motion then we'll clarify the motion and we'll have a vote and go on from there. Our first item of business tonight is to review and accept the meeting agenda and minutes. The only thing that I have added to it is Heather has asked for just a couple of minutes to talk about dedicated hunters so I put that as the next item after I get done here. So do we have a motion to approve?

### **Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)**

Gary Hallows: Move to approve.

Jake Albrecht: Is that also the minutes?

Gary Hallows: Absolutely.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Gary.

Rex Stanworth: I'll second.

Jake Albrecht: Second by Rex. Any other discussion? All in favor. Any against? Motion carries.

**Gary Hallows made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as submitted. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carries unanimous.**

Jake Albrecht: Heather, we'll go to you for a few minutes.

**Dedicated Hunter (informational) 5:40 to 6:21 of 2:52:44**

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Heather. I might mention that on your comment cards, if you're an individual you have a three-minute time limit. If you represent a group we give you five minutes. So I'm going to turn the time over to Doug Messerly for a little wildlife update.

**Wildlife Board Update:**

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'll give a brief update from the last Wildlife Board meeting, which as I recall I attended in your absence, and represented the RAC. It was just from our RAC meeting, which occurred on December 9<sup>th</sup>, 2008. The Wildlife Board meeting was in early January. It was the bear meeting, if you recall.

- The significant actions that I think would be of interest to the RAC were that on the bear proclamation the Wildlife Board accepted the bear proclamation as presented with the exception of the Beaver Unit, which they approved 10 permits for. If you'll recall the Division recommended 8 permits, this RAC recommended 12, the Wildlife Board went with 10 permits.
- In addition to that the statewide pronghorn management plan was accepted as presented by the Division at the Wildlife Board meeting.
- The same for the falconry rule.
- The drawing application procedure rule.
- And also for the wildlife conservation permit rules.

Douglas Messerly: So unless there's any questions that's what happened at the last Board meeting in January.

**Regional Update:**

Douglas Messerly: Next Mr. Chairman I'll do the regional update. I'll try to keep this brief. I expect that we'll have several comments this evening and in the interest of time I'll try to keep these brief.

- It's that time of year when we conduct our annual elk census flights. For those of you that aren't familiar we census approximately three units each year. We rotate around the region so we're on a three-year rotation with those elk flights, so we count them every third year. This year we did the Fish Lake-Boulder, Thousand Lake, and Monroe. And we don't have final numbers for you tonight, however, I'll tell you that our flights indicate that we're

significantly above objective on the Fish Lake, we're at or above objective on the Boulder, and we're significantly below the objective on the Monroe, in terms of overall numbers. We'll present you with our population estimates based on those census flights at our next RAC meeting where we discuss antlerless harvest; which is the way that we primarily manage our population numbers of those animals.

- The snow goose hunt was held earlier this month out to the Delta area, western Millard County. We discussed it and approved it through this process. It was I think, highly successful in terms of the number of animals that were harvested. There was a lot of interest. It was compared to the old days when the pheasant hunt opener was a big deal in Millard county in terms of the number of people that came in from out of town, rented motel rooms, ate meals, etc. We put in an effort there to show a law enforcement presence. And I believe the hunt largely went off without major incidents. So in general I think that was a success. They're still trying to determine an estimate of the harvest that occurred to determine if it was significant enough to continue the hunt but we can anticipate those numbers and those recommendations in the near future when we discuss the waterfowl proclamation at a future meeting.
- Our pronghorn census flights are in progress, or nearly in progress now. For the next few weeks we'll be flying our various pronghorn units making an attempt to count the animals that are out there. That's a fixed-wing operation. And in general that takes us about three weeks to a month to complete on the units that we're going to fly this year.
- In addition this is the time of year when we're doing sage grouse lek counts. These are where the sage grouse strut in the springtime as part of their mating ritual, and is our primary index to how their populations are doing. So that's what's occurring this time of year.
- Finally I'd like to announce that we need to recruit some replacement RAC members for some of those members here that have served their terms. We're looking for three members, at a minimum. And we need people to represent the agricultural community, the non-consumptive wildlife community, and sportsman's group. And if you're interested in participating in this process of if you know someone that is you can have them contact myself at the regional office or you can have them go to the website. The nomination form is right there on the website. They can download it and fill it in and it shows where to send that form to to be considered for a spot on the regional advisory council.

Douglas Messerly: So unless there's any questions Mr. Chairman that's all I have.

Jake Albrecht: Any of you gentlemen have any questions? Okay, we will move to our next agenda item which is Bucks and Bulls permit numbers. This is Once In A Lifetime also, for 2009. This is an action item. I'll turn the time over to Anis.

**Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (action) (DEER) 12:25 to 27:00 of 2:52:44**  
**-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

**Jake Albrecht:** I want to welcome Commissioner LeFevre here. Glad you could be with us. We're

going to stop at this point on the presentation and we're going to go to questions from the RAC and then we'll go to questions from the public. And we'll go all the way through and vote on the deer, which way we're going to go, and then we'll go to the elk, which will be the next one. So with that presentation do we have any questions from the RAC? Sam.

### **Questions from the RAC (Deer):**

Sam Carpenter: I know Anis that we've beat all this to death in our committee meetings and things of that nature. Really the only comment that I'd like to make at this point is that in our meetings when we come up with the management hunt idea and spent the time, this was strictly based on the Paunsaugunt, why is it we feel that in doing that and making that plan on the Paunsaugunt do we need to apply this management hunt to the Henry Mountain area?

Anis Aoude: Yeah because the same principals apply. Basically when you hunt bucks at such a low level to maintain the quality that we're trying to maintain you are going to have extra bucks out there. And when you do have extra bucks out there you're reducing your overall potential to produce fawns. So they're both managed similarly to try to keep the permit numbers down to produce those big antlered animals and eventually we are going to get to a point where the Henry's has more than 50 bucks per 100 does, if it doesn't already.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and that's fine. But do we have a three-point problem out there? I mean is . . .

Anis Aoude: Well it's not based, it's not a three-point problem. It's trying to kill enough bucks to keep the buck to doe ration down. And if you can't kill them as premium bucks you have to kill them somehow. And yeah, why not kill the three-points or whatever. And I guess I, I keep arguing this is not to fix a three-point problem. This is to fix a buck to doe ration because you cannot fix genetics through hunting.

Sam Carpenter: Right, that's fine. And I understand that but we're trying, these are premium units and we're trying to manage for quality deer.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Sam Carpenter: Why not add more tags to the Henry just to the trophy hunts, as opposed to have them go just shoot young bucks and waste their points?

Anis Aoude: We recommended that at the statewide committee and they were opposed to it. They don't want more hunts. They want to maintain the quality. So the only way to maintain quality and still harvest enough bucks is to have these dual hunting strategies where; one you set numbers for premium bucks by looking at what the age classes are. And the other one you deal with the buck to doe ratio by shooting what some would think are inferior bucks or bucks that may never obtain that trophy class.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, is it in the cards to possibly manage these two units separately, with a separate management plan?

Anis Aoude: Anything is possible.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. One other thing, in going through your statewide data up there that was presented; I noticed the doe to fawn ratio statewide is right around 62 percent.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Sam Carpenter: Is that what the number is? Is that population growing? The general population. . .

Anis Aoude: It's hard to generalize like that over the whole state. You know certain populations are, certain populations are not. It just depends where you look.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. And what did the data show this year for the Paunsaugunt? (Unintelligible).

Anis Aoude: We haven't done the population estimation yet.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. One other question I'd like to ask is, when did we change models? I understand we changed models a few years back. Do you know what year that was that we changed the modeling and (unintelligible)?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, it was probably 2004.

Sam Carpenter: 2004?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. We didn't change, we changed the model we use is still based on the same exact data; it's just that we standardized. Everybody is using the same model now instead of before. . . They say the same thing when you plug in the same information; I guess is what I'm saying.

Sam Carpenter: Right. Okay. And can you tell me who the biologist was on the unit back in '04 and '05? I can't find . . . I know that Hal Stout took over, what . . . in '06?

Anis Aoude: Yeah I don't know the timeline. Somebody in the region might know. Adam was probably the biologist then.

Sam Carpenter: No Adam, I think Adam had gone. There was two years there . . .

Anis Aoude: Well it was Adam then Hal, then Dustin.

Sam Carpenter: Hal came right in after Adam.

Anis Aoude: Right.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, all right.

Jake Albrecht: Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: Anis, I guess one questions I've got on this management hunt, I want to make sure I'm clear in my mind on that; on the management hunt that can only be a three-point on one side. You could have twenty on one side but three on the other is a legal buck to shoot.

Anis Aoude: That's correct. Yep.

Rex Stanworth: So what, are you doing anything from an educational standpoint to make sure these people understand what the goals are?

Anis Aoude: Yeah we do. We are putting a course together that every hunter that draws that permit has to complete before they get their permit.

Sam Carpenter: And also just on Rex's question we've also put together a group of people that are familiar that are volunteering their time to try to take different hunters that draw this tag out, if they would like, to help them find one of the bucks that we would like to have taken off of the unit.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, and we'll present that list to those folks that draw that permit if they choose to have someone take them out.

Jack Albrecht: Okay, do we have any other questions? Steve have you got any? Anis, on the one slide you showed, I think it was Chalk Creek or something, it had like 45 bucks per 100 does.

Anis Aoude: Yeah.

Jake Albrecht: Do those come back into the state numbers that, that uh . . .

Anis Aoude: No they don't.

Jake Albrecht: They keep them separate?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the state numbers I represent are all public land units when I generalize. Because private land units are so much higher they would skew it, they would skew the distribution.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Do we have any other questions from the RAC?

Anis Aoude: And also to make clear, limited entry units are taken out of that as well. So it's general season public land units.

Jake Albrecht: Seeing no more questions from the RAC we'll go to questions from the public. If you have any questions please come up to the mic and state your name first.

### **Questions from the Public (Deer):**

Brandon Barney: Brandon Barney representing Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. My question would be since the Henry's is still under objective number, which the slide showed, what's the purpose of doing this before?

Anis Aoude: Okay, even though it's below objective there's always some bucks out there that are never going to reach their potential and since we set the seasons before we actually set the numbers we had to

have a place holder there. And really, you know taking ten bucks off of that mountain that are I guess never going to be trophies is not going to sway things more one way or the other. My thinking is if you look at this population and how few bucks we harvest the buck to doe ratio should be going through the roof. And I can't really understand why it's not. It is where it is.

Brandon Barney: But I mean (unintelligible) (not speaking into the mic).

Anis Aoude: I explained it. The reason it's there, it's a placeholder that . . .

Brandon Barney: I mean we're also adding how many trophy tags?

Jake Albrecht: Brandon . . .

Anis Aoude: We're reducing four.

Brandon Barney: Reducing four?

Jake Albrecht: We need you . . . Okay we need to make sure that you talk into the mic so that it's recorded into the minutes. And I know that's hard for you Brandon.

Keith Durfey: My name's Keith Durfey. I have property on the Henry Mountains. I'll face this direction. I'm sure they can hear me behind on the mic. The talking points that you can't effect trophy by taking trophies I'm sure it's valid because I know that you can't select for increased milk production by selecting cows that milk more.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we welcome those comments but we are in the question part of this procedure. So anybody else got any other questions? Okay. Seeing none we will move on to . . . oh we got a guy coming. All right.

Gavin Stewart: Gavin Stewart. I'm just wondering on these units where they're doing that management hunt, are you putting more officers a field just to make sure that legal bucks are being pulled out of there?

Anis Aoude: There's a mandatory check-in for the bucks that are harvested on that unit and basically they'll be the right . . . I mean these are all premium units so that there's a bit of law enforcement that goes along with those units. So no, they won't be increasing it but every one of those bucks has to be checked in. And I'm not sure; different regions may do things differently. They may have additional patrols. I'm not responsible for how much law enforcement is out there, I guess. But we made it mandatory for every one of those bucks to be checked in.

Jake Albrecht: Okay thank you. Any other questions?

Keith Durfey: This is the first RAC meeting I've been to and I apologize, I thought you were asking for comments. So turn that comment around to a questions, is that true that you can't control, or that there is no influence on trophy size by hunting, for selecting big bucks?

Jake Albrecht: Anis, do you understand the question?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Now if we were harvesting at a high enough rate where we were killing most of the premium bucks, then yeah you would have a selection pressure. But at the rate that we're harvesting to be able to grow big bucks you cannot harvest at a high enough rate to decrease the big buck population. So you have so many older animals in the age class that you can't, on an open population, unless it was a high fence and you knew who was breeding whom, no you cannot because half of those genetics lie in the doe. So by just harvesting a small amount of bucks on a unit when most of the bucks are breeding, no you're not controlling genetics. Now your example was yeah you know which ones are producing the most milk, or the fewest milk. You cull those and you keep the ones that are producing the most milk. That way it would work. But you can never do that on an open population of mule deer.

Keith Durfey: Assuming that he's correct, so I guess it doesn't matter what size the hunting unit is either because that does take in play the number of bucks in a population. So his answer is incorrect. That's a question and I don't agree.

Jake Albrecht: Keith, while I got you right there, on your comment card you've got private land and wildlife. Is that for elk, deer, buffalo? So you want to comment on all of them?

Keith Durfey: Any of them. I had wildlife on it.

Jake Albrecht: I do. I was just wondering if you wanted to clarify anything there. All right, thanks.

Keith Durfey: Not until we get to that point where we're talking about buffalo.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to go to comments from the public. This is three minutes for individual and five minutes for organization. One second. Okay, our first comment card will be Wade Heaton from Alton. Also, did you want to talk about bulls in the future so we can keep our comment card, or just bucks? You've got the floor.

### **Comments from the Public (Deer):**

Wade Heaton: I appreciate the time, and I think all of you know what I'm going to speak on just a little bit. With regard to the Paunsaugunt buck numbers . . . Can you hear me? All right. Sorry. Wade Heaton. I sent out e-mails to as many of the addresses that I had and hopefully you're a little bit familiar with what I'm going to talk about. One thing I do want to address before I talk about a proposal . . . We've talked about this group that has been formed on the Paunsaugunt and I just want to clarify a few things. It might seem kind of dumb to have a group, a committee organized for one unit. I guess the reasoning behind this is the Paunsaugunt is probably one of the most complex units in the whole state just given all the different issues and the problems that come up. And so we organized this little group and this committee so that everyone's got a little say. And to be real honest I'm proud. I mean not that it was my idea, but the cooperation and the unit that we've got within this little group. We don't all agree but uh, you know we compromise and we negotiate and we come here with one unified proposal; as opposed to having ten interest groups up here trying to drag you guys in ten different directions. And anyway it's worked well. This is the group that really worked to get the Paunsaugunt the permits cut in half several years ago. And I just want to say that since then we have had slow and steady progress on the Paunsaugunt with regard to the quality of deer. And we knew when we cut those permits in half that this was going to require some fine-tuning and some tweaking. We've reached a point, three or four



years later, when we do need to make a few adjustments. And we've met with this group. We've probably met six or eight times in the last nine months and have come together, after a lot of work, to present this proposal. And here's our problem, Anis brought the issue up that we've got a buck to doe problem on the Paunsaugunt. The buck to doe ratio is just too high. And we've worked with the Division quite a bit on this and it was actually our idea to do these management hunts as opposed to increasing trophy tags. And we can still get our buck to doe ratio down with the management hunt. And so we worked on that and we really like that idea. We think it's a step in the right direction. But we've had a few changes on the Paunsaugunt with regard to season dates and a few other things just in the last few months. And they were necessary season dates; we had some conflicts. And so we've got some issues. We originally recommended let's leave our permit numbers at 150, along with the DWR. But since these new changes, these new developments, we're worried that those permit numbers might need to come down just a little bit. And you're all familiar, as Anis brought up; the Wildlife Board seems to have taken a step where they really want premium units to have some quality on them. And so I think we're headed in that direction and we're echoing the Wildlife Board's recommendation by trying to do this. Our buck to doe ration, as I said, is a little high so we can take it down with our management hunt but we really don't want to jeopardize our trophy quality. And so what we recommend, because of these developments coming down the road, we recommend just an easy ten percent cut, something that we can monitor and watch and see the progress. The developments I'm talking about are we've moved back the Paunsaugunt any weapon hunt two weeks later. And given the dynamics of that migration on that herd it's going to have an impact on trophy quality over the years. We also have these addition 50 management tags, which unfortunately in a perfect world it wouldn't have, but it is going to have some effect on our trophy quality, and because we're also under objective on our average age of our deer. We're at, the objective's 40 to 50 and we're at 39. Close but with these other factors we're just worried and concerned that we may have some issues with our trophy quality down the road, and so that's why we're asking you guys to just give the Paunsaugunt a 10 percent across the board. We think that will help maintain our trophy quality on that unit.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Wade, we appreciate your comments. Our next one is Brandon Barney. And you can actually take the mic out of that if you want to.

Brandon Barney: Okay, I'm here representing SFW, again. Gary Syrett, who I believe e-mailed most of you guys was supposed to be here. We voted on this proposal that the Friends of the Paunsaugunt did at the SFW Board meeting last week and we unanimously decided to support it.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, thanks Brandon. Our next one is David Verosco. And I think that's the last one, am I right? This is the last comment card unless we have some others in the next minutes or so. David, good to see you.

David Verosco: Yeah, you too. My name is Versoco. I live in Kanab, Utah, for the last five years. I've spent an incredible amount of time on the Paunsaugunt unit. I've come to learn the herd extremely well, the migration that takes place, as a guide and an outfitter down there. As a representative of the Friends of the Paunsaugunt and the Mule Deer Foundation, I would just like to take comment addressing the number of trophy permit numbers on the Paunsaugunt for 2009. We feel the need for a 10 percent cut overall in trophy tags this year. The reason for this cut is based on the any weapon hunt being moved to the end of October and the fact that there will be a management hunt this year as well; as it's been said here just recently. An age class, because of that any weapon hunt being moved back an age class will be more vulnerable; there's no doubt about it. Like I said, as a guide, the older age class deer that we've

killed during the traditional muzzleloader hunt which is the end of October, first of November, when we do kill an older age class buck we having found that week that this hunt will take place now, uh, with a long range rifle that will become a lot easier. And I'm not just speaking as a guide aspect, as the average hunter as well, you put that advantage in his corner and it's just going to happen, there's no doubt about it. And you know, and (unintelligible) it's not a bad thing. I don't see a rifle hunt being a bad thing being moved back. I've kind of been vocal in our committee meetings saying it is a bad thing. And I don't think it is. I just think we do need to monitor it closely. We don't want to shoot an age class out in one year by keeping trophy tag numbers up, combined with the management hunt that we did propose as the Friends of the Paunsaugunt Committee. That management hunt, like Wade said, we were the ones that proposed that. And it was for one reason and one reason only, because our buck to doe ration was high we didn't want to see trophy tag numbers up so we saw an out by having this management hunt. Since the outcome of that management hunt in my mind, in our mind, will be questionable on what really does get harvested, um, that is another reason for the address to cut the tags 10 percent. So again, as a representative of the Friends of the Paunsaugunt and the Mule Deer Foundation, we want to 100 percent support Wade's motion for the 10 percent cut. Thank you.

Gary Hallows: Question. Can I ask him a question?

Jake Albrecht: A question from Gary.

David Verosco: You bet.

Gary Hallows: So you aren't wanting to kill these, and the purpose to kill, you're confusing the hell out of me. Isn't the purpose of that to kill them?

David Verosco: Basically I don't want to have it. It is. But basically as an outfitter and a guide down there I don't want to shoot our age class out in one year and look down the road and like dang.

Gary Hallows: Yeah but a poor guy like me would spend his whole lifetime getting one, wouldn't you want to see me get one?

David Verosco: You bet, absolutely I would.

Gary Hallows: Okay well that makes me feel better.

David Verosco: My whole thing is you kids and your grandkids and people down the road. I do want to see guys succeed. And I want to see them do good. I just want to see it averaged out and monitored very closely because those bucks will be more vulnerable. I hate to see 80 guys this year have a hell of a hunt and watch 80 guys next year scratch their heads.

Gary Hallows: I always thought it was peculiar we sold em permits if we didn't want them to kill a deer.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, Gary will be way confused if you keep listening to him. I need a little clarification though; a 10 percent cut, what's your . . . in each, archery, muzzleloader, any weapon?

Sam Carpenter: Can I answer that?

Jake Albrecht: Sam can answer that or Wade. Do you want to take it while you're there?

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Go ahead Wade.

Wade Heaton: Sam, we've talked about this at length. The split isn't up to our discretion, although we wish it was. We wish it was a more even split between archery, rifle and muzzleloader. It's not; that's legislated across the board. And so while originally we wanted to cut more out of the rifle hunt we realized that was not a good idea. We are just asking for 10 percent across the board from each one of those categories. As well as the landowner groups, conservation permits, everything else.

Jake Albrecht: Okay so what you're saying is where your CWMU tags are already allocated for this year you would take a cut next year?

Wade Heaton: And the same with landowner tags, and conservation tags; they've all been approved for '09 so we can't cut those but we can cut them in 2010.

Jake Albrecht: And you're ok with that?

Wade Heaton: I got out voted but I guess I'm okay.

Jake Albrecht: And we've got it in the minutes. Okay, do we have any other uh, no other comment cards so we'll go to comments from the RAC. Sam Carpenter.

#### **Comments from the RAC (Deer):**

Sam Carpenter: I'm a part of the group, these guys I've talked with, I've met with them several times. It's like Wade said, we spend all summer meeting trying to strategize to come up with some kind of a plan where we could make more opportunity out there for the hunters on the unit to address the buck to doe ratio that is a problem. This is where the concept of the management came from, through these meetings. We had a biologist with us in these meetings. It wasn't just a bunch of guys. We spent an awful lot of time trying to put this together. The only thing that I can really say without just reiterating pretty much what has already been said is that I just don't think the general public understands the gravity of what this, moving this hunt forward a couple of weeks is going to do. That migration is completely happened. These deer are completely down out of the thick oak and cedar, and out of the migratory patterns that they are normally in during this Paunsaugunt hunt and the way it's been for the last several years. I don't know exactly how many, at least 10 years I think that we've had it early in October. And we're all about trying to make this a premium hunt. I mean we do not want to take opportunity away. We want to get the ratios where they belong. And there's a lot of talk out there on the habitat issues. We have some degradation out there. But I can assure you there are no deer starving to death out there. We're not to that point but we do need to act. And hopefully through these committees and that we can keep action going and keep intervening and take care of some habitat out there that will be available and that we can go out and recondition. I can tell you now that I've spoke with all of the BLM biologist and the monument biologists. They recently done 14,000 acres up on the Buckskin that was a burn in, I believe it was '06. That has been completely raked over, planted. And we have 14,000 acres of really good habitat up there that was available this year to the deer. Again, we're about opportunity. The total cut here this year will be 15 tags if we go with this 10 percent and 5 less next year. And we were talking about the amounts; it would be 9 tags on the rifle, 3 on the

muzzleload, and 3 on the archery. And that is what we're asking. And you know we appreciate . . . you know and Anis and them guys have left us the status quo that they came out with that and didn't ask for an increase this year. We simply want to put the brakes on until we can gather data and see what moving this hunt forward has done and how that is going to affect. And if it turns out that we're still high on numbers I'm sure we can deal with that later down the road.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments from the RAC? Sam?

**RAC Discussion and Vote (Deer):**

Sam Carpenter: I'd like to move that we accept the Division's plan as presented with the exception of a 10 percent cut across the board on the Paunsaugunt unit only.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Sam and a second by Rex that we approve the Division's recommendations with the exception of the Paunsaugunt, we have a 10 percent cut which would come down to 9 rifle tags, 3 muzzleloaders, and 3 archery, that would be a deduction. No reduction in management. Do we have any other discussions? Steve?

Steve Flinders: Just a clarification. Did I hear a commitment from the landowner association and CWMU that they're willing to take a 10 percent cut next year as catch-up?

Wade Heaton: Yep.

Jake Albrecht: We have that in the minutes. All we got to do is keep track of them. Okay, all in favor of the motion please raise your right hand. Motion carries. Any against.

**Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the deer permit numbers as presented except for a 10 percent cut across the board for permits on the Paunsaugunt unit. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carries unanimous.**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, I just want to make a little comment here, I think it's very, I think it's healthy for the, for people like this to get together and come up with some ideas and plans and bring them forward, and that's why we're here. Whether it passes or whether it goes away, not the way you like it, I think it's always good to reconvene and come back again. So with that Anis we'll go to the elk.

Anis Aoude: I'd just like to say I concur what he just said again. I do agree that we do need to get input and get folks involved.

**Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (action) (Elk Portion)**

**56:26 to 59:42 of 2:52:44**

**-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Anis. We'll go to questions from the RAC. Any questions? Rex Stanworth.

**Questions from the RAC (Elk):**

Rex Stanworth: Anis, you really believe 13 percent when we're continuing to go up for a majority of

those, do you think 13 percent in enough increase on those tags?

Anis Aoude: It could always be more, let's put it that way. But we're trying to take a slow approach because we're getting to the point where we're harvesting more bulls than we're producing. So when you get to that point you want to slow down. Even though the mature bulls are out there in the population there comes a point where you're going to have to decrease permits eventually. So we don't want to get up too high and then have to drop too much. We're kind of slowing down, I guess, so when we do reach that point where we are getting into those age classes we don't have to drop half the permits and have a lot of people upset. There will come a point on these units that we will have to reduce permits because you're going to run out of big bulls eventually because you're not producing them at the rate that they're in the environment.

Rex Stanworth: So I guess one of the questions I've got is we're, we've decided to go with the statewide spike hunt . . .

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Rex Stanworth: So this number doesn't reflect the spikes.

Anis Aoude: No this number does not reflect the spikes. And the spike hunt this year won't affect anything because you won't see a reduction in that age class for five years, for three years on the units that are managed to three to four. Four years on the units that are managed four to five, and so on. So on the premium units you're not going to see that affect for six years. So right now I guess is not the time to think about the spike harvest. We'll have plenty of time to tabulate that data and figure out what we're getting, how many are getting killed on each unit to put that into the equation.

Rex Stanworth: Are you thinking that on these spike hunts, if all of a sudden you're saying that there's a unit that comes into play, you've done your census and the bull population has dropped, are you thinking that there could be instead of having a statewide you may keep spike hunting from specific units?

Anis Aoude: No no, the spike hunting really doesn't affect the quality or, and in a lot of cases, the quantity of bulls that are in that older age class; because basically a bull is only a yearling one year. Once he passes that threshold you know, you're building bulls for four years on the units, five years and six years on the bigger units. So you've got six years worth of yearlings in that age class, so it's six times the number that would be available as yearlings if they pass that yearling stage. So that's why at this point when we don't harvest yearlings we have bull to cow ratios that are in the 80's in some units, which is not healthy for the population. So basically we've chosen to take some of those bulls as yearlings, even more than half are going to get into the next age class. And once they get there they're safe until we put limited entry permits on them. So it's not going to affect things as much as, especially with the number of permits we have out there. I think it's only 1,500 permits more than we've had. So what that's going to do is it's going to take pressure off of some of the units that we've already had spike and even out that pressure. We won't know exactly what the harvest will be until we start getting harvest data but we don't feel that it's going to be detrimental.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions?

Steve Flinders: I have one Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders.

Steve Flinders: Anis, you still collect hunter satisfaction data from all the hunters?

Anis Aoude: Yeah we do.

Steve Flinders: Since there's some discussion tonight about some of the units locally here, like Monroe .  
..

Anis Aoude: Right.

Steve Flinders: Is you, or Teresa, or Jim, maybe, any sense for how satisfied hunters have been for the last?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the satisfaction index hasn't really dropped. On the Monroe it was over 60 percent were satisfied. I think 20 something were neutral. And another 20 were dissatisfied. Which, if you look at almost every unit in the state it's about the same. So yeah, the satisfaction index is still where it always has been. I mean there's always some dissatisfied hunters and that correlates well with the success rate. Uh, the success rate was, you know, again phenomenal on the Monroe. So even though we do hear, as do you, that there was, it was a tough hunt this year, it was a tough hunt state wide, not just on the Monroe. The rut was late. It was a full moon during the rut so a lot of the rutting behavior happened at night. So there was a lot of things that played into it this year that made it a tough hunt statewide, not only on the Monroe. But the harvest was still there; the ages are still there. So we have no qualms with increasing permits.

Jake Albrecht: Anis was that satisfaction filled out by the type of hunt that they're in?

Anis Aoude: It is. I don't have the specific data if you're going to ask it.

Jake Albrecht: I was hoping you would.

Anis Aoude: Well I can get it to you at a future date, but I don't have it here, not by specific hunts.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. One other question; on those management bull hunts the Monroe was one of those units. Was they also required to send in a tooth for age class?

Anis Aoude: They were.

Jake Albrecht: And what did those come it at?

Anis Aoude: I don't have that data. Since we discontinued the management bull hunt we didn't see the need to present that data. We did get them aged but I don't have that data here.

Jake Albrecht: Does anybody with DWR have that? Mr. Lamb?

Anis Aoude: The average was 4.3 years old.

Jake Albrecht: 4.3

Anis Aoude: 4.3 was the average.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. And uh, were those hunts like 100 percent successful then?

Anis Aoude: Yeah.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. All right. Any other questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the public? Last call, questions from the public. I think we have one coming up. Please state your name first please.

### **Questions from the Public (Elk):**

Trail Kreitzer: Trail Kreitzer. My question is Anis I wonder if you could talk a little bit about how the tags, the numbers are set by the age class of bulls that we're managing for and how the process that we come to know the age class (unintelligible) these units. I understand that the tooth data is supposed to be sent in but it's not mandatory? Is that right? So it seems like there's some bias built into that from the get-go. I wondered if you could talk a little bit about that.

Anis Aoude: Yeah it's not a mandatory, uh, the teeth don't, aren't mandatory to send in but we do get a large sample size on most of these units, 80 percent plus. In biology that's a heaven sent if you get anything near 80 percent. So even if you, if everyone that didn't send a tooth in was a yearling and you averaged those in you would still not bring those ages down substantially. So we feel really good about those ages representing the population that's out there.

Jake Albrecht: Did you say it's not mandatory?

Anis Aoude: The tooth collection is not mandatory.

Jake Albrecht: I thought a few years ago we made that part of like the premium (unintelligible).

Anis Aoude: No, there was talk of doing it but there's no way we could make it mandatory with the trouble we have with the postal service and all this other stuff getting teeth into us.

Steve Flinders: The harvest reporting is mandatory.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the harvest reporting is mandatory.

Steve Flinders: And most guys don't know the difference.

Anis Aoude: And we've looked at the data that comes from the harvest reporting and unless a lot of these guys that are not sending their teeth in have 40-inch spikes, you know, the ages are not going to come down very much. So we look at all this data, even the stuff that we don't get teeth in, they're supposed to measure the antlers. And we're getting, you know, they're almost on average 5x5 or 5x6's.

So there's no way they're going to be yearlings. So that's the only thing that would bring it down is if someone shoots a yearling on a unit like that.

Jake Albrecht: But basically aren't you, I want to make this in the form of a question so I don't look like I'm making a comment. Basically aren't you getting just the guys who got the bigger bulls to report because they're a little prouder of what they have?

Anis Aoude: No we have, I mean I could show you the distribution. We have some three-year-olds, we have some two-year-olds that are showing up in the, people are sending teeth in. And we look at the data of the people who don't send their teeth in, and they have to do antler measurements and they're not measuring yearlings or two-year-olds in those measurements. And that's the only thing that would bring that average down is if you had a yearling or two-year-old on most of these units.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC or public? Okay, we got one more right here.

Trail Kreitzer: Sir, I just have one more question; my question was about the season dates. I saw one bull last year and I talked to several people that were hunting during the archery hunt, limited entry archery, and with those dates, and I know that the one guy that I talked to, I actually saw pictures, he killed a bull in the velvet. And I have quite a few friends and buddies that are looking forward to having limited entry archery tags this year and they're not real excited about hunting bulls in the velvet. So I was just wondering if you could talk a little bit about how the seasons are, how the dates are set and if that's able to be changed.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, that is able to be changed and we're looking at that for the 2010 season. Up till this last year, actually we could have changed it for the '09 season but we had so much going with the mule deer plan and everything else that we couldn't put a hunt structure in place and get enough public input to really make it worth, uh, it's salt, I guess. But basically the way it was set before is everything had to be backdated from the general deer hunt because it had to start on a specific Saturday in October. So if you back everything up X amount you end up with the archery ending early. Now this would have changed next year regardless, it would have moved forward again because that Saturday happens later in October so everything else would happen later in the month. But we're actually looking at restructuring everything and having a different hunt structure for all the hunts and then trying to get some public input on that and see what people would like. And basically not have it start on the specific Saturday of the month but have it start on a specific date every year. And that way you know that hunt's going to start on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, unless that 3<sup>rd</sup> is a Sunday then it will probably start on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, because we can't start a hunt on Sunday by a legislative decree. So basically we're looking at it and we get enough input from folks similar to that that people did think that the hunt was way too early for the archers this year. And we agree but we didn't have a lot of leeway until this year. So hopefully by 2010 and into the future we will have a better hunt structure.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, I have three comment cards, so if there's anybody else out there who feel like they need to comment we need you to hurry and get one filled out or get it turned in. Anis you've got one right behind you, maybe somebody could get picked up. We're going to go in this order: the first one will be Brandon Barney, the second one will be Allen Rowley, the third one will be Deloss Christensen, and the last one will be Steve Nielsen. So we'll start with Brandon Barney, and Allen Rowley you're up.

#### **Comments from the Public (Elk):**



Brandon Barney: Brandon Barney representing Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. We are asking for everything to stay the status quo to see the effects of the spike hunt. We are also asking for the elk committee to reconvene on some of these numbers before we go through with this count, I mean with the aerial census report coming back on the Monroe with, I can't remember the exact numbers, 100 and, 188 mature bulls counted on the Monroe during flight with a 20 or 30 percent missage thing. With the increase being 13 percent that's going to put 130 tags on the unit. My math shows within two years there's not an elk left on the unit. So um, we're just asking for it to stay as status quo.

Alan Rowley: Chairman Albrecht and commission, I'm Alan Rowley with the Fish Lake National Forest. I have a letter. I apologize we didn't make copies for the whole committee in advance. I only have one but I will leave it with you. After a careful review of the proposed recommendations the Forest Service would like to express our support for the Division of Wildlife Resource's permit recommendations. The support is based on our partnership and involvement in the development of various management plans. As a partner to the process the Forest Service supports the overall concept of maximizing recreational opportunities and experiences while staying within the boundaries of our existing management plans. We appreciate the opportunity to provide our official comments and look forward to assisting the Division in managing habitat for Utah's wildlife. Thanks for your time. And I'll hand the letter to Steven and he can make sure it gets down to you. Thank you.

Deloss Christensen: Mr. Chairman, my name is Deloss Christensen, representing myself. I live at the base of Monroe Mountain so I'll speak specifically to Monroe Mountain management plan. As far as I know, in the 33 or 34 years I've watched this unit we've never had a spike hunt on it. We've never seen what a spike hunt can do to that unit yet. It's kind of a different unit than the Pahvant range, behind us here, or the Fish Lake in that there are a lot of roads there, there's not a lot of canyon country there. The elk are quite visible, quite easy to hunt. And where we've never had a spike hunt yet I don't think we know exactly, in fact someone from the Division mentioned that this evening, what the consequences will be on that particular unit until we've had that experience. So it would seem as though, even though I realize there's some management issues and the objective is to maximize the recreational opportunity, the local sportsman that I've heard from have a real concern about what might happen there, and how tender that unit could be to tipping over. And so it would seem that if we're going to go at this particular unit to reduce some harvest we ought to do it a little more gently maybe than we've done some other units because we could really end up with a real serious failure there as far as shooting out a year of animals. And then if you come at it from the top and you take more animals off the top and the bottom at the same time it just wouldn't seem like a fair opportunity to manage that unit correctly. So my comment and request would be that the RAC, for the Monroe unit, leave it as it exists now, at least for a year or two until you can come back together and see what the results of the spike hunt have been and then make your decision from there. Thanks.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Deloss

Steve Nielsen: Steve Nielsen, Monroe Mountain Small Landowners Association. As the Division stated earlier Monroe is well below it's objective. And with the flight, the actual count of the flight of mature bulls on the Monroe Mountain is 188 bulls, is that correct? The actual flight?

Anis Aoude: We don't, they don't have that data yet. It's still being analyzed.

Steve Nielsen: Well it was on the Internet. So, 188 bulls and they're looking 130 bulls off from there this year. That's 70 percent of your elk right there. I don't think that this Monroe Mountain can handle that much of a decrease in elk in one year. The, we've also, also increased the landowner permits up there from 3 to 7. I know of one premium tag that's already been sold on Monroe. I don't know how many others are going to be issued at the banquets that are around the state. This one was given at the Mule Deer Federation in Cedar City. So we don't really have any idea on how many more of them tags that are going to be added into the situation also.

Anis Aoude: (Unintelligible) in the number. So they are taken out before the number is set.

Steve Nielsen: They are in the number of the 130?

Anis Aoude: No, they're taken out before. We say how many we want to kill, then we take out all those permits and then we say this is what goes to the public draw. So those are already accounted for.

Steve Nielsen: So they are accounted for. Okay. But as a landowners association knowing that, I believe the statewide harvest on spikes is 20 percent. They counted, from what I understand on the Internet it was 71 that they counted spikes up there this year. If they took 20 percent, which I feel will be more than that because of the accessibility on Monroe, because of the roads, you can get anywhere on that mountain. And where it's a new unit opening up you're going to see an input of hunters on there. So they may be coming from the Fish Lake, which may save some elk on the Fish Lake, it's hard to say. But uh, I feel like that we should increase, in fact we feel like we should have a 20 percent reduction in tags until we see what the spike hunt does to us. And that's our recommendation.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Steve. That's the last of our comment cards. Do we have any . . . I'd like to ask one question of Anis before we go to comments from the RAC, if that's okay. On this Monroe that he was talking about you have like 114 permits to be let out and we also have how many public and how many conservation tags then, that would increase that up to maybe 125?

Anis Aoude: Yeah I don't have the exact, there's a couple of conservation permits and then there's 7 landowner permits.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, so we're looking at about 125 total then, am I correct?

Anis Aoude: Yep.

Jake Albrecht: 123. Okay.

Anis Aoude: Realize you're two and a half years over your age objective. And there's no way you're going to get there by not increasing permits.

Jake Albrecht: Comments from the RAC. Rex has got a couple.

### **Comments from the RAC (Elk):**

Rex Stanworth: Anis, the elk committee, one of the things that we talked about, about the mandatory tooth and they said well we can't depend on the post office. Uh, one of the recommendations was

charge an extra ten bucks or whatever it costs for a UPS envelope. That envelope goes with that permit that says you will return a tooth and there is absolutely a way of tracking if they got that.

Anis Aoude: Right I don't think that cost is worth it. We're getting 84 percent return. I don't think you're going to get much better data than that. You'll spend ten bucks on every envelope and get the same data. I don't, you know, I don't think you should dwell on that because I think the data is about as good as it's going to get for ages.

Rex Stanworth: Well I guess my point was, is that the excuse of the post office is not an excuse.

Anis Aoude: It's not an excuse. I don't think we want to put the money forth . . .

Rex Stanworth: You wouldn't put the money forward; the permit holder would put the money forth. Isn't that right?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Well yeah I guess. But uh, I don't think that added cost is going to buy us anything. We've made much bigger decisions on a lot less data than this. So this we feel is some of the best data we get in all of our data. So I would hang my hat on this data than the flight data. Because you are never, you are always underestimating bulls when you're flying. We fly the Southwest Desert unit and count fewer bulls than we actually kill, and that is impossible. So we don't pay attention to our flight data so much, it's more of a getting a feel for how many are out there, getting good classifications for cows and calves. Our bull data is not something I would ever hang my hat on on those flights. So that's why we have age objectives on those units. And you could never get an eight-year -old average in the age class if you're killing too many bulls. It's impossible.

Rex Stanworth: And, no. I guess the other thing I would make a comment on is reconvening the elk committee. And I would hope that the Board would not do that at this point in time. We've already reconvened, I don't know how many times. And each time we lose a little bit of ground.

Anis Aoude: The plan is up for review in 2010 so it's going to happen regardless.

Rex Stanworth: That's what will happen.

Jake Albrecht: Jim Edwards.

James Edwards: Yes, I agree with Anis. We've got to manage these elk by the age data. Last year the average age that was taken off of the Monroe was 7.8. We're managing at 5.6. So I think the age structure is there. And I'm not a believer in these flight plans either. So I agree with what the Division wants to do.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other comments? Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes I've got a comment. I'm in agreeance with being cautious not to over harvest an age class group out of any of these units. I flew, have flown on the Boulder for quite a few times. This year I saw no, no big bulls. I'm talking bulls over 360, what I figured was a 360 bull. We saw 25 bulls that I, that I witnessed and there were no big bulls. There always have been in the past. The Boulder was way above objective for age but, boy be careful, don't uh, don't over harvest that unit. You know, I

mean there were a lot of good bulls taken off of there the last two or three years and I think we need to be pretty cautious with it and not over do it. Just talked to Del. He didn't see any big bulls when he flew with them either. What was your feeling about that Jim? Can you comment on that?

Anis Aoude: I can actually comment on it. Basically when we manage for a 5 to 6 year-old age class or 4 to 5, I think that one's 5 to 6, you are going to, the bulls are 6 to 7? Yeah, so, I mean I'm not sure. He's talking about the number of bulls he saw on that flight. Size of bulls. I guess the thing you need to understand is bulls are the hardest things to see when you're doing elk flights. And we always undercount them because they're spread in smaller groups. So I wouldn't put too much weight on those flights for bull numbers because they're totally, if you look at the numbers of animals out there there's no way there could be so few bulls, from the flight data.

James Lamb: Another thing that we need to remember Steve, is if we look at the tooth data over the last several years it's almost flat. And so we continue to fight to have less permits offered, on the Boulder for example, and our average age remains constant, remains constant, remains constant, and it's always higher than our elk plan asks for. And so by increasing the permits we're simply trying to meet the objectives of our elk plan. Because right now our age is staying over what it should be. And it's doing that year after year after year. Does that help ya? Does that answer your question or? I'm as concerned as anybody else about how many bulls are there and how many big bulls are there and everything like that. But our age data is showing that it's just pretty much flattened out over the last few years.

Steve Dalton: What I was trying to do was complement you on being conservative with increasing the number of permits on that unit.

James Lamb: Okay.

Anis Aoude: And just to clarify, we were conservative on all of the 6 to 7 year-old units because we realize that those are quality units. So we manage, we recommended on the low end of what we could increase on all of those units.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Flinders.

Steve Flinders: Jake I had a comment, I've gone through the numbers here on some of these rifle hunts, the any weapon hunts that have early and late hunts. I know there's differences in vulnerability of the bulls, September versus November and it escapes me how up North there's higher vulnerability in November than during the peak of the rut, on like the Nebo and the Wasatch, there no longer is a November hunt. Nevada loves hunting big bulls in November because they're tougher to kill. Anybody can hunt elk that bugle, so they say. But I see that even in the Southern region we're playing with the proportion of permits in those any weapon hunts, such as the Beaver, as well more permits late than early. Which if you've hunted elk in November on the Beaver, it's tough. They're not bugling and there are a lot of trees. And I, I, my comment is I that I think that's good. We went through the elk management plan process and looked at ways we could harvest more bulls, offer more opportunity, maybe not take as much of the resource, maybe even lower the success rate by hunting them in November. And are we looking at that on all of these units? Is that something that we could look at if we're toying with Monroe and some of these others? It's got two and a half times the permits during the peak of the rut versus November. Every unit's different. The biologist knows best what to do. But I love what Sean's done with the Beaver. I think it makes a lot of sense. He sees more opportunity there but

feels those bulls are real vulnerable in September.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments? I would like to make one before we go on to RAC vote. This particular unit here on the Monroe has set at 8, approximately 8 for the last 3 years. Last year with the amount of hunters that I have talked to that have drawn out in our area the satisfaction was well below 50 percent I would guess. That includes the spider hunter also. He wanted a bigger one. These people that have been putting in for 20, 21 years, 25 years before they've drawn out have got use to the 350 to 380-390 range. And with what came off of there last year was well below the 350 range. I stopped a gentleman today to talk to him about what I do for a living, and just happened to bring up the elk subject and I wish I wouldn't have even have stopped to talk to him now because I probably lost a customer also. But even though that age class is still high on what comes in, the satisfaction rating is not very high on Monroe. Do we have any other comments? Cordell?

### **RAC Discussion and Vote (Elk):**

Cordell Pearson: I don't have a comment Jake. I'd just like to make a motion.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Okay. That we accept DWR's proposal except for the Monroe, and we keep the Monroe the same as it was last year. Also, one other thing that I'd like to reconvene the elk study on these units. And I know there was a comment come up a minute ago and I don't know if that's feasible now or not, with you. And you said we're going to do the plan again.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. If I read the motion right, we have a motion by Cordell to accept the DWR's recommendations on the elk units with the exception of the Monroe, we would leave that as the same number as last year, and to reconvene the elk committee as soon as possible. Am I correct?

Cordell Pearson: Statewide committee.

Jake Albrecht: Statewide. And if I read that right that's possible next year anyway. But do we have a second on that? Second by Gary Hallows. Do we have any other discussion? Rex Stanworth.

Rex Stanworth: I would ask this Board not to vote for the motion with the provision of reconvening the elk committee. It absolutely will not serve any purpose. It will be convened within, I think next year. And if you want to talk about futility that would be it. I think we should go ahead and let the elk committee reconvene at its time. I also would recommend that Anis, or whoever's there in that position, look a little more, a little more into the makeup of the committee so it's not such a tainted committee. And so I would suggest to this Board do not vote for the motion with that in it.

Jake Albrecht: Cordell, are you okay with uh . . . Settle down there Rex. Uh, with the meeting in 2010 was part of your motion? Okay. Okay, we have a motion, we have a motion by Cordell to accept the DWR's elk permit numbers with the exception of the Monroe and it stays the same as last year and that the Wildlife Board look at reconvening the elk committee at their next appropriate mandatory time, which I understand is 2010. And then we have a second by Gary on that. Any other comments? Seeing none, all in favor, right hand. We have one . . .

Rex Stanworth: That's reconvening when the Board (unintelligible).

Jake Albrecht: Right. Two, three, four, one, two, three, four, five. We have six in favor. All against? Six to four, motion carries.

**Cordell Pearson made motion to accept the DWR's elk permit numbers as proposed with the exception to leave the Monroe Mountain unit as it was last year and to have the Wildlife Board reconvene the statewide elk committee when scheduled. Gary Hallows seconded.**

**6 in favor 4 against: Steve Flinders, Paul Briggs, Clair Woodbury and James Edwards**

Jake Albrecht: Our next item is the Pronghorn Permit Recommendations. Anis.

**Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (action) (Pronghorn)**

**1:34:53 to 1:35:55 of 2:52:44**

**-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, questions from the RAC of Anis? Questions on the pronghorn? Clair Woodbury.

**Questions from the RAC (Pronghorn):**

Clair Woodbury: I know a couple of years ago we were talking about a significant impact by the drought years that we'd had, especially on the antelope. Are they recovering? Has that range recovered enough now?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. The majority of the units are doing well. We've had quite a few transplants as of late, to some of those units. And we have had favorable springtime and summer precipitation that a lot of those units have either leveled off or are seeing a little bit of an increase. You know there are some units that are still drought stricken and on those units we didn't recommend increases. But basically we need to realize that we're harvesting bucks. And production, the bucks are still out there. The buck to doe ratios are high. So even on units that are affected by the drought you only need, we're carrying probably 40 to 50 bucks per 100 does on a lot of these units. So we're in good shape as that goes.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton.

Steve Dalton: Yes I am on the antelope Parker Mountain Antelope Planning Committee and we haven't had a meeting for a couple of years, so I'm kind of curious what the population model looks like now at this point, and how things are proceeding with our management plan on the Parker Mountain.

Anis Aoude: I guess he says they are going to hold a meeting in April. It's above objective. I believe it's (what do you think your estimates?) Yeah, it's over 2,000, with an objective of 1,500.

Steve Dalton: You'll schedule a meeting right away Jim?

Anis Aoude: He's got one scheduled for April.

Steve Dalton: Okay.

Anis Aoude: All right, he's scheduling one in April.

Steve Dalton: This will be before the doe antelope permits . . . after that?

Anis Aoude: After that.

Steve Dalton: Why don't you hurry?

James Lamb: We'll have one tonight right after this. We had one in the parking lot.

Steve Dalton: I know. I wanted to make sure that it was recorded that we're going to have one here right away at least. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the public?

**Questions from the Public (Pronghorn):**

None

Jake Albrecht: We have no comment cards.

**Comments from the Public (Pronghorn):**

None

Jake Albrecht: So we're to comments from the RAC. Gary you can't leave we're going to vote.

Gary Hallows: Real quickly?

Jake Albrecht: No. Get back here. Any other comments from the RAC?

**Comments from the RAC (Pronghorn):**

None

Jake Albrecht: Steve, I'll entertain a motion, or somebody.

**RAC Discussion and Vote (Pronghorn):**

Steve Dalton: I'll make a motion that we accept their, the Division's recommendation for antelope.

Steve Flinders: Second.

Jake Albrecht: A motion by Steve and a second by Steve. All in favor. Motion carries.

**Steve Dalton made the motion to accept the pronghorn permit numbers as presented. Steve**

**Flinders seconded. Motion carries unanimous.**

Jake Albrecht: Anis. Gary, you may be excused.

**Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Permit Numbers for 2009 (action) (OIAL)**

**1:39:16 to 1:42:27 of 2:52:44**

**-Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator**

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Anis. We'll go to questions from the RAC. Has anybody got any questions? Steve? Anybody?

**Questions from the RAC (OIAL):**

Steve Dalton: Questions, no I don't have any questions. I've got some comments.

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the public?

Steve Dalton: Maybe I do have a question.

Jake Albrecht: Steve Dalton has a question.

Steve Dalton: I'm in favor of the original recommendation which was 152, which would have been what was agreed to when the bison plan was accepted by the Big Game Board and the Bison Planning Committee. I perhaps could have seen my way clear to agree to this other option, option 1, were it not for the way it was done. We have put together a bison planning committee and we don't have any meetings. The last meeting we had was one that I recommended just before the RAC meeting last year, this same RAC meeting. This year we didn't have a meeting and now they're changing what was agreed to when the bison management plan was accepted. And that's just . . . I just think that's a poor way for the Division to be doing business. And so consequently I'm, I want to go on record that if you're going to have a committee, similar to the Parker Mountain Antelope Committee, we haven't had a meeting in two years. I was on that committee as well and we haven't had a meeting. The people that were being impacted by those animals are having no input in the management of them and it's right back to what causing more problems with uh, more contention with the bison management by doing this again. And so I just want to be on the record that I'm really opposed to the way you're trying to handle this.

Jake Albrecht: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Anis I've got a document here that was mailed to me. This is supposed to have to do with your 2008 buffalo count this year. And I just would like to read what is on this and make the other RAC members aware of the count, if indeed this is the right information. And what I'm showing here is the count for '08, with the helicopter, it looks like you spent 10 hours in the air doing this with a various number of people. And you come up with 542 buffalo counted. And with a 90 percent sightability adjustment, that adjusted to 602. Are these numbers accurate?

Anis Aoude: Uh, I don't know, wait. Yeah. You've got to keep in mind that the plan is adults not total counted, post season. So this was before the season. We harvested some. Some of those were calves. So there's, there's, the numbers after the season are different than the numbers before the season because we harvested quite a few animals.



Sam Carpenter: Okay so let me continue on here. So if you had 100 percent success with the, the plan that calls for 152 buffalo, did not count the calves, you'd still have a population of 342.

Anis Aoude: Right, that's correct

Sam Carpenter: And your objective is what?

Anis Aoude: 300 and . . .

Sam Carpenter: (Unintelligible) 75 and then 305 next year?

Anis Aoude: 305. Post, post 2010 season. So we still have 2 hunting seasons before that.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. But the total tags is 152, is that correct?

Anis Aoude: Uh . . .

Sam Carpenter: Total tags.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Well that included Antelope Island.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. That's, that's what I wanted to know.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public. Please come forward.

#### **Questions from the Public (OIAL):**

Keith Darfy: Okay I'd like to just pose a scenario question which would lead to another question, very shortly. If DWR and the sportsman for wildlife or habitat or whatever were to go to down into the everglades and get 18 to 24 alligators and bring them up and plant them in the Dirty Devil drainage with Don Peay's help and some others, we could bring more gamblers into Utah and raise our revenue. Do you think that would be a good idea?

Jake Albrecht: We're talking about buffalo right now.

Keith Darfy: That's what this question is leading to because that is exactly what happened with the buffalo. We went to Yellowstone National Park, introduced a non-indigenous species to the Henry Mountains. And my question is should we have any buffalo on the Henry's under that scenario? Anybody?

Sam Carpenter: Yes. I think the opportunity to hunt those buffalo is fantastic. I'm glad that we did.

Keith Darfy: It is a fantastic opportunity, if they were indigenous. So let's move them up into northeastern Utah, like you did, so that they will be not an exotic introduced species.

Sam Carpenter: Exotic I doubt. Buffalo roamed the range . . .

Keith Darfy: It doesn't matter what you doubt. The facts are that they never were there.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. So leading back to your question, did you get that answered?

Keith Darfy: No. You all think it's okay to have exotic buffalo, exotic species on Utah land.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're getting away from our agenda item.

Keith Darfy: No, the buffalo question is still in play here.

Jake Albrecht: Anis, will you answer it then?

Anis Aoude: There's actually archeological evidence that bison were on the Henry Mountains.

Keith Darfy: That's BS.

Jake Albrecht: Do we have any other questions.

Keith Darfy: I have a map here that I would like to share with you.

Jake Albrecht: Will you please do that under comments then?

Keith Darfy: Yeah, sure.

Jake Albrecht: Okay.

Verlin King: Verlin King, Henry Mountain grazers. I'd like to ask what the percentage on the hunt was this last two years, if I could.

Anis Aoude: It varies.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, he wanted to know what the percentage was for the last two years. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude: Every one of those hunts has different success rates and they're varied from the 90's to the 80's. And there was a couple of hunts that were 68 percent or something like that. Wade has all the data if you want to go hunt by hunt. You know because we have, any bison hunts, we have cow hunts, and so on and so forth.

Wade Paskett: For last years hunt the overall success was 80 to 81 percent, right in there. You bet, 80 to 81 percent on last year's hunt. And I don't remember exactly what the previous year was; I think it was around 77 percent, overall success.

Verlin King: All right. I didn't follow you comment about 542 and then got to 602. And how did you get back to the 540 or . . .

Sam Carpenter: I'll try to clear that. The actual count including calves was 542 buffalo. They consider

90 percent sightability so they added 10 percent of that total to that and came up with 602 buffalo. They said that the calves are not really something that we're going to be killing this year, which left with the sightability factor in there at 494 buffalo. And my statement was if they killed 100 percent success they would still have 342 buffalo remaining. Is that?

Verlin King: My question is, where are you taking into account those calves that you didn't count that will be adults the next year.

Sam Carpenter: Good, Steve's got a comment on that one.

Jake Albrecht: So what's your question then Verlin?

Verlin King: Well it seems to us that you're not, somehow your model doesn't take into account the calves that are coming in. We've killed a large number of buffalo, or we have sold that many permits. Whether they were killed or not, you know, that's 80 percent or 70 percent, but every time we count them we've got a lot of buffalo still there. So are we not counting the calves or . . .

Sam Carpenter: My point was this, without counting the calves they are still at least 60 buffalo over their projected population. That was the point that I was trying to make.

Verlin King: This year and 160 next year.

Sam Carpenter: That was if they had 100 percent. Now next year you add the calves to it and you're right back; now they've got 450 buffalo. And I think Steve wanted to talk to you about this.

Steve Dalton: Yeah. I just wanted to reiterate the comment I made before. We wouldn't be having this discussion if we'd of had a bison planning committee meeting. All of this would have been discussed already. And we would be able to come here to the RAC and be close to agreeing on what's presented or recommended by the Division.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we're going to move right along and we're going to go to comments. These are the comment cards. Three minutes per individual, five minutes for an organized group. The first one is John Keeler with the Utah Farm Bureau. Hello John.

### **Comments from the Public (OIAL):**

John Keeler: John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau. We would like to support the plan that was proposed and the numbers in that plan. A lot has been said about the benefit of committees and a group and plan which we support 100 percent, but we feel like it ought to be followed. And just like Steve mentioned a lot of these questions and a lot of these problems could have been solved had we met and come forth with a recommendation. So we're supporting the original numbers of the original plan. Do we have those numbers?

Jake Albrecht: Anis, have you got the numbers?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, Option 2 gets you to that number.

John Keeler: Okay.

Jake Albrecht: All right. The next one is Commissioner Wood. Is he still here? There you are. You moved back a little ways on me.

Stanley Wood: My name is Commissioner Stanley Wood from Wayne County. We the Wayne County commission would like to go on record as being in full support of the Henry Mountain management plan. We are in the process of amending our county land use plan and we are going to incorporate the whole management plan into that. So we are definitely in support of that. And one other issue that I would like to deal with is transplants. I know this isn't the proper time. The commissioners would like to be involved when there's any transplants in or out. We want to be involved. And we are going to put that in our land use plan as well. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Commissioner. Mac Morrell.

Mac Morrell: Mac Morrell from the Wayne County Farm Bureau and the Henry Mountain Grazers. We would like the original, 3 yr plan, to be done before we make any changes. That means bring the buffalo down to 275. And then the committee meet and hammer out a new plan for that. Plus, the plan to go to 305 has a lot to do with habitat and vegetation and improvements, and that has not happened. So that's why we've got to bring them down to 275 and work from there. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Thanks Mac. David Brinkerhoff.

David Brinkerhoff: My comments are pretty much down the same line. We need to follow the plan that's already in place before we start trying to implement another plan. There's lots of issues that we need to hammer out before we get to another plan and trying to work through another one. This has been the problem in the past; before we get one issue solved why the DWR's got some more that's trying to, trying to raise the numbers before we get these other things implemented into our plan. Now there's a lot of issues that we need to deal with before we start raising numbers. As a permittee there's a winter issue allotment that we need to deal with before we start raising numbers also. That's the biggest issue here, that there's not enough winter projects done that they'll be able to maintain the number of 275. I'd just like to say again that we need to finish one plan before we start trying to implement another and then hammer out the issues that we need to deal with before implementing the next plan. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Verlin King.

Verlin King: Verlin King, president of the Henry Mountain Grazes. We were discouraged that, and I'm also a member of the Bison Management Committee. We were discouraged that we weren't, the meeting wasn't set up where everyone could talk this out. And I think we wouldn't have to be here so vocal as we are. We could be called the Friends of the Henry Mountains. It sounds like a good name. Our main purpose, the main thing we're worried about is the habitat on the Henry Mountains. And we would like to see the herd at 275 for at least two years like it says in the plan. Increases will be delayed for two years to allow habitat projects to become established. We'd like to see it at 275 before we start growing it. We're seeing places even on the Henry Mountains proper, meaning the summer range, where the buffalo are staying there for extended periods and are damaging the range. We've seen this happen on our winter range or desert country to more of a degree and a quicker problem, and a harder problem to fix. We, there is must be some kind of problem with the, well . . . I've heard a lot of hunters aren't

happy. There's too many hunters. There's too many people there. Not enough buffalo. Buffalo are harder to find. The weather. I, I agree. I don't like seeing all the hunters there set up in the certain places where they can set their camps while they're hunting. But I can get along with that. The problem has been the mismanagement of the numbers of the herd through the DWR for so many years. And at this time it's really hard to get them back in line, as we have seen the last two to three years that we've been trying to manage the numbers back to 275 and it hasn't happened. Every time we kill and then count we're still way out of line. So we would like at least to go with Option 2. And for the 2010 season we'll be back here and we'll probably be hunting 142 again. Thank you.

Jake Albrecht: Brandon, did you want to comment?

Brandon Barney: Brandon Barney, representing the Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. I was told to recommend Option one, due to the overcrowding fact. Some of the people felt that the reason that the percent was at 80 percent was due to the fact that there were too many people in the field on some of those later hunts. And by killing them and putting less people in the percent would go up which would get us to those numbers either way.

Sam Carpenter: Can I ask you a question real quick?

Jake Albrecht: Let's wait until the other guy gets done and then . . . Let's finish our comment cards and then we'll go back to them. Keith Durfy.

Keith Durfy: I have two maps here; one showing by William Hornady and other researchers the extent of buffalo before they started to be exterminated. At that point in time they were an expanding species, or new. There was very little differentiation between the mountain buffalo, or the woods buffalo, or the plains buffalo. And of course John Wesley Powell expedition never saw any buffalo. Fremont that went through Cathedral Valley, no buffalo. Capital Reef National Park, Dr. Genesky from BYU, 4-year study, and I was with him on much of that study, no sign of buffalo. Dr. Lee Kritzer, archeologist for BYU, working with BYU from Capital Reef, no buffalo. Capital Reef National Park has fenced the buffalo attempting to keep them out of the park, however it hasn't worked because I saw buffalo in the park this fall. Not only that but Colorado National Monument has fenced the buffalo out of their monument over by Grand Junction. The facts, the truth of any buffalo that guesses in your court now. There were no buffalo in the Henry Mountain area. They are an exotic and introduced species. And if you follow your laws you shouldn't have them there. It's just like introducing chukars from Turkey and they've killed all of the quail in Capital Reef National Park. There's not one left. There are unintended consequences to every decision. Buffalo in the Henry Mountains is the root of all of the mismanagement in the Henry Mountain resource area. I would plead with you to consider removing the buffalo entirely; doing away with all this discussion, all these issues and the problems. Here are those maps. I and my dad have felt the impact of these buffalo which spent 90 percent of their summer months on our property and that that Steve Dalton manages on the Henry Mountains, have not received not one sympathetic word or one cent in remuneration for that. And it's rotten. You guys, I know you're money driven but please, think this over. Remove the buffalo from the Henry Mountains. Remove this problem. And forget about talking about numbers because there shouldn't be any there. I'll leave these; you can make copies of them.

Jake Albrecht: Just leave them with them gentleman right there. Okay, that concludes our comment cards. Do we have, I know we had a couple of questions for Brandon there. Do you want to ask those now? Brandon, please come up to the mic.

Sam Carpenter: This is a real simple one, I just wondered when SFW made the recommendation were they aware of these numbers?

Brandon Barney: Yeah, I talked to Don as I walked in the door, yes.

Sam Carpenter: You seen them when you came in the door?

Brandon Barney: No, I don't know if Don had a copy e-mailed to him. He just told me that he would prefer the one that puts the permits closer to the same numbers. I mean I realize that we're over objective and either way we do it, I mean we're either going to be at 275 next year and 305 the year after. So I mean, either way.

Sam Carpenter: Right. Okay thank you

James Edwards: Yeah, Brandon I have a questions. Last year when we went over these plans and we had the buffalo, bison committee together they, the Sportsman for Wildlife came and said that they was going to take and put in some water construction projects and some troughs down through there. Did that happen?

Wade Paskett: Okay, just specifically the water, the troughs?

James Edwards: They said they were going to make some water construction projects and some habitat changes.

Wade Paskett: Yeah I can go, I've got all the habitat projects I can list them for you if you'd like.

Sam Carpenter: Oh okay. I just wanted to know yes or no if it happened.

Wade Paskett: Yes.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, thank you.

Wade Paskett: Let me qualify that, a lot of habitat projects have been done, not all of them have.

Jake Albrecht: Sorry to put you on the spot there Brandon. Comments from the RAC. Steve Dalton.

**Comments from the RAC (OIAL):**

Steve Dalton: Yeah I've got another comment. A lot of money's been spent out there but it, that doesn't mean that we've increased our carrying capacity on the range out there. Mac made reference to it, Mac Morrell, that part of this plan after we've reached the 275 head, before we increase to 305 which was the first step up on the increase of the herd towards 325, that needs to be justified by increased carrying capacity on the range through range improvement projects that SFW is contributing to and some of those have been done, some of them are not completed yet but they're working on them. But it hasn't worked down to increasing our carrying capacity on that range at this point. Here again, all of these discussions should have been had at the bison planning committee level before we come here to the

RAC meeting.

Jake Albrecht: Gary Hallows.

Gary Hallows: I met with the BLM area manager today and she in tune got in touch with the district manager, Cornell Christensen. And I also stopped and talked with the state land people today and they were all, informed me that they like to be involved with these decisions through our management team like we were supposed to do. And they also stated that they wouldn't go along with any number increases until we went through that process and evaluated the range. So they are in favor of our management team getting, or our working groups to get back together. And so they all three told me to announce that tonight that they were in favor of getting our working groups together before we changed our management plan.

Jake Albrecht: Mr. Briggs.

Paul Briggs: I'm not sure if it was an oversight or what the situation was but none of those folks provided anything for me to address that with tonight.

Gary Hallows: That's because they didn't know about it. I brought it to both of them's attention this morning and they don't know anything about any of this stuff. That's the problem. And you call them when you get home.

Jake Albrecht: Any other comments? Rex Stanworth has a comment.

Rex Stanworth: Anis, is there, obviously you're over numbered on the bison. What about an objective hunt? You start to hunt and you go through with the hunt until you get the numbers down where they're supposed to be. Like the buffalo that come out of the park, you know? Those buffalo come out of the park, they keep calling the hunters until there's no more buffalo outside of the park. It looks like to me some sort of an objective hunt, with numbers being kept like we've done on lions and that, would be something that would possibly work for here to try to get these numbers down to where everybody can agree; and now we can go forward. Has that been looked at or?

Anis Aoude: No. Basically we made a 3-year plan to get the number to objective. And it will get there by next year if we take Option 2. We just wanted to smooth the transition out, that's all.

### **RAC Discussion and Vote (OIAL):**

Dell LeFevre: I make a motion we go with Option Number 2.

Jake Albrecht: We have a motion by Dell LeFevre and a second by Steve Dalton that we go with Option number 2. Before we vote on the motion I'd like to say just a couple of things. When we voted on this in 2007, the way I remember, and I tried to pull up all my old books tonight and I'm missing one, but the way I remember the motion was and what was accepted by the Wildlife Board, and they might correct me if I'm wrong, is we would have our numbers back down to 275 by the end of this year. And also, that the bison committee would meet annually to discuss what was going on there. And I think that is the most important part of the whole thing is that hasn't been done. So whether the BLM's not involved or somebody else is not involved, here we are back again struggling over permit numbers. And those

people who are going to hunt this year, they'll probably have a good hunt but they'd have a lot better if it was Option Number 1. But this Board voted and we all, you know, put our trust in it and that's the way it was. So I think that's the way it needs to stay. And when actually Option Number 1 is probably a better scenario. But anybody else got any comments?

Rex Stanworth: I'm just wondering on their motion if we want to make sure that we put in there that we want to see that management team to get together, period.

Dell LeFevre: I would amend my motion to that.

Jake Albrecht: And we have a second by Steve also on that? Okay. We have a motion by Commissioner LeFevre to go with Option 2, and also that it be mandatory that the bison committee work together on this. And we have a second by Steve Dalton. Is there any other comments? Okay, seeing none, all in favor right hand. I have 8. Those against? 1. Motion carries.

**Dell LeFevre made the motion to accept Option Number 2 regarding bison permit numbers (to reduce population to 275 adults post season 2009 and increase to 305 post season 2010) and that the bison committee reconvenes and works on the bison plan. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carries. 9 in favor 1 against: Clair Woodbury against**

Jake Albrecht: Okay, before we move on we need to have another motion to accept the remainder of the OIAL Permit Numbers.

Rex Stanworth: I recommend that we accept the Division's numbers on the OIAL hunts.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Rex Stanworth and a second by Jim Edwards that we approve the remainder of the Division's recommendations on OIAL permits. All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the remainder of the OIAL recommendations as presented. James Edwards seconded. Motion carries unanimously.**

Jake Albrecht: Our next item of business is the 5-year Statewide Sharp-tail Grouse transplant. This is by Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator. Hello Dave.

**5-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list (action) 2:16:00 to 2:22:34 of 2:52:44  
-Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the RAC. You got it.

**Questions from the RAC:**

Clair Woodbury: Being where upland game birds are my love, what caused the decline of such if the distribution was so widespread historically?

Dave Olsen: Probably most of it was habitat related. They were hunted heavily. If you look at a lot of the journals they were generally distinguished in journal entries from sage grouse by being called prairie



grouse. And they did form an opportunity to feed families and things like that during settlement. But a lot of it was habitat related. A lot of that growth that's happened in the northern part of the state is a direct reflection of conservational reserve programs that have been, the contracts that were signed by landowners and were beneficial to sharp-tails.

Clair Woodbury: So they need grasslands, is that what you're saying?

Dave Olsen: They're strongly associated with grasslands and sagebrush interface. And they rely heavily on mixed browse communities as well.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the public?

**Questions from the Public:**

None

Jake Albrecht: We have no comment cards.

**Comments from the Public:**

None

Jake Albrecht: So we're to comments from the RAC.

**Comments from the RAC:**

None

Jake Albrecht: Clair?

**RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Clair Woodbury: I propose we accept the Division's recommendation as presented.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Clair Woodbury to make this a 10-year and accept it was presented. A second by Sam Carpenter. Any other discussion? All in favor. Any against? Motion carries, unanimous.

**Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept the 10-yr Statewide Sharp-tail grouse transplant list as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carries unanimous.**

Jake Albrecht: Our next one is Sage grouse transplant proposal. This is an action item. Brian Maxfield.

**Sage grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain (action)**

**2:24:45 to 2:34:07 of 2:52:44**

**-Brian Maxfield, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Jake Albrecht: Questions from the RAC. Gary Hallows.

### Questions from the RAC:

Gary Hallows: Is there any way we can promote this? This is a good thing. I feel bad that we didn't get it through the (unintelligible) beforehand, but I understand the reasons why. But I think we need to put this out so that it shows the outside world, when we're moving sage hens from one area to another, I think that's a good thing. And I think it shows the world that we're really doing what we say we've been doing here all these years. I'd like to, I guess I ask you the question, is this something that we can televise a little? And in this case at this particular time in history I think it's a good thing to be a little. .

..

Brian Maxfield: I totally agree. I think we have opportunities to put this out, especially in the state. This information has been put into the scientific literature now. Baxter has published this. So it's getting out there.

Gary Hallows: We had lots of tours out there last summer and had the Audubon Society and that, all of these big groups that were just flabbergasted we were doing all these things. And they wanted to help. And they wanted to put money in. And in this case I think the more we talk about this at this particular time in history I . . . Anyway I'm in support of this. But I think we really need to make a big issue with this. I guess that 's in question and comment, sorry Jake.

Jake Albrecht: I notice that you had some predator listings there. Are the eagles a problem on those?

Brian Maxfield: We have had some of the grouse on Anthro Mountain killed by golden eagles, right on the lek, but it's not very significant. The largest mortality on Anthro is predators, and most of that are mammals, coyotes. The eagles, we have other areas in the state that eagles can be a significant impact, especially in the spring. When the males are on the strutting ground they're not paying too much attention to what's around them.

Jake Albrecht: Any other questions? Rex.

Rex Stanworth: You brought up a word I didn't think I would ever hear from a Division guy, and that is a treated egg. And down in our country, Millard County, when we used to have lots and lots of pheasants they treated eggs. The game warden treated eggs and he went down through all the drains and along the river and he dropped these tainted eggs in every hole and we had pheasants. And uh now, you know, we're told we can't do that. Have you got any comments in regards to? Maybe I'm confused.

Brian Maxfield: Um we actually have been doing this for, I believe, 4 years in the northeastern part of the state. It was something that the Strawberry Valley did, aggressively. They have a lot of ravens in Strawberry Valley. And we have a lot of raven associated with; well ravens are just associated with people. But we've been putting out, last year we put out over 4,000 of those eggs. And they figure one out of four eggs kills a raven. So we're not, we're seeing some dead ones but we're not seeing what we'd expect. But yeah, it's something that it started, just as transplants need to be put out there, raven control for sage grouse and upland game is something that is gaining interest.

Douglas Messerly: Rex if I can continue to actually answer your question with regard to why we're not

doing it in other areas. This is a highly regulated substance that they're putting in these eggs. And the uses that we're putting it to in these special situations are by special permit based on the fact of the situation with sage grouse populations in general, with the sensitive nature or their population levels. It's not something that can be used generally. It can only be used by certain people under special permit, under very particular circumstances. So times have changed with regard to how we do things over the years. And I think you can go through a lot of pesticides and a lot of chemicals that we put on the ground and illustrate that.

Brian Maxfield: Yeah like I said this compound is specific to those kinds of animals. And as Doug mentioned, Wildlife Services are the only ones that are approved to do this. We actually, they put out the eggs and ask us where to put them. You know we tell them where to go put them. So as Doug said, it is very regulated. And they're only allowed, the ration of one to four, they're only allowed to kill so many ravens. So they can only put out some many eggs statewide each year. And that's also, you know, they do this for livestock also.

Rex Stanworth: Ravens...you are allowed to shoot a raven but you're not allowed to shoot a crow or is that visa versa?

Doug Messerly: Let's be very clear. You can shoot a crow if they are depredating or causing a nuisance but you can't shoot a raven.

Jake Albrecht: Clair Woodbury.

Clair Woodbury: I've got a question on this wildcat that he accidentally got it going. You know we know that leks are the key to sage grouse and if you've discovered a way to create a lek you're going to be a hero in the whole western United States in the sage grouse community. I've got a question on this wild cat

Brian Maxfield: That would have to fall back on a couple of Division employees that are fairly high up in the Division right now that did that. So if it does turn out they maybe will be quite famous. But that process is similar to what Dave just talked about, the fall release for sharp tails. They're doing that for sharp tails so it looks like that may be the key.

Clair Woodbury: And that will create the new leks then huh?

Brian Maxfield: We'll see.

Clair Woodbury: Boy I sure hope that works. That would be fantastic.

Brian Maxfield: It would be nice.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have any questions from the public? Please come forward young man.

### **Questions from the Public:**

Jerry Dastrup: Jerry Dastrup. I just a question, how the Parker Mountain flock is doing? I know they're

down from their historic highs but whether they're stabilized or going up? And then secondary to that question what we're doing to increase that flock, improve habitat in that area?

James Lamb: In the interest of time I'll come back and visit with you about all the efforts the PARM (Parker Area Resource Management) has made over the last, what is it ten years? Uh, the population on the Parker Mountain is increasing, slowly. We have expanded our efforts to find, locate leks, which are the breeding grounds for those birds. And this year we're going to expand it even further with two different aerial searches, one by helicopter, one by plane, to make sure that we're not missing counting some grouse that are there. Our high count last year, we're just beginning to count this year, and next week we'll start. Our high count last year was down a few grouse from the year before. And we've had a record high, in the last five years we've had a record high every year and then last year it dipped by, I think, four birds. Does that answer your questions?

Gary Hallows: Jim, while you're there is it alright if we invite these RAC members to come, invite them to the counting process next week or on the 15<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> of April?

James Lamb: Yeah I didn't know of the PARM set a date yet.

Gary Hallows: Yeah somebody informed me today that those were the dates.

James Lamb: Okay. I just e-mailed Todd a couple of days ago to see if he had written a date down.

Gary Hallows: I think it would be interesting if any of these guys want to come and participate in that.

James Lamb: We have an e-mail list for everyone on the RAC, is that correct?

Gary Hallows: I think you'd really enjoy that.

James Lamb: When we set that date then I'll . . .

Gary Hallows: We come back and we make a big event out of it. We don't eat sage hen either.

Jake Albrecht: Does Gary have one?

James Lamb: Pardon?

Jake Albrecht: Does Gary have one?

James Lamb: An e-mail address? I just call him; it's easier. But I know you have an e-mail . .

Gary Hallows: But anyway we'd like to invite all of you to participate because there's a lot of lek sights and we like to send help to all of them. And it's a neat thing.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. Before we go to a motion we have one other item that was brought up earlier in the meeting, the Wayne County Commissioners would like to be notified of any thing that's happening there, in or out. So please make note of that Jim. Wayne County Commissioners would like to be notified . . .

James Lamb: I'm meeting with them on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Jake Albrecht: All right, you'll notify them then.

**Comments from the Public:**

None

**Comments from the RAC:**

None

Jake Albrecht: Okay, do we have a motion? Gary.

**RAC Discussion and Vote:**

Gary Hallows: I make a motion we, whatever the hell we need to do. Yeah, in favor of the motion.

Jake Albrecht: Okay, we have a motion by Gary Hallows to approve the sage grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain. And we have a second by Dell LeFevre, is that correct?

Dell LeFevre: Yeah.

Jake Albrecht: All in favor? Any against? Motion carries.

**Gary Hallows made the motion to accept the sage grouse transplant proposal for Anthro Mountain as presented. Dell LeFevre seconded. Motion carries unanimous.**

**Other Business: See Email**

Jake Albrecht: This is an informational item but before we get to that, is Kirk Herbert still here? Okay, he wanted to talk about changing a dedicated hour, 24-hour workweek. So I'll visit with Kirk. I know him. Information item only for Rex. This is information only and then we'll discuss it later if it gets to that point. Rex you have the floor.

Rex Stanworth: I had a couple of gentlemen that came in to my office and chatted with me. The southern region and the central region intersect on Highway 6 and 50, which goes right through the middle of the farming community. And it goes right through Delta and Hinkley's main street. So on the north side you have central, on the south side you have southern. And we have a lot of farmers that have ranches and operations on both sides of the road. We know for a fact that we have a lot of people who have one permit verses another permit; they hunt on both sides of the road. In talking briefly with Sean Kelly and with Doug, I mentioned to them and it would be very easy to ask for a change in the boundary of the southern region to include the entire farming community of Delta. And it has very visible landmarks in that the Intermountain Power Project power lines come off of Highway 6 and 50, which is the present boundary. It goes north and intersects the line at what the call the Brush-Wellman Highway. And that Brush-Wellman Highway would be the north boundary. That would continue east and match

back up with Highway 6, which is the original boundary. So we're talking about, what would you say Jim, how many square miles? Probably four or five miles across, probably five miles, six miles long. But it would incorporate everybody into one particular thing. I know Sean's indicated that he manages kind of both of those areas. And it would certainly keep us from having folks who want to be legitimate legal citizens with a permit, would keep them from crossing boundaries to hunt. So we just want to promote this and send it to the Board. Let some others look at it and see if it's possible. Then it would come back to us, probably in the fall. And from there we could make some motions as to whether or not we wanted to adopt it.

Jake Albrecht: I'm going to let Doug make a comment on this for just one second and then we'll make a motion to adorn.

Douglas Messerly: Thanks Rex, I appreciate you bringing this proposal forward. Um, there's some clarification first of all. The boundary that you're speaking of is actually the general season deer hunt boundary between the regions rather than the administrative boundary, which is totally separate, because the southern region actually administers all of Millard County. And although the general season deer hunt boundary is as you've described, and I presume that's what you're proposing to change. Um, so we need to make that point. I think the proposal would accomplish the goals that you've set out, and that is to make it so the people with southern region deer tags could hunt in the area that you're describing. And whenever we solve a problem for one person we sometimes have the potential of creating a problem for another person so there may be a few deer in those fields that people are accustomed to hunting with central region deer tags which have been easier to get, frankly, so I think we need to be aware of unconvincing, or the potential for unconvincing those people. The other thing is that I was around when the boundaries were created and the state was split up into general season deer hunting units. And one of the directives that we have, and we've kind of continued with this tradition when we create hunting boundaries, is to use major roads and highways to avoid confusion. Because, although I'm sure that most of the people that live in Delta are quite familiar with where the Brush- Wellman road is, I'm also certain that most of the people that live in Salt Lake City or St. George are not. And so it can create some confusion in those regards, if there were to be some people going out there in the general deer season to hunt those deer. So the potential exists for that. As we compound these boundaries with these jogs, etc, the potential exists for some confusion on those parts. I checked with our law enforcement folks today with regard to this and wondered if they had encountered any problems. And I talked with both Scott Dalebout and Sergeant Fred Pannunzio and they couldn't remember an incident where there had been confusion or where we had encountered a violation or cited someone for hunting deer with the wrong region deer tag in these areas. So, um, you know the fact is that these deer are huntable by either method, by either the current boundary or with the change that you've proposed. I guess the difference that I see is that if we include them as southern region deer, frankly they'll probably be harder to get a permit to hunt. So, in any event those are essentially our comments. I encourage us to go forward with, you know, asking this be an agenda item if you still want to do that. I e-mailed this to the Salt Lake office this morning and the question has been posed statewide. Now we may want to consider Salina, for example, because the main street in Salina also separates the southern from the central region. So as you can see there's a lot of potential, I think, and I think as we look statewide there's probably going to be a lot of places. . . And it's primarily a factor of using major roads and highways for these boundaries in the interest of simplicity.

Rex Stanworth: One other question I was just going to ask Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: Paul and Steve, these two things would favor you. Where there are large scale explorations that go on on BLM and Forest Service lands, are, is the DWR contacted in regards to what they're doing, how they're doing it, how many people are going to be there, the impact that they're going to have on the resource? And the reason I tell you that is because last year during the elk hunt there was the exploration guys going from the Scipio lake side taking a helicopter with, I think explosives, up over the top and coming down off on the east, or on the west side of that mountain, raising all kinds of hell and havoc. So I'm just wondering, is the DWR notified of that?

Steve Flinders: Yeah we go through the formal NEPA process, for that exploratory seismic work that you're talking about. I'm familiar with that project. We had exclusionary dates that we uh, laid on that contractor. And I don't recall the dates off hand. They're, if you're the contractor they're, how can I work within this framework? Geeze, you don't give me any days. But if you're the hunter that they fly over or mess up, we tried to stay out of the general season hunts. We try to stay away from the limited entry hunts. But, you know, there was some overlap in archery hunting and some overlap on the cow elk hunters and things like that. But we try to stay away from the guys who were giving up the most bonus points and allow the seismic work to go on, but we do.

Jake Albrecht: Okay. I thought we had a very good meeting tonight. We had a good attendance. There were lots of comments that were brought forward. And I think the RAC responded very appropriately in most cases. And I want to thank you for your time. Motion to adorn? Second? All in favor? Next meeting will be in Beaver, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 7 O'clock. Gary's in charge of the refreshments.

Douglas Messerly: 6:30.

**Meeting was adjourned at 9:54pm**

**MOTIONS MATRIX**  
**SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER**

March 18, 2009

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION:** to approve the agenda as printed.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**MOTION:** to approve the minutes as written.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009**

**MOTION:** to approve Option #2 for the bison plan.

**PASSED:** With a majority vote. Two opposing votes were cast.

**MOTION:** to approve permit numbers for the balance of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL species as presented with the motion that statewide deer, elk and bison committees reconvene to address existing issues.

**PASSED:** unanimously

**FIVE-YEAR STATEWIDE SHARP-TAIL GROUSE TRANSPLANT LIST**

**MOTION:** to approve the five-year sharp-tail grouse transplant list as presented.

**PASSED:** unanimously



**SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**

**John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River**

**March 18, 2009**

**Commence at 6:30 p.m.; Adjourn at 9:30 p.m.**

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

|                  |                     |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Albrecht, Kevin  | U.S. Forest Service |
| Bates, Bill      | Regional Supervisor |
| Byrnes, Verd     | At Large            |
| Gilson, James    | Sportsmen           |
| Hatch, Jordan    | Agriculture         |
| Hoskisson, Wayne | Environmental       |
| Kamala, Laura    | Environmental       |
| Maldonado, Walt  | Sportsmen           |
| Riddle, Pam      | BLM                 |
| Sanslow, Terry   | At Large            |

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

|                |                  |
|----------------|------------------|
| Bayles, Lyle   | At Large         |
| Sitterud, Drew | Elected Official |

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

|              |             |
|--------------|-------------|
| Adams, Bruce | At Large    |
| Lewis, Kurt  | Agriculture |

**UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Aoude, Anis  
Bates, Bill  
Crompton, Brad  
Paskett, Wade  
Stettler, Brent  
Wallace, Guy

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 22**

**CONDUCTING THE MEETING**

-James Gilson, RAC Chairman

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Kevin Albrecht to approve the agenda as printed.

**SECOND by** Walt Maldonado

**PASSED** unanimously

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

-James Gilson, Chairman

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Terry Sanslow to approve the minutes of the previous meeting as written.

**SECOND by** Kevin Albrecht

**PASSED** unanimously

**OLD BUSINESS**

By Terry Sanslow, RAC Vice Chairman

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

Terry informed the RAC that coyote control funding was not being fully utilized in all counties.

Jordan protested that we need to find out why, due to the fact that Wildlife Services was under-funded and could use the money that was not being used.

**MOTION by N/A**  
**SECOND by**  
**PASSED:**

**REGIONAL UPDATE**

By Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

**Questions from the RAC:**

**Questions from the Audience:**

**Comments from the Audience:**

**Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

James Gilson asked when RAC terms expire.

Bill Bates replied that they expired on June 30, 2009.

Bill invited members to look for nominees to replace those who will be lost to the council.

James Gilson protested what appeared to him to be an increasing bear population. Bear population objectives called for stable, rather than increasing number of bears.

**MOTION by N/A**  
**SECOND by**  
**PASSED:**

**BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2009**

By Anis Aoude, Big Game Coordinator

**Questions from the RAC:**

Terry Sanslow engaged Anis Aoude in a discussion over what appeared to be an increasing number of deer permits on the Henry Mountains. Anis disputed Terry's assertion.

Jordan Hatch queried biologists about bison post-season counts and hunter success. Jordan was suspect of DWR's population model and expected end result.

Walt Maldonado spoke in behalf of his constituents, who insist that the quality of bucks on the Book Cliffs has dropped.

James Gilson asked Anis about statewide deer hunter success over the last few years, and vented his frustration that harvest success has not improved during his tenure on the RAC.

Verd Byrnes asked about age-at-harvest elk tag returns, and then voiced his concern about the perceived decline in bull quality.

**Questions from the Audience:**

Verlan King asked Anis how a landowner association is formed.

David Brinkerhof aired his concern about the elk herd on the Henry Mountains and why the previous hunts have not been able to eradicate them. David also lamented the perceived increase in pronghorn herd size.

Verlan King asked about future elk hunting on the Henry Mountains.

David Bailey asked why the bison committee had not met to discuss bison numbers. Anis answered that the time frame did not allow a meeting. David proposed Option 2.

#### **Comments from the Audience:**

Jason Branson voiced his perception that deer have not been managed well enough to keep young hunters interested in hunting.

Darren Gardner insisted that DWR buck: doe ratios were wrong. There are fewer bucks than reported.

Shayne Thompson asked questions about the deer herd objective, and where the herd stands today. He expressed disappointment in the size of Utah's deer herd.

Jason Branson proposed that the DWR reduce hunter numbers.

Troy Anderson stated that wildlife was a business, and that professional biologists needed to listen to their customers.

Paul Pace proposed that bison hunting objectives be passed through the working group. He favored Option 2.

David Brinkerhof of the Henry Mountains Grazing Association spoke in favor of the continuation of a bison working group and placed his vote alongside Option 2.

Verlan King asserted that the population model didn't seem to be correct. He supported Option 2.

#### **Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

Bill Bates advised the RAC that a range trend crew would be conducting habitat studies on the Henry Mountains this year.

Pam Riddle indicated that the Hanksville BLM office favored Option 1. Pam also asserted that the Hanksville BLM supported the DWR in its bison management.

Walt Maldonado asked for clarification on Options 1 and 2. Bill Bates explained the differences.

Kevin Albrecht made a statement about his service on the statewide mule deer committee. He spoke of the committee's initial optimism. Kevin then reminisced about the gradual decline in quality suffered by his extended family's deer hunting camp over the years.

Verd Byrnes commented about the public's misperception of buck: doe ratios.

Terry Sanslow expressed disappointment over the decline in quality bucks. Terry also affirmed the loss in the quality of Book Cliffs bucks as reported by Walt Maldonado's constituents.

Walt Maldonado spoke in behalf of his constituents, saying that they would support reduced hunting, if the reduction would improve hunting quality.

With regard to the state's loss of deer, Jordan Hatch hypothesized that we have traded deer for elk. In the 60's, there were no elk, but lots of deer. Besides, trading elk for deer, we would have more deer, if we killed more coyotes and improved habitat.

Wayne Hoskisson asserted that range conditions have deteriorated to the point that we can't expect to stock as many livestock or wildlife under present circumstances.

James Gilson related his disappointment about the lack of progress during the last eight years. James concluded that it was time to reduce the number of deer tags.

Verd Byrnes related that his family was so frustrated with hunting in Utah that they had decided to hunt in Colorado.

James Gilson added a comment from his father that he had decided to stop hunting.

Bill Bates spoke of his father's career and about the livestock density and range condition of yesteryear. Jim Bates saw far worse conditions than we have now. Bill suggested that it may take many years before our habitat work improves carrying capacity to a significant measure.

**MOTION by** Jordan Hatch to accept Option 2 with regard to the bison plan.

**SECOND by** Walt Maldonado

**PASSED:** With a majority vote. Opposing the motion were Laura Kamala and Pam Riddle.

**MOTION by** Terry Sanslow to accept the permit numbers for the Bucks and Bulls proclamation as presented with the motion that deer, elk and bison committees reconvene to address existing issues.

**SECOND by** Walt Maldonado

**PASSED** unanimously

### **5-YEAR STATEWIDE SHARP-TAIL GROUSE TRANSPLANT LIST**

-By Brad Crompton, Acting Wildlife Program Manager

#### **Questions from the RAC:**

Verd Byrnes asked about places of sharp-tail introduction and was answered by Brad Crompton. Pam Riddle asked about the potential consequences to areas occupied by sharp-tails, if the species were listed as threatened or endangered. Bill Bates addressed Pam's concern by stating that the plan was intended to prevent listing of the species.

#### **Questions from the Audience:**

#### **Comments from the Audience:**

#### **Comments/Discussion from the RAC:**

**MOTION by** Kevin Albrecht moved to accept the statewide sharp-tail grouse transplant plan as presented.

**SECOND by** Pam Riddle

**PASSED** unanimously

### **ADJOURNMENT**

James Gilson adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.