

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
August 4, 2009 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Approval of May 19, 2009 minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as transcribed
Passed unanimously

Proposed Fee Schedule

MOTION: To accept the fee schedule as proposed
Passed unanimously

Wildlife Board and RAC Rule amendment R657-39

MOTION: To accept the Board and RAC rule as proposed
Passed unanimously

Error Remedy Rule Amendment r657-50

MOTION: To accept the rule amendment as proposed
Passed unanimously

Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54

MOTION: To accept the proposed guidebook, rule, permit allocation and transplant list
Passed unanimously

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

MOTION: To accept the Divisions recommendations as proposed
Passed 9 to 1

Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10

MOTION: To approve the cougar guidebook and rule as presented
Passed unanimously

Cougar Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the plan as presented
Passed unanimously

Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendation as presented
Passed 6 to 5

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
August 4, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Micki Bailey, BLM
John Bair, Sportsmen
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Byron Gunderson, At Large
Richard Hansen, At Large
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive
Allan Stevens, At Large

Members Absent

George Holmes, Agriculture
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

Others Present

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board Member

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

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by Byron Gunderson

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Approval of the May 19, 2009 summary** (Action)

VOTING

Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the summary notes as transcribed

Seconded by Gary Nielson

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Regional Update** (Information)

- Craig Clyde, Central Regional Wildlife Program Manager

4) **Proposed Fee Schedule** (Action)

- Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief

Questions from the RAC

John Bair – We have been arguing about the non-resident cougar and bear pursuit permit price for as long as I can remember. This is good to see.

Questions from the Public

? - Could we raise that higher?

Greg Sheehan – Possibly. The fee was set based on the ratio for what a resident versus non-resident pays for a kill tag for the amount.

VOTING

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept fee schedule as presented
Seconded by Byron Gunderson**

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

- 5) **Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment – R657-39 (Action)**
- **Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief**

VOTING

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the Board and RAC rule amendment
Seconded by Matt Clark**

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

- 6) **Error Remedy Rule Amendment – R657-50 (Action)**
- **Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Section Chief**

Questions from the RAC

Byron Gunderson – If someone tries to buy a license at an agent but the computers are down so they go fishing without one, is there any mitigating circumstance for that?

Greg Sheehan – I know it has happened before. The official answer is no. We do have a phone line you can call now to buy a license which is independent from our sales system.

Richard Hansen – Is Fallon considered a third party?

Greg Sheehan – They are considered Division errors as are our license agents.

VOTING

**Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept rule as presented
Seconded by John Bair**

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

- 7) **Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54**
- **Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Allan Stevens – If you are unsuccessful in the limited entry draw and get a bonus point and then buy permit over the counter would you lose your bonus point?

Dave Olsen – No.

Allan Stevens – Will the region wide hunts use the same boundaries as they are now?

Dave Olsen – No they would be more inline with our administrative boundaries.

Richard Hansen – Are the numbers you gave regarding hunter satisfaction the same from region to region?

Dave Olsen – It was a conglomerate for the state.

John Bair – So the region boundaries would not be what the deer boundaries are?

Dave Olsen – That's correct.

Duane Smith – With the general statewide hunt do you see that putting any undue pressure in the southern region? It seems that would be hard to manage.

Dave Olsen – It will be interesting to see how hunters distribute themselves. In other states there were higher concentrations of hunters around urban areas.

Duane Smith – That should show up in the hunter satisfaction survey.

Dave Olsen - The phone survey will focus on counties.

Fred Oswald – I understand there is a minimum acreage for landowner permits. Why are landowners limited to a single permit? If a landowner has 1,000 acres that is turkey habitat shouldn't they be able to get more than one permit?

Dave Olsen – I guess that could be looked at. In the past there were fewer units and the limit was part in fairness.

Craig Clyde – For clarification, if a landowner has enough land in separate parcels they could apply for more than one permit however he could only receive one permit for himself and the others could be given to family.

Byron Gunderson –Is part of the criteria to get a landowner permit that your land has to be open to turkey hunting?

Dave Olsen – I am not sure that applies to this process. It does to landowner associations.

Fred Oswald – No your land does not have to open.

Questions from the Public

Mike Pritchett – In the past we have brought birds from out of state. Are we going to try to bring birds from out of state or use depredation birds that are in Utah?

Dave Olsen – We are looking at focusing on instate birds because of expense and disease issues.

Comments from the Public

Mike Pritchett – SFW – I served on the turkey committee the last five years. We have worked with National Wild Turkey Federation, Dave and all the regional biologists to formulate the recommendation and we feel that it is a great recommendation. We are finally reaching our goal of going over the counter with permits and giving more opportunity. The National Wild Turkey federation is 100 percent in support of this recommendation and we hope you pass this on to the board for approval.

Doug Jones – I support over the counter turkey permits. There are great compromises here with some limited entry, some over the counter, youth hunts and hunts for disabled. I have received and will receive complaints about too many hunters. We will loose some turkey hunters I say so what. The dedicated hunters who are willing to get off the road will still be successful. I support this proposal.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – We are voting both on the proposed rule and the transplant list as well.

VOTING

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the proposed guidebook, rule, permit allocation and transplant list

Seconded by John Bair

John Bair – I think the turkey program has been a great success.

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

8) Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (Action)

- Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Matt Clark – I know the Division has been relocating nuisance geese. Can you comment on how that program is going?

Tom Aldrich – For those of you who are unaware, in Salt Lake City we have an increasingly difficult problem with Canada geese and we do have a number of areas with an urban goose problem. Three years ago we started moving adults and young out of the city. We move the adults to Clear Lake and infuse the young into broods in the north. We marked all the birds to monitor what is happening. So far virtually none of the young have returned to the city and about 40 percent of the adults come back. I consider it very successful for moving the young and fairly successful for moving the adults.

Matt Clark – The literature we received showed one pintail and the presentation said two?

Tom Aldrich – It is two. The fly way meeting had not taken place when the mailing went out.

Fred Oswald – We have some comments regarding the motorless WMAs. Could you comment on that?

Tom Aldrich – This proposal is similar to a proposal that was presented to the RACs three years ago. In lieu of making a decision at that RAC we asked for a year to evaluate the proposal and to pole hunters. That survey we did was provided to you via email in anticipation of this proposal. People have put a lot of hard work into this proposal but the Division has come to a different conclusion. When I look at the study it implies to me that most folks, meaning 75 percent of waterfowl hunters, oppose an increase in motorless areas. Only 50 percent of hunters who do hunt out of motorless boats wanted more motorless areas. For those reasons the Division does not support the proposal. Every five or six years the Division reviews its administration of these areas and we will be doing that again probably in the 2010 season.

Fred Oswald – So this is not before us tonight?

Tom Aldrich – The waterfowl guidebook does include regulation on this so recommendations should be heard tonight.

Comments from the Public

Andy Parker – I have been asked to represent the motorless guys today. Thank you for hearing us tonight. We submit this as a comprehensive plan meaning we are not going to ask for more changes down the road. The Division did a study about six years ago and we have been waiting for something to happen. We have a different outlook on the survey results. We are asking for a ten percent increase in ramp accessible places. 72 percent of hunters are motorless. We do have some motorless areas in the state right now and they work well. When access is difficult hunter pressure goes down. 53 percent of the hunters surveyed wanted to see rest ponds. We believe that the motorless areas act as rest ponds. When hunting is good people don't make the effort to go to these marshes. When hunting is slow guys will go back into these areas and stir up the birds and enhances the hunting for the surrounding areas. So providing more motorless areas will enhance hunting for all involved. Public Shooting Grounds has an area as well as Herald Crane. It is very good hunting for those people who use them. We don't have a lot of people using these areas because there is only one place you can drive your truck up and unload your boat. If there were more areas there would be more people participating in this kind of hunting. This is similar to people on public lands and four wheelers. This is not a new idea, we do have motorless areas in the state and they are very effective. We feel this would benefit the WMAs as a whole.

Josh Noble – I would like to thank the chair and members for your time. I am the president of the Utah Mud Motors Association. We strongly support the Divisions recommendations for the upcoming season with respect to the dates and limits. We feel these regulations will attract new hunters, particularly youth which is vital to our future. We would like to thank Tom Aldrich and his dedication to the waterfowl program. His time and efforts make it what it is today. The Utah

Mud Motors Association strongly opposes the proposal for motorized access restrictions on the WMAs for these reasons:

- Proposal lacks input from the general sportsmen.
- Proposal restricts the rights of one user group over another.
- There is no research to support claims that this would improve hunting in areas.
- There is no study of motorless areas that compares and contrasts the impacts.

D. J. Williams – Utah Waterfowl Association – We are here to thank Tom for his work and to support the Division’s recommendations. We appreciate the work Tom puts into the waterfowl program. We also oppose the proposal for motorized access restrictions for the same reasons you have heard. We think the evidence we have shows that the sportsmen would not support this proposal. I don’t own a mud motor. I hunt out of kayak or a canoe and I do not support this proposal. I don’t think this proposal encourages youth to participate in waterfowl hunting.

Carl Taylor – Utah Waterfowl Alliance – I have emailed our response to this proposal. I would like to point out that these guys are asking for ten percent more motorless areas. They already have 16 percent and they only represent four percent of the waterfowl hunting population. Tom has done a wonderful job. Thank you for your time.

RAC Discussion

Richard Hansen – What are mud motor boats and do they do damage?

Tom Aldrich – They are air cooled motors that can go through very shallow water. The technology is dramatically improved. Our managers don’t think damage is significant at this time. I think it is unfair to say they are like ATVs although they do leave a footprint.

John Bair – My opinion is that our best action is no action. I don’t think I know enough about this to make a change.

Byron Gunderson – Mud boats have to be registered so do you have any information on how much increase there has been in the last few years.

Tom Aldrich – Based on our survey the motorless guys represent three percent of the duck hunting population. 20 percent are motor boat and five percent are air boaters and all the rest are walk in. We are talking about three percent of hunters who have 16 percent of the boat able areas. They have a greater share of areas than they represent.

Byron Gunderson – Wouldn’t you agree that this is a subject that should have some looking into in case the mud motors becomes a problem?

Tom Aldrich – Yes, as I mentioned we do this survey every five or six years. In 1995 they represented 20 percent of the waterfowl hunters and they still represent 20 percent.

Richard Hansen – Did you say there are 16 percent of areas that are non-motorized?

Tom Aldrich – If you look at the acreage on our WMAs where you can float a boat 16 percent of those areas are currently non-motorized.

Richard Hansen – I would think that these areas are good for the resource.

Tom Aldrich – We have closed areas to serve the purpose of rest areas. I don’t think making an area motorless will help benefit the waterfowl population.

Larry Fitzgerald – You said you don’t see an impact from the boats now?

Tom Aldrich – No.

Byron Gunderson – You could look at it this way. 73 percent of the hunters, the walkers and the motorless guys are only accessing 16 percent of water and 84 percent of the marshes is left for the guys who have the boats.

Tom Aldrich – If you ask just the walk in hunters if they support more motorless areas 75 percent say no.

VOTING

Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the Divisions recommendation as proposed
Seconded by Gary Nielson

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Larry Fitzgerald, Micki Bailey, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson, Byron Gunderson, Duane Smith, John Bair, Matt Clark

Opposed: Jay Price

Motion passed 9 to 1

- 9) Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 (Action)
- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – You mentioned the reason for a split season is because it doesn't need to be protected for deer. Why are our five day deer areas not on predator management plans?

Kevin Bunnell – Deer recommendations are made on buck to doe ratios not populations objectives.

Richard Hansen – What percent indicates you need a predator management plan?

Kevin Bunnell – According to the policy we start looking into a predator management plan if for three consecutive years a population is below 75 percent of objective or if for one year it is below 65 percent. In some cases it is put into a predator management plan for coyotes not cougar.

Fred Oswald – When gathering data do you take into consideration whether the hunt is being guided?

Kevin Bunnell – We do ask that question. I don't have the percentage of how many are guided versus not.

Fred Oswald – Do you have information showing if a guided hunt changes what kind of animal is taken?

Kevin Bunnell – I don't have any data. People don't always hunt these species every year. It is something they may want to do once in their life so they don't have a lot of experience looking at these animals and it is not easy all the time to tell and adult from juvenile or male from female. People may rely on a guide to make that determination and some are really good to help them and some are not.

Byron Gunderson – What does the term source sync management mean?

Kevin Bunnell – There are areas that end up being refuges and those areas become a source for the surrounding populations.

Questions from the Public

Dave Woodhouse – Is the Central Mountains Manti areas considered an area under a predator management plan?

Kevin Bunnell – For coyotes but not cougar currently.

Dave Woodhouse – I couldn't get the numbers for this year but for the previous two years the population was below 75 percent.

Kevin Bunnell – It is below.

Dave Woodhouse – We are held to numbers and age objectives in other species, why not here?

Kevin Bunnell – The difference is it is not a threshold. The way the policy reads is those triggers don't automatically push you into a predator management plan. The Manti is currently on predator management plan for coyotes but not cougar.

John Bair – Meaning we are flying for coyotes?

Kevin Bunnell – Meaning we are spending money for coyote control with Wildlife Services.

Craig Clyde – It gives Wildlife Services the opportunity to go in earlier than they would normally go in to control coyotes on a sheep herd.

Dave Woodhouse – On Wasatch Mountains West it said there were 11 harvested, is that correct?

Craig Clyde – 11 is the recommendation and the number harvested.

Richard Nielson – Is the season on a split unit year round?

Kevin Bunnell – They are but few if any cougars are harvested in the off season.

Richard Nielson – I remember cougars being killed every year all year long. Maybe we should be doing that now to help the deer herd.

Kevin Bunnell – Interference is an issue during big game hunts. Enforcement is also an issue.

Theron Taylor – Do you have an estimated population of cougars in Utah?

Kevin Bunnell – We don't because they are not able to be counted accurately.

Bryon Gunderson – Your literature states between 2,500 and 4,000 cougars.

Kevin Bunnell – Right, that is pretty broad number.

Comments from the Public

Jason Binder – President of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen – I would like to thank the board. It has been brought up to move the Manti to harvest objective and we oppose that recommendation. We would also like to see the Abajo unit be a limited entry unit. We also recommend a 20 percent reduction in tags due to the over harvest of females taken. The average age is also way down. We would like to see the start of the split season dates moved from February to April first. Other RACs have passed a March first start date. We would also like to see a female sub-quota on harvest objective units to reduce the number of females taken. Thank you for your time.

Randy Long – I am an avid hiker and camper and I go out hiking and camping every weekend and I have never seen a cougar in my whole life. You can't tell me they are that secretive. Hunting cougars should stop.

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – We would like to show support for the cougar recommendations. We would like this RAC to look at the Manti and make sure we stay within the parameters of the management plans. If the deer herd is below objective we need to look at the different options to bring it back.

RAC Discussion

Jay Price – So this is a ten percent reduction in tags from last year?

Kevin Bunnell – Nine percent.

Fred Oswald – Can you tell us what the recommendations have been percentage wise for the last three years?

Kevin Bunnell – This is the third year in a row we have recommended a reduction in tags. A lot of that reduction is adjusting quotas that are not being met. I don't think a nine percent reduction will impact the harvest very much.

Byron Gunderson – I would like to commend everyone that worked on the new cougar management plan. As a private citizen I have had concern about the future of cougars in Utah but this plan is a very good plan.

Kevin Bunnell – That is next.

Fred Oswald – The houndsmen have made five recommendations different from the proposal. Do you want to look at those separately?

John Bair – I think in light of the fact that we are getting a new cougar management plan next year and the population is stable I would recommend that we approve the recommendations as presented.

VOTING

**Motion was made by John Bair to approve the cougar guidebook and rule as presented
Seconded by Duane Smith**

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Fred Oswald – I would like to thank the houndsmen for their time, efforts and recommendations.

10) Cougar Management Plan (Action) - Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Larry Fitzgerald- What does it take to sustain a lion?

Kevin Bunnell – It depends of if it is male or female and whether it is a female with cubs or without.

Larry Fitzgerald – For a mature male?

Kevin Bunnell – With the data we have they average a deer every 8.6 days. The old adage of a deer a week is fairly accurate.

Richard Hansen – I thought we were told it is almost two a week.

Kevin Bunnell – That would be a lactating female. The average over all age classes is 8.6.

Larry Fitzgerald – When are the deer herds counted?

Craig Clyde – They are not actually counted.

Larry Fitzgerald – When are the buck to doe ratios taken?

Craig Clyde – Some regions do it in the spring. In this region we do it in the fall, post season as soon as the rifle hunt ends until the first of January.

Fred Oswald – Can you comment on why the age objectives have been taken out of the new plan?

Kevin Bunnell – The group tried to focus on basing the management on pieces of information we know tell us something about the population. We don't have anything that tells us what the age means.

Fred Oswald – Will you continue to gather age information?

Kevin Bunnell – Yes because we have to know the age of the females to determine the percent of adult females in the harvest.

Allan Stevens – One of the criteria that concerns me is the cats treed per day. If we increase the number of houndsmen will that increase the number of cats treed per day? Are you making an assumption that the number of cats treed per day will be consistent?

Kevin Bunnell – The assumption we are making is that the bias that is in the data now will remain constant. If we had a huge influx of houndsmen that could change.

Richard Hansen – I think those numbers could be affected by weather changes.

Kevin Bunnell – That is one of the reasons for using a three year cycle. Usually over a three year period that stuff will even out.

Questions from the Public

Theron Taylor – Can a trap be used for a chronic cougar problem?

Kevin Bunnell – Wildlife services does use traps but the public cannot.

RAC Discussion

Duane Smith – This is great compared to what we have had in the past.

Previous comments also in support of plan

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the plan as presented

Seconded by Byron Gunderson

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

11) Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 (Action)

- Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Gray Nielson – What kind of restrictions will be on the Provo River?

Kevin Bunnell – The restrictions are not totally restrictive. We did restrict grounding sets and you can only use modified conibear traps. The restrictions only apply to 100 feet from waterline out and ¼ mile up tributaries. It is a small area and you could still successfully trap beaver in these areas.

Richard Hansen – There was a statement that DWR will meet with Utah Trappers Association prior to releasing otters in an area. Would that change the DWR's plans if UTA has concerns?

Kevin Bunnell- It may modify our plans. It is the standard process that we go through to gather information from the parties involved.

Richard Hansen – Are there any lynx in Utah?

Kevin Bunnell – None that we know of. We have had some come through that we know of and it would not surprise me if we did.

Byron Gunderson – Is there any work on Current Creek to remove beaver?

Kevin Bunnell – I don't know. That is in the northeastern region so there is no one here to ask.

Questions from the Public

Theron Taylor – I have been asked to request that the Division be available at the fur sale to tag bobcats on Friday and Saturday.

Kevin Bunnell – I think we have made that change but I will double check. We do intend on making that available.

Comments from the Public

Dave Woodhouse – SFW – (letter read) SFW has by unanimous vote approved the Utah Trappers Association recommendation. This recommendation will clearly define the taking of “protected Furbearers” only. This will allow the hunting and trapping of non-protected wildlife, specifically coyotes, and will greatly help to improve Utah’s mule deer. We appreciate your consideration and vote to approve the Utah Trappers recommendation.

Theron Taylor – Tooele County – (letter read) public relations for Utah Trappers Association – I would like to thank Kevin and the group for their work on the otter program. Our recommendation is to clarify a serious contradiction in the guidebook. We would like to see language that would read something like the 48 hour trap check rule shall pertain to the taking of protected furbearers only. The contradiction is that coyotes are listed as non-protected wildlife and trapping means taking protected wildlife but coyotes are still held to the 48 hour trap check regulation. Utah spends over 600,000 dollars annually for coyote control. If coyotes are non-protected then why are they afforded protection under the furbearer guide? We maintain that the furbearer guidebook has no jurisdiction for the taking of coyotes, yet the 48 hour trap check rule is being enforced on coyote trapping.

Richard Wolfe – I agree with the trappers association recommendations.

Kenneth Butler – If you check a coyote trap every 48 hours they will not come back.

RAC Discussion

Kevin Bunnell – I sympathize with what they are trying to accomplish here and certainly there are some areas where we would like to see more coyotes taken however we don’t support the recommendation. First we are not regulating the take of coyotes; we are regulating the use of traps. You can’t set a trap for a coyote and guarantee that is what you are going to catch. Several other species could be caught and that is why we require the 48 hour trap check whenever a trap is used. To remove coyotes from regulations would mean no numbers on traps, no restrictions on bait, no spacers to allow you to release non-target species. What that would do would allow anyone to put a trap in the ground and if there is a violation say they are trapping coyotes. All trapping regulations would be unenforceable. There are two reasons we have the 48 hour trap check in place. First because traps are not specific and second it comes down to an issue of humaneness. Even a coyote deserves to be treated in a humane fashion and not sit in a trap and die of dehydration.

John Bair – I don’t think your argument about traps pertains. The spacers and other regulations could still apply. They are only asking to eliminate the 48 hour trap check. Kevin Bunnell – The recommendation has been modified slightly. If the intent is to just do away with the 48 hour trap check to two issues I talked about still apply. Another thing that shouldn’t be overlooked is that this protects the sport of trapping. There are several states that have completely lost the opportunity to trap based on the argument that it is inhumane. Just like in Colorado we could lose the use of leg hold traps completely.

Duane Smith – Animal rights groups continually petition against trapping and I think it is critical to have regulations like this in place to protect trapping.

Kevin Bunnell – We don't disagree with taking more coyotes but we cannot support this because of the factors mentioned.

Larry Fitzgerald – I have been around trapping all my life and if you set for a coyote you are going to catch a coyote. Even government trappers have a hard time keeping with the 48 hour trap check policy. I have checked traps for them because they can't get from one to another in time. Also coyotes are the most inhumane creature there is and I don't think it should matter if they are treated humanly.

John Bair – I agree, coyotes are inhumane and I don't know why we are protecting a nongame species. I don't think the 48 hour rule should apply to coyotes.

Fred Oswald – How long has this regulation been in place?

Kevin Bunnell – At least ten years.

Duane Smith – How can you be sure you are not trapping something else unless you check?

Kevin Bunnell – You can't. Even experienced trappers can and will catch something other than a coyote when trapping for coyotes. We have done several things to alleviate this problem. It is now legal to check someone else's traps. Another thing we have changed is making a snare a legal set which has a 96 hour trap check. We have tried to do what we can but we feel like we have gone as far as we can at this point. We are not willing to remove the 48 hour regulation.

John Bair – Can you define check? Can you look through a spotting scope to check?

Kevin Bunnell – You have to know that there is not something in that trap.

Duane Smith – Then you should be able to do that with optics.

Kevin Bunnell – I think law enforcement would have to address that.

VOTING

**Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept the Division's recommendation as presented
Seconded by Duane Smith**

John Bair – If we vote for the motion are we voting against the trappers recommendation?

Fred Oswald – Yes.

**In Favor: Allan Stevens, Duane Smith, Micki Bailey, Byron Gunderson, Matt Clark
Opposed: Jay Price, Larry Fitzgerald, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson, John Bair
Tie- RAC Chair Fred Oswald voted in favor of the motion
Motion passed 6 to 5**

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

55 in attendance

Next board meeting August 19 & 20

Next RAC meeting September 15th at Central Region Conference Center

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/July 30, 2009

5. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE

MOTION to accept division's proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

6. WILDLIFE BOARD AND RAC RULE AMENDMENT – R657-39

MOTION to accept rule as presented
Passed unanimously

7. ERROR REMEDY RULE AMENDMENT – R657-50

MOTION to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

8. TURKEY HUNTING GUIDEBOOK, RULE AND PERMIT ALLOCATION – R657-54

MOTION to accept turkey proposal
Passed unanimously

9. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION to accept proposal as presented
Passed unanimously

10. COUGAR GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-10

MOTION to accept the Division's presentation as presented except to move the opening date for the split units to March 1.

Passed unanimously

11. COUGAR MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION to accept the division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

12. FURBEARER GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-11

MOTION to go with the Division's recommendation.
Motion passed 5 to 1

MOTION to send the trappers' issue to the Board and have them have it as an action item.

Passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
Western Park, Vernal
July 30, 2009
Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 10:00 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Curtis Dastrup–Agriculture
Loran Hills–Non-consumptive
Amy Torres–At Large
Kevin Christopherson-NER Super
Bob Christensen–Forest Service
Ron Winterton–Elected Official
Rod Morrison–Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking–Agriculture

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Kenny Johnson-SLO Wildlife Licensing Sp
Kevin Bunnell-SLO Wildlife Coordinator
Dave Olsen-SLO Wildlife Coordinator
Tom Aldrich-SLO Wildlife Coordinator
Staci Coons-SLO/Research Analyst IV
Gayle Allred-NER Administrative Aide
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Bio II
Clint Sampson-NER L.E. Officer
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Floyd Briggs-At Large
Carlos Reed-Native American
Beth Hamann-Non-consumptive

1,2 AND 3. REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA AND MINUTES AND OLD BUSINESS: Bob Christensen

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept the agenda, minutes and old business
Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

4.REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson

Introduced the new RAC Members: Loran Hills representing Non-consumptive and Mitch Hacking representing Agriculture.

RAC Meetings will be tape recorded now, with the audio recording posted on the Division's web site.

RAC appointees commit for four years.

RAC members will be offered training at the Marriott Hotel this year. This is a good opportunity to meet other RAC members and get a grasp of the big picture. This training is offered every other year.

The Allan Smith property 5,700 acres, by Duchesne has been acquired. It will be added to the Tabby Mountain WMA as of January, 2010. That's an important area for elk, deer, sage grouse, etc. The Mule Deer Foundation kicked in about \$200,000. If anyone is interested in a tour of the area, let us know.

Campers shot a bear the first part of July, which the County Attorney deemed justified. Five bears have been shot around the state by the public. We really need to keep our campgrounds clean.

Our bison are right where we want them to be near Winter Ridge. They have two young calves with them. Some of Tribal bison went back to the Tribe and some of theirs may have mixed with ours.

Sage grouse surveys are underway. Black-footed ferret surveys begin next month. If you have interest in volunteering, let Brian Maxfield or me know.

There was a bull hog project on Winter Ridge. Lop and scatter projects are also underway.

We will be doing a cutthroat trout survey on the West Fork of the Duchesne next week. We put a barrier there last year and plan to put another one in. Then we'll remove the fish between the two. Hopefully, it will provide a little extra protection to prevent whirling disease from going upstream.

The Tagged Fishing Contest has had 28 tags returned so far. It will go another five weeks. A lot of the tags came from the Moose Pond in Daggett County.

We will be installing guzzlers for bighorn sheep in Lake Canyon next week. Also stream restoration work is being done in Lake Canyon.

Goat surveys will begin later this month.

5. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE – Kenny Johnson

See attached

Brine Shrimp COR
Swan and Crane Hunting Permits
NR Cougar Pursuit Permit
NR Bear Pursuit Permit

Questions from Public:

Ken Madsen: Are swan permits currently no charge?

Kenny Johnson: Yes

Amy Torres: People at RAC asked for potential way to limit non-resident pursuit. Is this a way to help with that?

Kenny Johnson: Historically the pursuit permit had to be held by whoever had the dogs.

Kevin Bunnell: The legislature recently passed a Guides and Outfitter bill, which separated the groups, and allowed us to charge a higher fee. When there was a commercial aspect, we ran up against a commerce clause.

Mitch Hacking: Colorado has quit their pursuing, haven't they? Is there a quota on the non-resident permits?

Kenny Johnson: They cannot use dogs on bears at all and some limited use on cougars. In Utah there is no limit. There were 80 permits sold, on average.

Mitch Hacking: Can we place a quota on non-residents?

Kevin Bunnell: We decided to try this first and evaluate. Options exist in the future.

Kenny Johnson: The price was set based on other permits.

Questions from RAC:

Kevin Bunnell: They can't use dogs on bears at all, but can use limited area on cougars.

Mitch Hacking: Wondering if we'd get a big influx because they can't do it in Colorado. Would a quota help if too many come in?

Kevin Bunnell: Now that commercial and recreational aspects have been separated, we'll do it.

Mitch Hacking: The amount of money isn't enough to really make a difference. There's a quota on our big game stuff.

Kenny Johnson: WSE arrived at that fee by comparing value of

Mitch Hacking: I'd rather see a quota.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: I think it's a good idea to raise non-resident fees.

RAC Motion and Discussion:

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept the Division's proposal as presented

Second by Ron Winterton

Passed unanimously

6. WILDLIFE BOARD AND RAC RULE AMENDMENT – R657-39: Kenny Johnson

The chair and vice chair shall serve for a two-year term of office. The RAC may serve a second term but not more than two terms Loran Hills: What was it before?

Kevin Christopherson: The rule left it off at a couple years but it was open for interpretation. Now we have it specified more clearly.

Questions from Public:

None

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: This has to go through the Legislature?

Kenny Johnson: Rules go through the RAC and Board. Fees go through the Legislature.

Mitch Hacking: So we vote on it and it goes to Wildlife Board?

Kenny Johnson: You can discuss it here for sure.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: On R657-39-5. I agree with each one of them, but on 1(C) I would like to amend it. The RACs make recommendations to the Wildlife Board in an advisory capacity. It takes a lot of time to discuss the issues at public meetings and make a recommendation and then it is changed by the Board. I would like to see that, if we are turned down, I'd like to know why. I'd even like to have a member of the Wildlife Board come talk to us at the following meeting and explain it.

Bob Christensen: Board meeting minutes are available online for you to review if you wish. Also, we could report back what the Board meeting decided and why they are going in a certain direction.

Mitch Hacking: Can we have our local guy report to us? A lot of times we don't know why.

Curtis Dastrup: Isn't that the responsibility of RAC chairman to tell the RAC why they were turned down? The Board explains why and the chair takes the message back to the RACs.

Bob Christensen: Yeah, and we'll do that in the future.

Mitch Hacking: If state members would come here and talk to us, we could question them instead of the chairman who's burdened with that responsibility. You almost feel like the RAC doesn't have any teeth.

Amy Torres: Del Brady makes it to about half of the meetings. Maybe if we can get him to come a little more often to these meetings we could hear his point of view on it and how the Board came up with that decision that could be invaluable.

Mitch Hacking: Rather than get our RAC chairman nailed, I would like to see a Wildlife Board member, so we could ask what we are doing wrong and what can we do differently. I just want more feedback from the Board when they are at variance with what we recommend.

Bob Christensen: Would you like to make a recommendation?

Mitch Hacking: If an amendment is turned down by the RAC that we get a written explanation why so we can have feedback.

Bob Christensen: So the rest of the rule is okay?

Mitch Hacking: Yes

Bob Christensen: So we would like to Motion to amend this to accept the rule as presented with an amendment for Wildlife Board member to give reasons why certain recommendations weren't agreed with?

Kevin Christopherson: The Board has a challenge in that each of the five RACs don't always recommend the same thing. Sometimes two RACs vote "Yes" and three RACs vote "No." There are also other statewide issues. I'm not sure we need to amend this. Bob and I attend those meetings, and we could take more time and talk about that in our opening comments the following month. I think we can meet your needs without amending the proposal.

Mitch Hacking: I know from experience with Diamond Mountain Landowners, you can get things done.

Amy Torres: I agree with Kevin. I don't think we need to amend this rule. I think a better approach would be within this RAC to make sure we bring this information back. When I was the RAC chair I could have brought that information back. We do have the Board minutes.

Bob Christensen: I'd be happy to come back and report what the decisions were and if they go against what the Board decisions were, we can explain why.

RAC Motion and Discussion:

MOTION by Mitch Hacking that if the Board turns us down after we advise them, that we get responsible feedback, with one of their members here to explain it, 1(C).

Bob Christensen: So we have a Motion by Mitch Hacking to accept the rule as presented, with the amendment.

Second by Ron Winterton

Favor: Ron Winterton, Mitch Hacking

Against: Curtis Dastrup Loran Hills, Amy Torres, Rod Morrison

Motion failed.

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept the rule as presented

Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

Bob Christensen: We'll definitely come back at the next RAC meeting and explain the decisions of the Board if there's an item where they went against our recommendations.

7. ERROR REMEDY RULE AMENDMENT – R657-50: Kenny Johnson

Currently, there is no refund policy in place. Sometimes honest mistakes are made and need to be made to offer redress to the public that is impacted.

See attached

Anything underlined is new, anything with a strike out is a change, and the rest is what has been there before.

Questions from Public:

None

Questions from RAC:

Loran Hills: What are bonus points and what are they for?

Kenny Johnson: Bonus points are awarded for limited entry species. If you apply for a limited entry permit and are unsuccessful you are awarded a bonus point.

Loran Hills: So if somebody makes a mistake, you might not get your money back but you would get a bonus point?

Kenny Johnson: Yes.

Rod Morrison: Who's on the committee? Are there a variety of people?

Kenny Johnson: It consists of a broad group of people who perform different functions inside the Division including fiscal personnel and a member of the Attorney General's office. The idea is that we are making precedent with each decision and applying it across the board.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Curtis Dastrup: You have used "applicant" all the way through and then on 2(A) it has "petitioner" instead of "applicant" in one spot.

Kenny Johnson: A group of applicants who may have been impacted, changes their name to "petitioner."

Kevin Christopherson: So you think it was done on purpose?

Kenny Johnson: I can certainly look at that.

RAC Motion and Discussion

MOTION by Curtis Dastrup to accept as presented

Second by Amy Torres

Passed unanimously

**8. TURKEY HUNTING GUIDEBOOK, RULE AND PERMIT ALLOCATION –
R657-54: Dave Olsen**

Goals are to:

Establish and increase statewide populations, Increase hunting & viewing opportunities

Minimize depredations and nuisance turkeys on individual landowners

Simplify regulations and management.

See attached

Two Hunting Season Frameworks – 1 Permit / Hunter / Year

a. Limited Entry, Regional early season hunts (5 Total)

i. Season Dates: 2nd Saturday in April opening

1. 2010 April 10 – April 29

ii. Permit Numbers – valid region wide for specific DWR Region

1. NR 400

2. CR 500

3. SR 1,100

4. SER 250

5. NER 250

TOTAL 2,500

iii. Bonus point system continues

iv. Youth Opportunity

1. 15% of LE permits in each region will be available to youths 15 years and younger

2. Permits are valid for this season hunt only

v. Landowner Permits

1. 20% of LE permits in each region are available

2. Defined application period, unused remaining go into the drawing

vi. Sportsmen with Disabilities may apply for the COR season extensions.

However, early season extensions influence breeding activities and will require DWR Region approval.

b. General Statewide (Over-the-Counter) Permit Hunt

i. Season Dates:

1. 2010 May 3 – May 31

ii. Permits are unlimited, sold OTC and valid statewide

iii. Youth Opportunity – 15 years and younger; statewide

1. 3-Day Youth Only Hunt

a. 2010 April 30 – May 2

2. Permits valid through remainder of OTC season

iv. No Landowner Permits

v. Sportsmen with Disabilities – COR for Statewide 3-day hunt

1. Season Dates:

a. 2010 April 2-4

2. Permits also valid for the regular OTC statewide season

Questions from Public:

Ken Madsen: What is the opening date for over-the-counter sales?

Dave Olsen: It will be in February

Questions from RAC:

Amy Torres: I know that for the limited entry hunt, for people with disabilities, there may be a problem with extending the hunt before season because it would disrupt the breeding season.

Dave Olsen: General sportsmen hunt would be during breeding hunt still requires certificate of registration (COR) and have to be approved on regional basis. For this initial period we want to be as liberal as possible. The rule is written as 30-day extension now on limited entry. However it does require a COR. I don't think our biologists would approve the whole month.

Amy Torres: Can you apply that to limited entry as well?

Dave Olsen: The way the Wild Turkey Federation recommended that. They viewed it as two separate programs.

Amy Torres: Looks like it would be a possibility.

Dave Olsen: That could be a possibility.

Rod Morrison: Will this be set in stone for three years? What if the over-the-counter sales are too much? Could we change that?

Dave Olsen: Once the Board passes the three-year rule with the Upland Game Guidebook, they're very reluctant to go back and change it. However, I asked some of surrounding states, specifically Montana and Oregon, who just went to this general season type hunting, and first, typically the hunting success will drop to about 25%. Birdwise, it gets tougher to call them and bring them in. Typically even under those regimes, you're only harvesting 30 to 50 % of the males so there's still plenty for breeding. That should probably stabilize the program, so we would be reluctant to open it up unless we saw problems. It's not set in stone but it's pretty thick. Our folks will be watching it pretty close too.

Mitch Hacking: Do the turkeys compete with any of the other upland game birds as far as forage?

Dave Olsen: Nothing we're aware of.

Mitch Hacking: I have seen them near sage grouse. Are there concerns with sage grouse?

Dave Olsen: They use essentially pretty distinct habitats from sage grouse. Nesting doesn't overlap. They prefer more woodland and tree habitat than sage. There's really no competitive factor.

Curtis Dastrup: What the populations in NER?

Dave Olsen: Statewide, they're doing very well. In localized areas, we've had some snows and fires which have impacted our areas. We had 20-22,000 a couple of years ago, and it's probably about that now.

Randall Thacker: We are down now in our region. That winter before last we did see a sizeable reduction in flock size but with upland game it only takes one good season to double or triple the population again.

Curtis Dastrup: Every place I've been, there were a lot and now we don't have any.

Randall Thacker: I talked to your brother the other day and he does have a flock of about 40 now.

Loran Hills: What is a CWMU unit?

Dave Olsen: The Division works cooperatively with landowners in what's called a Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit to have hunts. Most of the hunts are for big game but this one has six units.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

RAC Motion and Discussion:

MOTION by Rod Morrison to accept the Division's turkey proposal

Second by Amy Torres

Passed unanimously

9. WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09:Tom Aldrich

See attached

Migratory birds are regulated by the Federal government. States can be more restrictive but not more liberal. Because the United States has had such a wet year, the number of ponds has almost doubled. Most duck species are up 10 %. Only pintail, canvasback and scaup are down. The Federal rules are not completely set yet.

2009 Season Frameworks:

White Goose season	Oct 24-Jan 16, Feb 18-Mar 10, Northern Zone Oct 31-Jan 31, Feb 27-Mar 10, Rest of State of Utah
Goose Bag	3 dark, 10 white
Snipe Season	Oct 3-Jan 16, 8 daily
Swan Season	Oct 3-Dec 13, GSL Area, 2000 permits
Duck Season	Oct 3-Jan 16 Statewide, Scaup Oct 3-Dec 27 (or Max) Canvasback-?? (or Max)
Duck Bag	7, 2 hen mall, 1 pin, 2 reds, ? cans 2 scaup (or Max)
Coots	Same as duck season, 25 daily
Dark Goose season Canada	Oct 3-Jan 16, Northern Zone Oct 3-Oct 15, and Oct 31-Jan 31 Rest of State of Utah

Also, we have a problem with phragmites. Because we were not able to burn enough in the spring, we may need to close some areas in the fall to get the burn done.

Questions from Public:

None

Questions from RAC:

Amy Torres: In the rule there's a restriction in floating sink boxes, why is that?

Tom Aldrich: Federal definition. A sink box in their mind was an old tool (box that moved out into deep water) that was weighed down until it was only about two inches above water. It was very effective at harvesting waterfowl. When the Federal government outlawed market hunting, they also outlawed some of the techniques. But it does not eliminate the use of an anchored box or a culvert, or underground blinds which are still legal.

Amy Torres: Where do the swans go?

Tom Aldrich: The Central flyway in the gulf coast, or west of here into San Francisco delta on their migration. We're kind of a stopover.

Amy Torres: Regarding the motorist proposals for mud boaters. Have you looked at that?

Tom Aldrich: We have. We are not in support of that proposal. We reviewed the proposal for motor less. We conducted an extensive survey to help us look at where the public hunting folks were willing to take any kind of restriction in order to improve hunter satisfaction and success. Very few hunters supported motor less restrictions. It was well-written, we just disagree. Everyone wants better hunting; they just want you to give up yours. Half the hunting on state waterfowl management areas try to accommodate diversity. We take it seriously but we just can't support it.

Amy Torres: On float/boat, some non-motor areas are already established. I can see the difference in need and information.

Tom Aldrich: I don't agree with some of the motor less group's analysis and they're interpreting the results I believe inaccurately. People who prefer motor less represent 2-3% of the hunting population. We have some motorless areas already established which represents 16% of the areas.

Bob Christensen: A lot of the people who use the management areas didn't approve the proposal.

Tom Aldrich: The people who don't hunt on WMA's were much more favorable to making restrictions than those who hunt on WMA's. Half of the hunting in the state occurs on waterfowl management areas. You have to be real careful on state waterfowl management areas because you're affecting half of the hunting community. We couldn't support this.

Mitch Hacking: On farms in Randlett next to the bird refuge we never used to see cranes. Now they're as thick as the geese.

Tom Aldrich: Cranes are growing in numbers. We used to only have cranes in Cache County. Now they've spilled over. Box Elder has gone from nothing to a bunch. And we're seeing it elsewhere in central and southern Utah.

Mitch Hacking: There are cranes now.

Tom Aldrich: And you're getting more and more of the permits too. As you start seeing more and more cranes, you'll get more and more of the permits.

Mitch Hacking: And you can do that considering the Federal regulations?

Tom Aldrich: As crane numbers go up, our permit allocations also can go up. Most of them are migrants from Montana and Idaho, a few from Wyoming..

Mitch Hacking: Have they changed migratory routes?

Tom Aldrich: No, they're just growing in numbers.

Mitch Hacking: Does the Division have any rules for depredation permits for farmers?

Tom Aldrich: Cranes are dealt with in the Upland Game Proclamation rather than in this proclamation but there are no depredation permits.

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

RAC Motion and Discussion:

**MOTION by Amy to accept proposal as presented
Second by Ron Winterton**

Passed unanimously

10. COUGAR GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-10: Kevin Bunnell

See attached

Questions from Public:

None

Questions from RAC:

Amy Torres: We're given a table of three harvest summaries by unit. Some went over the harvest quota.

Kevin Bunnell: There's a 48-hour window between harvest and check-in. Sometimes someone else had harvested as well. It's a total of five out of a total of 300 in the whole state.

Amy Torres: On limited-entry only units, are those areas that don't need to go down to an objective? How do you get to the harvest objective?

Kevin Christopherson: We're not managing density, we're managing quality hunting. You can carry a few more and be more selective if deer populations are okay.

Amy Torres: So you use these different hunt strategies depending on how the numbers are for that area. So a limited entry could turn into a split?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes

Amy Torres: I suppose you've seen the comments on the split hunt that Mr. Lloyd Nielsen from San Juan had sent out. What was the outcome?

Kevin Bunnell: Lloyd Nielson lives in Blanding. The SER RAC supported him. You have to take it with a grain of salt. He's a guide so he's protecting his profession, which is different than a cougar population, to protect his livelihood. He's looking at different goals.

Amy Torres: So it was just changed for that one area?

Kevin Christopherson: We also turned the Manti unit into harvest objective unit; that was a different scenario.

Amy Torres: Even though they understood.

Kevin Bunnell: Sometimes biology is different than social issues.

Loran Hills: Are they no longer protected?

Kevin Bunnell: They are protected as of 1965. It was the sportsmen that convinced the Legislature to make them protected. In 1989 we started using limited entry units.

Loran Hills: So there must be research on the number of cats per number of deer?

Kevin Bunnell: If we knew the exact number of cats and the number of deer it would be easier.

Mitch Hacking: Question for the chairman: Letters are not presented?

Bob Christensen: Sometimes we'll summarize them. We assume the RAC members all get them and have read them, and we need to take them into consideration.

Amy Torres: Lloyd Nielson sent about five e-mails that said the same thing.

Bob Christensen: Randall, could you summarize NER recommendations?

Randall Thacker: There are two new sheep units. Split seasons have been harvesting more consistently and higher harvest. And where the sheep are still seeing significant predation on bighorn sheep, we thought it would increase harvest in the sheep areas.

Kevin Bunnell: Harvest is year-round pursuit. Charlie's had some issues with bear permites chasing cougars and he's trying to temper that.

Amy Torres: Does the Utah Federation of Hounds men support the proposal?

Kevin Bunnell: They have a representative here tonight.

Amy Torres: Do you have an opinion on this on the split unit starting earlier?

Kevin Bunnell: I can tell you now or after they present.

Amy Torres: After they present is fine.

Mitch Hacking: Under this plan are the livestock producers still protected as far as harassment of animals?

Kevin Bunnell: That's in State Code. We haven't messed with that at all 72 hours after confirmed loss; they can take an animal on their own. If they see an animal in the act of harassing, even if it hasn't actually taken yet. Plus Wildlife Services can respond.

Mitch Hacking: Does it apply to wolves?

Kevin Bunnell: Not in this part of the state. It's a Fish & Wildlife issue.

Comments from Public:

Ernie Millgate (Utah Federation of Houndsmen): We're in support except for the split season start date. It's worked out pretty good as far as a management tool but we have had some problems. I'm trying to improve the houndsmen's image. The conflicts in the state is almost like opening day of deer season when the split season opens back up. The problem is in the middle of February when that opens back up, you usually have good snowfall and everybody with a hound wants to be there. If we can move it to March 1st, it would alleviate some problems. I promised Kevin the kill results will still remain the same. There may be less females in the harvest if they're not racing to be the first one in line. San Juan, that deer herd's doing real well. I don't see why it couldn't go to split season Lloyd's a guide. That's how he makes his living. "I'm also a guide but I don't expect the state to support me. That's the stance on the Utah Federation of Houndsmen.

Kevin Bunnell: The houndsmen requested that we make the recommendation to make that split and we saw it mostly as a social issue more than a biological issue. The implications of it are that you may not have as good a snow after it transitions to harvest objective. A lot of the guides are supportive of a later change when they could be negatively impacted but because of conflicts we've had they feel it would be better to have a later transition. I don't think it will impact the harvest a whole lot. We recommended to the houndsmen that they make the recommendation.

Bob Christensen: That summarizes all the letters we've had on this as well.

Comments from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: You can have real people problems with fist fights and people walking all over each other. If they have more time, it makes all the difference in the world. If we can alleviate the tensions and the Fish and Game is not against it, I support it.

Loran Hills: I'm intrigued by the idea of the idea of a social management. You're saying it won't really affect the harvest.

Kevin Bunnell: We'll look at it. If it matters, we'll adjust it

Loran Hills: I would have to support the people management because it seems like an integral part, if people are duking it out and you can spread it out so they're not fighting. My questions is it's not must about managing harvest but people too.

Mitch Hacking: Is snow a factor?

Ernie Millgate: There are different classes of houndsmen. Opportunistic ones and guys who take it serious. They have good dogs; can find lions with or without snow. By March, opportunistic hounds men won't be there like they would after a heavy snow. The serious guys will still get it done.

Bob Christensen: The Forest Service is going to encourage permittees if conflicts arise to let law enforcement know.

RAC Motion and Discussion:

Amy Torres: in light of Ernie's presentation and the houndsmen's stance, and in light that the Division doesn't think the change will have an impact, I make a **MOTION to accept the Division's presentation as presented except to move the opening date for the split units to March 1.**

Loran Hills second

Passed unanimously

11. COUGAR MANAGEMENT PLAN: Kevin Bunnell

This will be a 12-year plan, done in four 3-year cycles

See attachment

Questions from Public:

None

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: You've discussed depredation on private ground. What about BLM and livestock producers?

Kevin Bunnell: We haven't seen this happening on those in the past, where it's the same animal, because the public has access to them. Whereas on private land, the public may not have access to that land so a particular cougar may there over and over.

Mitch Hacking: How does this affect us?

Kevin Bunnell: It'll operate exactly as it does now on public land.

Amy Torres: (Flow chart clarification)

Kevin Bunnell: (Clarified flow chart)

Loran Hills: When you're talking about taking a predator off someone's private land, does that mean killing it?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes. Lethal removal.

Loran Hills: Why is that?

Kevin Bunnell: If we have an animal come down to town and needs to move through, it's one thing, but if you've had an animal that starts killing, that's another matter.

Loran Hills: What do you do with it after it's dead?

Kevin Bunnell: The skin's harvested, and any of the usable parts as they can, they salvage. Then Wildlife Services sells the pelts.

Comments from Public:

Ernie Millgate (Federation of Houndsmen): I was on the committee. It was really interesting to me. We have some of the premier authorities on cougar in the world here. I was also impressed at how well everybody got along. I felt like everybody from all the different aspects, like sheep men, was happy with it. I think it's well thought out. From what I've read in the western United States, it's probably the best plan we've had. In the last 10 years we've had a lot of ups and downs. We're just trying to balance everything so we won't have to go into an ecosystem and wipe out the population because of problems.

Comments from RAC:

Bob Christensen: I think this management system establishes certain triggers so you have a definite direction to go.

Loran Hills: I like the part of the public education and living with wildlife. There are some things the public needs to know that I don't think they know.

Kevin Bunnell: The part that gets overlooked in a lot of cases.

Mitch Hacking: Do you get a lot of first-time hunters?

Kevin Bunnell: They usually hire a guide or go out with a guy who has hounds. People don't want to do it every year but they'll do it once or twice in their life. These things don't have big antlers on their head. You have to really know what you're looking at to determine what it is and a lot of hunters don't have that experience. Sometimes the guide is out to get that client done so he can move on to the next one. I've literally had a guy bring in an animal that's an 8- or 9-month animal who's been with a guide who told him to harvest the animal. Occasionally you get something like that, although that's not normally the case. A guy should educate himself before he goes out and we'll try to provide opportunities for him to do that.

RAC Motion and Discussion:

MOTION by Amy Torres to accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Second by Rod Morrison

Passed unanimously

12. FURBEARER GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-11: Kevin Bunnell
See attached

Questions from Public:

Ken Madsen: When you talk about a trigger to remove restrictions, does that mean in regards to other species?

Kevin Bunnell: Right

Questions from RAC:

Amy Torres: Do you need to have the other recommendations voted on now?

Kevin Bunnell: They could be done later but could easily be done now.

Amy Torres: Is there any other trapper organization besides the Utah Trappers Organization?

Ken Madsen: None that I know of.

Rod Morrison: What about coyote? Is that considered protected wildlife?

Kevin Bunnell: Ask me that question in a minute because then it'll be in the context of things that are being recommended.

Comments from Public:

Ken Madsen (Utah Trappers Association): We have 750 members across the state. I want to tell you that you guys have asked some of the most intellectual and thought-out questions I've ever seen. You're doing a great job. We support everything and also want to make one recommendation:

Coyotes under "Definition 7" should not be considered furbearers. They can be hunted year round. Trapping means taking protected wildlife with a protected device. The proclamation is called Furbearer Guidebook. Coyotes should not be in a furbearer guidebook. Any person can harvest coyotes without a license, except trappers. We want the opportunity to respond to other opinions.

Kevin Bunnell: I agree with Ken that there are places to take additional coyotes but this is not the way to do it. We don't restrict the take of coyotes. We regulate the use of traps. Coyotes can be trapped 365 days a year without a limit, without a license, but the traps they use have some regulations that are stipulated. Traps have to be marked with a number so we can know whose trap it is; it has to have an offset so it doesn't completely close, to release non-target animals. The biggest issue is that traps have to be checked every 48 hours for humaneness of activity. Every animal deserves to be treated in a humane manner. You will have non-target animals harmed or an animal dying of dehydration or killed by another animal. The trappers' request means anybody could go out without an offset; it could be over bait, not numbered, and so we wouldn't have any idea whose trap it was. If law enforcement questioned someone, they would say, "I was hunting coyotes." It would remove all restrictions. We certainly don't agree with that. Restrictions are in place for specific reasons. Coyotes can be shot by people any time without a license but you can't use fully automatic rifle. This is no different. You can trap coyotes at any time but you have to use a legal trap. It's a huge issue for law enforcement guys.

Clint Sampson: (NER Law Enforcement Officer): Regarding snares as well as other traps, we require a 300 lb release limit so they can break away. If these restrictions are not in place, it could be detrimental to all sorts of other protected wildlife. Mainly, spacers 3/16 gap. That allows a lot of raptors and owls to release. Bait was a really important thing. No trap is allowed within 30 yards of exposed bait and so if we take that rule away, your chances are going to increase that you'll get not only coyotes but raptors and non-target species. Trap numbers especially would be very hard to keep track of who's responsible for that trap site.

Amy Torres: Ken, are you guys asking for changes in the regulations for traps?

Ken Madsen: Yes. We've tried many ways and the biggest deal is the 48 hour trap check. Just 'cause that trap's set, the animal's not going to get caught that day. I wouldn't want to remove spacers or over bait, and I don't want to leave the animal to dehydrate and die. A trapper's going to do everything in his power to have that animal in good shape to take home. The greatest percentages of trappers live in the area from Nephi to Ogden. Our coyotes get worked pretty well. We'd like a way to go to other areas. If we're going to manage traps we need to make this a trapping proclamation. We just want to help take coyotes. This is a starting point. We would love to do away with the 48-hour trap check.

Comments from RAC:

Loran Hills: Why is a coyote not considered a furbearer?

Kevin Bunnell: That's in State Code. All wildlife is protected and then they make exceptions, coyotes, raccoon, field mice, ground squirrels. Coyotes are unprotected wildlife.

Loran Hills: Why do you trap them?

Ken Madsen: Fur market, recreational.

Loran Hills: And they're not protected because there are so many?

Kevin Bunnell: Probably a push from the cattle industry.

Ken Madsen: If coyotes are protected, the state is liable for all the damage that they do.

Kevin Bunnell: You could kill 75% of coyotes for 10 years and they could come back. They're amazing in their ability to come back. We have two major concerns, two things I don't see solutions to. A trap isn't specific. You could pick up a lion or bobcat that was intended for a coyote. If traps were specific and you knew the only thing you would catch was a coyote, we would support it. Also, the humane aspect. We do make some concessions to try to make it easier on trappers. You can trap with two other people. If you have other people, you're going every six days in stead of every two days. We feel strongly that somebody needs to be looking at traps within the 48 hours.

Kevin Christopherson: If law enforcement finds a trap, they have to know what it's for. Unmarked trap takes that rule unenforceable. They could claim that they were hunting for coyotes.

Loran Hills: Is there a way that you can clear up the language in the guidebook without changing the 48 hour thing? It is confusing and seems like there may be ways of clarifying what's in the guidebook.

Kevin Bunnell: It comes down to interpretation. If you come down to it that we're regulating the take of coyotes like the trappers think, or regulating trapping.

Amy Torres: Ken, I can appreciate and understand where you're coming from but I don't see how there would be a way to make it legal. It doesn't mean that can't be figured out in the future and we may want to look it for an action item to sort out if there is a resolution. I can't think of one right now and The Division sounds like they can't figure it out either. At this point I'm not sure that there's anything we can do about it

Ken Madsen: The best of all scenarios is if we could come up with a COR. I apply to Wildlife Resources to trap "X" number of acres on the Book Cliffs, or wherever. They know who I am, they know where I am. There's a time I can go in and a time I have to be out. If I have a bobcat in there, they'll know it.

Kevin Bunnell: The snares and lethal traps is a humane issue.

Amy Torres: You're saying with the COR you can't regulate it?

Kevin Bunnell: It's still a humaneness issue and time limits issue.

Amy Torres: I know you're away from your area but you can't make traps that are trap-specific, so it sounds like that's an issue that could be worked out

Ken Madsen: As far as non-target or length of time, a COR can be a 96-hour isn't an issue. You'll be trapping in cold weather where dehydration is not an issue. There is no solution to ever miss all non-targets and you do catch fox in legal sets now. I wish there was a simple solution. This is the best thing we've come up with and I just don't see the negative as that big of a deal. The risk of catching non-targets is being a little bit excessive.

Bob Christensen: I can see where you're coming from, especially when coyotes are a problem, a significant predator. I don't see how we can resolve everything. Maybe it's something to which we can give more thought.

Kevin Bunnell: We've been working on it for two decades and we'll continue, but those issues have remained the issues until another issue can come forth.

Amy Torres: Can the board make it an action item?

Kevin Bunnell: We meet with the trappers regularly.

Kevin Christopherson: The fundamental problem's the same. It's what's seen as the human treatment of animals. There are people who don't support any trapping so the 48-hour rule is done in part to make trapping more humane and therefore limit some of the opposition. They don't need a COR now but they have to follow the regulations.

Rod Morrison: How much is a coyote fur worth now?

Ken Madsen: 0-\$35.

Rod Morrison: My concern is that trappers would give up on coyotes, and they're a serious problem.

Loran Hills: They've been eating my ducks, but my dog got caught in a trap, so I can see both sides of the issue.

Ken Madsen: It is something that we do deal with and we worry about the way the public views us. I can attest from all the people I hang around with. Many don't trap until cat season opens. I love harvesting coyotes and I'll never give it up and I'll drive my 300 mile round trip every other day if I have to but a lot of other people have given up. The highest bobcat numbers this state ever had ran in conjunction with the highest deer numbers the state ever had. It was when there were no controls on coyotes.

Amy Torres: I think what needs to happen before we can vote is you needed to either need to come up with an agreement with the Division, or with your own proposal and hash out some of these issues.

Bob Christensen: I would agree with that.

Mitch Hacking: I'm a livestock producer. I've seen coyotes kill my calves that are being born. There's nobody in this room that hates them more than I do. But they're still an animal being driven by instinct. It's still a humane issue. A lot of people think of 48 hours is already too long to be caught in a trap. Even though I hate them with a passion, I still support the Fish and Game on this issue.

RAC Motion and discussion:

MOTION by Ron Winterton to go with the Division's recommendation. I feel for Ken. He has a valid point but go with the Division

Amy Torres: Before we go there, we have the other changes as well. Is that part of it?

Ron Winterton: Yes.

Amy Torres Second:

Favor: Curtis Dastrup, Loran Hills, Amy Torres, Ron Winterton, Mitch Hacking

Opposed: Rod Morrison

(I would like to have them seriously look at that. I'm afraid trappers are going to forget trapping coyotes.)

MOTION by Amy Torres to send this issue to the Board and have them have it as an Action item. And they may send it back to Kevin Bunnell and have him look at it.

Rod Morrison: There are places where bobcats and lions run. If you stay in the desert flats, you're not normally going to have a bobcat or a lion. A guy can stay in coyote trapping areas.

Kevin Bunnell: But you still have kit fox and gray fox and other canines.

Amy Torres: There are a lot of problems, but we can bring it to their attention again.

Second: Ron Winterton

Passed unanimously

Next meeting September 10, 2009.

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Aug 8, 2009

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

Robert Byrnes –At Large
John Cavitt-Noncon.
Paul Cowley-Forest Service
Joel Ferry-Agric
James Gaskill- At Large
Russ Lawrence- At Large
Jon Leonard-Sportsman
Bret Selman-Agric
Craig Van Tassell-Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Randy Wood
Tom Aldrich
Ron Hodson
Kevin Bunnell
Dave Olsen
Greg Sheehan
Clint Brunson
Justin Dolling
Darren Debloois
Randy Berger
Scott Davis
Rich Hansen
Scott McFarlane

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins
Bill Fenimore

RAC Absent

Shawn Groll-At Large
Ann Neville-Noncon.
Brad Slater- Elected

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 16

Introduction: Robert Byrnes

Agenda:

Review of Agenda

Review of May 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Old Business

Regional Update

Proposed Fee Schedule

Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment-R657-39

Error Remedy Rule Amendment- R657-50

Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation- R657-54

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule- R657-09

Cougar Guidebook and Rule- R657-10

Cougar Management Plan

Furbearer Guidebook and Rule- R657-11

Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Gaskill- Approve Agenda

Second: Cowley

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of May 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Gaskill- Approve Meeting Minutes

Second: Leonard

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Old Business

Robert Byrnes, Acting Chair

None

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Tiger Muskies restocked into Pineview Reservoir. Will be getting more Tiger Muskies each year. Regional work meeting at the Morgan County Fair Grounds. Fenced Riparian area to keep cattle from grazing in the riparian areas. Built over a mile of fence. Hardware Ranch Comprehensive Management Plan. Asking for public participation.

Item 5. Proposed Fee Schedule

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Coordinator

See Handout

Public Question

Byron Bateman- Do you still have to buy a hunting license in addition to the non-resident pursuit permits? That would be a combination of the two?

Sheehan- Yes. That would be in addition to that. The non-resident hunting is \$65 dollars and then pay \$200 dollars.

Bateman- Idaho is \$257 dollars for a non-resident pursuit permit if you can draw one.

Sheehan- It would be a couple hundred by the time you bought both.

Bateman- It would still be a little bit less than Idaho; they are \$257 dollars for a hunting license and a pursuit permit.

Sheehan- We will get there over time.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Other permits to be charged such as sage grouse in the future?

Sheehan- As far as non-resident fees?

Gaskill- No. Is there something about swan and crane that are different than grouse?

Sheehan- No, the cost of managing those two programs is pretty high. Particularly on the swan program.

Gaskill- We will put that in the minutes.

Sheehan- We do spend a lot of money on the management of those programs. We feel like \$15 won't scare anyone away but will help manage costs.

Gaskill- I am in favor of it. I think it is a good proposal.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Accept the Divisions proposal as presented.

Second: Leonard

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Question

Gaskill- You cannot serve in either office for more than two terms?

Sheehan- Either one. So you could be a vice chair twice and a chair twice and that would be eight years.

Gaskill- You just don't want to wear us out?

Sheehan- Yes, I think so.

Motion

Motion: Leonard- Accept the proposal as presented by the Division.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Question

Lawrence- On item 6, when would a situation come in to play where only part would be restored?

Sheehan- I don't have a specific example. Is that a change?

Lawrence- It is underlined.

Sheehan- It just gives us latitude if something were to come up. If someone comes in and something is wrong on our part, we would restore points and add points on that.

Lawrence- I know the Division would come good on that. That part just struck me as kind of odd.

Cowley- Why are we giving folks 180 days?

Sheehan- Sometimes it takes time for people to realize there is a problem.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Accept the proposal as presented.

Second: Wall

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 8. Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54

Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Jay Ashland- Are you going to allow people to buy tags after the season has already started?

Olsen- That did come up in another discussion and we have not addressed that internally.

Jay Ashland- I suggest that you would not allow that. You just gave 80 birds to Arizona. Was there a trade there for other wildlife or how does that happen on a state to state level?

Olsen- Sometimes we trade and sometimes we gain a credit. In this instance, we gained a credit.

Jay Ashland- If the success rate was much higher than expected for whatever reason, do you have a provision that says you can go back to a non over the counter process if in fact the harvest rates are much higher than anticipated?

Olsen- That is the reason we would like to establish this for a 3 year goal right now to see how it plays out.

Jay Ashland- If you had that scenario where you had a harvest in a metropolitan area. Would you go ahead and trap birds from another area and bring them in.

Olsen- No, because harvest would just be on males.

Steve Gaskill- Why choose region wide limited entry?

Olsen- Simplification in administering. With established season, we thought it would be good to combine them.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Would like harvest numbers in advance.

Olsen- Those tables were not in your packet?

Gaskill- The harvest numbers were not.

Olsen- I apologize, they should have been.

Gaskill- Harvest likelihood in the limited entry vs. later season over the counter?

Olsen- We can expect somewhere upwards 40-60% success rates during limited entry.

General season would probably be between 20-30%.

Gaskill- Do you think that is because of the limited entry aspect or because of the natural biological cycle of the birds?

Olsen- Lower numbers and getting a chance to hunt early will increase harvest for limited entry.

Gaskill- Handicap on the later over the counter hunters.

Olsen- It is looked at as a hunting opportunity and lower success possibility.

Gaskill- The 15% youth hunters and 20% landowner permits do not come out of the 2500 limited entry permits? In fact just the opposite.

Olsen- I think that is the way it is done.

Sheehan- The landowner permits come out.

Gaskill- What about the youth?

Sheehan- Limited entry youth permits are part of the 2500 and the landowner ones are as well.

Gaskill- If all the youth permits and landowner permits go, that would leave 1625 for the general population rather than the 2500.

Olsen- That would be true if they all went but I don't think that will happen.

Gaskill- Although that is maybe speculation since we have never really had this kind of scenario.

Olsen- We have had the youth and those landowner permits every year. Nothing has really changed, just a different number of tags.

Leonard- For each of those 69 hunts, there would have been 20% available to landowners in any one given hunt.

Gaskill- Right, I understand that.

Olsen- That would continue.

Cowley- Statewide conservation tag and statewide sportsman tag. 2 birds to be harvested would continue?

Olsen- Yes.

Cowley- If youth permits do not sell out, are those released to the general public?

Olsen- Yes, on the limited entry.

Cowley- 148 new sites on the transplant list. Has there been any coordination with the landowners or managers on those sites or is this a wish list? How many turkeys do we put out per site?

Olsen- It is usually a ratio of 2 males to 12-15 hens in each given release as a minimum. Coordination is typically done after the site is recognized.

Cowley- It is not done before we even vote on it here? That seems kind of backwards.

Olsen- Because the way the law is written, we have to identify a list first and that alerts the public to the sites for turkey release.

Cowley- Conservation permits split evenly across the region. Why are they not split in the same percentages that your general permits are issued?

Olsen- My easy answer is because that is what I was told it was going to be but I don't know. I think it was probably just because it is the easy way to distribute.

Leonard- The conservation tag rule limits 8 species per region.

Gaskill- Is there any discussion about any kind of either sex hunt in the future? In my experience, the hens really get numerous.

Olsen- In the future that is definitely an option. At this point, we are still in a transplant/trap mode.

Byrnes- Limited entry season extension for sportsman with disabilities. Limited based on influence on breeding activities. Over the counter season dates in the early part of the season.

Olsen- We think those would be very limited in number of permits. It is a very short time period of the 3 day hunt in April. We feel that would not be disruptive.

Byrnes- Could you set the same dates for the limited entry sportsman with disabilities?

Olsen- I suppose that could be considered.

Byrnes- You are placing some restrictions on someone who is drawing a limited entry tag.

Olsen- If a sportsman with disability goes out on that type of a hunt and gets disrupted; his hunt is essentially over for the day. In limited entry there is less chance of that. That is a good point.

Cowley- Is there going to be one transplant list generated vs. one out of every region?

Olsen- There is a composite list that is a state transplant list. The intent is to identify the list on a region basis.

Public Comment

Steve Gaskill- Hunter opportunity vs. hunter quality. I would rather have opportunity as far as region wide hunts are concerned. I would like to see more over the counter opportunities in April.

Byron Bateman- Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife- Fully support. Continue to help turkey program with transplanting and capturing. Help support this recommendation.

RAC COMMENTS

Selman- Spring hunt differs from fall hunt. Fully support program. As hunters, we need to be a little more aware of what is going on the ground in the spring vs. what is going on in the fall.

Leonard- Appreciation to the Division for the progress in the turkey management. Allow hunters to disperse themselves by giving time and area. Opportunity is more important than success rate.

Gaskill- Concerned that we have limited the potential for success. Recommend that we find a way to give over the counter hunters a better chance to get a bird.

Lawrence- Commend Division and Federation.

Leonard- Success rate in early spring is generally attributed to young birds that have not been hunted and do not have instincts.

Gaskill- I think if we approve this proposal as it stands, I would like to see some numbers to verify what Jon thinks. We need to make some adjustments because we are limiting the amount of hunters for limited entry.

Byrnes- In next year's survey, hopefully you will have the harvest split out for limited entry and over the counter?

Olsen- We will not be able to take limited entry as it has been for individual units but it will be more on a county basis.

Leonard- Based on limited entry hunts and big game; we have evolved into some culture of limited entry as equated equality. We do not see that same equality as turkey hunters. This was a compromise to give it a trial and hopefully see the numbers increase.

Byrnes- If we approve your presentation, will that be enough to include the transplant list?

Olsen- Yes.

Motion

Motion: Selman- Accept the proposal as presented.

Second: Lawrence

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 9. Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09

Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Steve Earley- Was spring snow goose successful? How did this affect the snow goose population? What to expect next spring?

Aldrich- Growing population and depredation problems. Spring hunt helps manage depredation and provides opportunity. Very successful. Difficult for some to find access. Working to get more access to private lands.

Darin Noorda- Pintail limited proposal. 1 hen allowable or open for 2 Pintail?

Aldrich- Right now it is 2 Pintail. There is some internal discussion about moving to sex specific and allowing an extra bird. Currently the federal government does not allow that.

Darin Noorda- Suggest harvesting Drakes only.

Tom Pordabell- Start time for youth hunt? Will it be 8:00 or a half hour before?

Aldrich- We moved it to a half hour before 2 years ago.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Effects on urban population for late season dart goose?

Aldrich- We are moving urban geese out of the cities. We moved adults south and the young north. Moving the young out of the city has been a great success.

Gaskill- Biological reasons. When you shoot a drake you essentially put a hen out of business. That is not the case with Pintail?

Aldrich- No that is not the case with Pintail.

Gaskill- So there is no biological reasons why we could not have a drake only Pintail?

Aldrich- That is true. We have asked for that to be considered. They could withstand more harvest.

Ferry- Swan hunt recommendations. Consideration to do the same with Sandhill Crane hunt going in to preference points?

Aldrich- I think we have gone to preference points with Cranes.

Ferry- When did that happen?

Aldrich- I think it is happening this coming year. It will start this fall.

Public Comment

Chris Cokinos- Bridgerland Audubon

Power went out for 15 minutes

Byrnes- There is no one here from the Mud Motors group to comment on the proposal for restrictions on Mud Motors. Representative needs to comment before members.

Cowley- So there is no proposal on the table or action to be taken. There are feelings on both sides but if there is no proposal for that adjustment, would there need to be any comment on that?

Byrnes- The council could make a recommendation for or against if they felt like it and then make changes to what has been proposed. If we don't take up the issue and say yes or no, you have basically just passed on the issue.

Chris Cokinos- Bridgerland Audubon- Support seasonal closure of Cutler Marsh. This issue needs to be studied carefully by the Division of what the affects and habitat are.

Josh Noble- President Utah Mud Motor Association- Strongly support the DWR recommendations for the upcoming season with respect to dates and limits. Opposes current draft of the proposal of motorized access restrictions on the Waterfowl management areas of Utah.

Joel Draxler- Proposal is good if it can be backed with biologically based information. Would like to see addition of one motorless area.

Steve Earley- Support DWR recommendations for upcoming season. Regulations fine the way they are. Limiting areas is not a wise thing to do.

Tyson Rasmussen- Strongly oppose this proposal. Focus efforts to get more huntable habitat.

Paul Gill- Oppose any proposals to restrict access to motorized watercraft.

Chuck Harsin- Oppose any further restrictions on motor propelled watercraft.

Darrell Noble- Access for all rather than a select few.

Jed Robinson- Oppose these restrictions.

Chad Yamane- Against proposal.

Kraig Wisner- This proposal does not represent the Utah Waterfowlers best interest.

TeRay Garn- Go-Devil of Utah- Strongly oppose as is currently written. Support current restrictions.

Jefre Hicks- Utah Airboat Association- Support all regulations, bag limits and season limits. Oppose proposal as currently written. Fewer restrictions and more hunter opportunity.

Jacob Andrew- Disagree with further restrictions and support where Utah Mud Motor stands on this.

Kelly Andrew- No further restrictions need to be made.

Kevin Noorda- Utah Waterfowl Association- Supports DWR recommendations for season dates and bag limits for 2009-2010 seasons. Opposes proposal for motorized access restriction.

Darin Noorda- Delta Waterfowl Association- Oppose motorless restriction proposal.

Adam Corliss- Data on Scientific survey. Quality duck habitat population numbers. Mud motors are not hurting habitat. Restricting access of any kind does nothing to promote water fowling among youth.

Joe Greene- Oppose proposal. Support Utah Mud Motor Association.

Blake Keyes- Strongly oppose restrictions.

Jimmie Reeves- Strongly oppose motorless proposal.

Chris Slocum- Oppose restrictions.

Steve Gaskill- Support presentation from the DWR.

Lyle Bingham- Bridgerland Audubon- We believe the RAC and DWR need to look at a limited restriction on motorized vehicles in the marsh.

Carl Taylor- Utah Waterfowl Alliance- Strongly oppose as is written.

John Glezos- Opposes any and all additional motorless areas. Also oppose any expansion of GSLM evaporation ponds.

Jeff Farr- Opposed to any new motorless restrictions on any of the WMA's.

Jay Ashworth- Strongly opposes the Mud Motor restriction proposal as currently written.

Aldrich- Have worked with PacifiCorp in the past to restrict certain activities on Cutler Marsh. The Cutler Marsh issue is not an appropriate thing for this RAC to do.

Byrnes- It would be restricting access on private land outside of hunting.

Aldrich- Right. Motorless rules on Cutler Marsh would be administered by Parks and Recreation.

RAC Questions

Selman- Is there already a motor restriction on that section of Cutler Marsh?

Aldrich- There are some restrictions but I cannot tell you what they are.

Debloois- Yes. I cannot remember specifics. It is essentially enforced by Parks and Recreation.

Selman- What is known of the spread of weeds with motorized travel?

Aldrich- Through motorized traffic spread?

Selman- Yes.

Aldrich- I am not familiar with the literature on that so I cannot speak intelligently on that. There are other reasons that are much more important.

Cowley- You do not feel the Division can restrict hunting at Cutler Marsh?

Aldrich- We would not be the appropriate agency to put a motor restriction on Cutler Marsh.

Cowley- So you are just saying restrict motor boat access?

Aldrich- Yes. Many of the users on Cutler are water skiers.

RAC Comment/Questions Continued

Lawrence- I am a paddler but not by choice. I have only had one conflict in the marsh with a motorized individual.

Ferry- Survey to get new data and better information.

Aldrich- We have conducted a survey and plan to do another one after 2010 season.

Cowley- Notice of new flotation device for hunting. Clarification of sink boxes.

Aldrich- A true sink box is a floating box with wooden wings on it and wade it to water level and anchor with a rope. You get completely below the surface of the water, those are illegal.

Cowley- I am talking about an open water boat that is below water surface with a 3-4 inch clearance.

Aldrich- If it is a floating device then it is a sink box and it is illegal.

Cavitt- Did the 5,000 participant survey include those who hunted by canoe and kayak?

Aldrich- We sent out 5,000 surveys and got back about 2,000.

Cavitt- And that was random?

Aldrich- Yes, we categorized those 5 ways. 3% of those 2,000 people indicated they hunted out a non-motorized boat.

Cavitt- Of those 3%, only 50% were in support of restricting?

Aldrich- Correct.

Cavitt- Even as a group, they did not have a mandate among themselves.

Aldrich- Correct.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the Division's proposal as presented and commend them for their work and recommend they study any and all biological aspects of waterfowl.

Second: Wall

Discussion on the Motion

Selman- We need to study the effect of these weeds and effects from boats on Cutler Marsh. Encourage Division to study this and learn more.

Gaskill- That is why I added those to my motion.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Cowley- Aquatic nuisance species group is well represented tonight.

Gaskill- Thank you for coming.

Leonard- Robert, I assume that you are going to be representing northern RAC at the Wildlife Board meeting with these issues.

Byrnes- No, Brad should be back.

Leonard- I would like to say that when that is reported back to the Wildlife Board that they make note of the strong public response that we have received from those that are opposed to that motion.

Byrnes- We will make sure that Brad communicates that or I will if I am representing the Northern RAC.

Gaskill- Had there been a proposal, we would have voted one way or the other but there was not.

Item 10. Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Robert Bybee- Lowering deer tags rather than killing off another species?

Bunnell- That is not even something I am going to touch because it is outside this proclamation. There is a lot of controversy there.

Ken Duncan- Any evidence that cougars have affected deer population?

Bunnell- It depends on the situation.

Ken Duncan- Any evidence to show how many deer are killed by lion each year?

Bunnell- We have really solid evidence on that. 1 deer every 8.6 days.

Calvin Duncan- Northern Utah Big Game Hounds Association- Studies done toward lion killing deer. How many of that is coyotes picking it up and ate that deer and not left anything for the lion to eat. Therefore, it has to move on and kill more.

Bunnell- There are all sorts of variables that impact the kill rate. There are various studies that have been done; the best ones are out of Yellowstone.

Calvin Duncan- I would like to see that done in Utah.

Bunnell- It is a matter of priority and resources.

Calvin Duncan- As a houndsmen, I would love to enjoy this sport for years to come.

RAC Questions

Cowley- How much discussion has there been about the deer herd on the San Juan? Is the management objective realistic?

Bunnell- We have adjusted how we do our deer objectives. They are set based upon the condition habitat. It can change drastically from one year to another.

Cowley- On this unit, has it been carefully looked at before making this change?

Bunnell- The change is to back off.

Gaskill- How many lion hunters are there in Utah?

Bunnell- I would have to look at pursuit tags. I would say maybe 2,000 statewide.

Public Comment

Kenneth Duncan- Northern Utah Big Game Hounds Association- Concerns about declining cougar population in the north. Recommend having pursuit only in Northern Utah and harvest lowered.

Orin Midzinsky- Oppose limiting Northern Utah to pursuit only. Agree with lowering tags.

RAC Questions

Selman- What was the decrease in tags in Northern Utah?

Bunnell- 17%.

Cowley- Any guess on why numbers are so different?

Bunnell- That data was misunderstood a little bit. The difference is that there is a broader distribution on the survey.

Motion

Motion: Leonard- Accept the Divisions proposal as presented.

Second: Selman

Discussion on the Motion

Cowley- If we are looking at a 17% reduction, how many tags will that be in the Northern region?

Bunnell- That was in your RAC packet. So we are reducing it by 12.

Selman- Do you remember what we reduced it last year?

Bunnell- It was in that 5-15% range. Northern region, I do not remember specific.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 11. Cougar Management Plan

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Kevin Mueller- Utah Environmental Congress- What is the best way for the public to provide thoughtful and detailed input on this plan?

Bunnell- At this point, the Wildlife Board would be the appropriate place.

Kevin Mueller- Can I find that information on your web page?

Bunnell- Yes.

Gaylon Bateman- How do you determine chronic depredation? What are the guidelines?

Bunnell- There are three things: private land, there has been depredation in the same area 3 out of 4 years and that there has been an attempt to resolve the problem and been unsuccessful.

Gaylon Bateman- When depredation has occurred, do you verify that?

Bunnell- Yes, through Wildlife Services.

Ken Duncan- Is the Fish and Game going out and verifying if a lion has killed livestock?

Bunnell- If that is happening, it is happening outside of the rules. There has to be confirmed kill before action takes place.

Ken Duncan- There is a lot of that going on.

RAC Questions

Cowley- How much do we see percentage wise for females in the kill that vary from one year to another? The number you used in the north for 3 years was 24%. Yet, last year it was 40%.

Bunnell- That was total females, not adult females.

Cowley- Age 3 and over females for the cougar management plan?

Bunnell- Yes.

Public Comment

Kevin Mueller- Utah Environmental Congress- Version 2.0 of plan was kept private and internal until meetings. It would be nice to have that available earlier.

Bunnell- It actually was available on our website when the RAC packets went out which was about 4 weeks ago.

Kevin Mueller- I called and was told it was not on the website and I could not find it.

Bunnell- It was on the website when the RAC packets went out at least 3 weeks ago.

Kevin Mueller- When Kirk looked he said it was not on the website.

Bunnell- Point taken.

Kevin Mueller- Recommend adding something to the effect of: "Existing occupied habitat while considering human safety, ecosystem or forest health, economic concerns and other wildlife species."

Bob Brister- Treat cougars as an essential part of the ecosystem, not as vermin.

Steve Gaskill- Support the Divisions proposal as an improvement over the existing rules.

Orin Midzinsky- Would like to see more lions in state. In agreement with how things are currently set up.

Byron Bateman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Continue to study and monitor cougars.

Craig Edwards- Utah Federation of Houndsmen- Support DWR cougar management plan.

RAC Comment

Selman- I support this plan.

Cowley- Kevin, can you respond to Mr. Mueller's comments about the overall ecosystem in regards to this plan? Was that taken into account?

Bunnell- They have impacts but how do they measure it? There were some things that were misconstrued. The type of predator you are dealing with makes a difference on what those ecosystem impacts are.

Gaskill- Support the proposal.

Cavitt- Support the plan.

Motion

Motion: Selman- Move to accept the management plan as presented.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 12. Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11

Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Would you be willing to meet with other organizations regarding otters?

Bunnell- Yes, if we are aware of them we are willing to let them be a part of this discussion. That is the only organized group right now.

Gaskill- I just wanted to make sure.

Bunnell- Certainly.

Gaskill- Do the existence of triggers in consecutive years make the changes greater or not?

Bunnell- We are taking an additional step, it will be a cumulative effect. That will continue until things go back to normal range. We felt a 1 tag and 1 week reduction was appropriate.

Gaskill- I was just wondering if we looked at more than one year at a time to make changes.

Bunnell- Yes, there is a trend that needs to be considered.

Byrnes- Taking of an otter in La Sal creek? Are you aware of that?

Bunnell- Vaguely, it is a result of reintroductions that have taken place in Colorado.

Byrnes- It was in a trap for beaver set by the Division.

Bunnell- There is incidental take every year.

Byrnes- Are we going to address that in the otter management plan?

Bunnell- We do put restrictions in place where we know there are otters.

Byrnes- But only in introduction areas?

Bunnell- Correct. They could show up in places we don't expect them to be.

Byrnes- There was a known population there.

Bunnell- It was known on the Colorado River but we were not aware of La Sal creek.

Byrnes- You do not intend to place any trapping restrictions?

Bunnell- Not based on one incidental.

Public Comment

Ken Madsen- Utah Trappers Association- Support recommendations as presented.

Proposal to change proclamation that all traps set for non-protective wildlife not be held to the standard 48 hour trap check.

Byron Bateman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support trappers' recommendation for non-protected wildlife. Need to clarify law.

Ken Duncan- Big Game Houndsmen Association- Would like to see the number of tags reduced to 2 on bobcats. Leave seasons as they are.

RAC Comment

Selman- I like this idea. If we take out coyotes, we increase so much game. This is a great proposal.

Byrnes- Maybe we could have law enforcement give their opinion on the application.

Scott Davis- I have not seen the written proposal. You would like to not have the 48 hour check law applied to the trapping of coyotes?

Ken Madsen- That is our proposal.

Davis- If you take the 48 hour requirement off coyotes, you are also taking it off of protected wildlife. For those reasons, I am not supportive.

Gaskill- I agree with Scott. 48 hours is a pretty reasonable rule.

Leonard- I wish I had a better understanding of this issue. Kevin, do you have more of a Division perspective?

Bunnell- I don't agree that this is the way to try and accomplish anything. If we start bringing some groups that are very well funded and opposed to trapping into this scenario, we could lose the ability to trap completely. We are not going to support changes to the rule.

Leonard- I struggle with reacting to some political pressure that may or may not come. It is a tough issue.

Bunnell- It is something that we have struggled with. We regulate the activity of trapping.

Cowley- I recommend that we do not have DWR meet with UTA regarding the river otter management plan.

Lawrence- Oppose trapping coyote because of incidental takes of non-target species.

Motion

Motion: Selman- Accept the trappers association proposal to remove the 48 hour trap check requirement on trap set for coyotes.

Second: Leonard

Discussion on the motion

Lawrence- Dealing with sensitive species that can be caught and I am not willing to do. I will probably have to vote negative.

Motion Fails: For: 2 Against: 7

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Accept the Division's proposal with the exception of section 2A.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 1

Meeting Ends: 10:50 p.m.

MOTIONS MATRIX
SOUTHEAST REGIONAL WILDLIFE ADVISORY COUNCIL
JOHN WESLEY POWELL MUSEUM IN GREEN RIVER
July 29, 2009

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: to approve the agenda as written

PASSED: unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

MOTION: to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2009 meeting as written.

PASSED: unanimously

PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE

MOTION: to approve proposed fee changes as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

WILDLIFE BOARD AND RAC RULE AMENDMENT-R657-39

MOTION: to approve the Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

ERROR REMEDY RULE AMENDMENT R657-50

MOTION: to approve the Error Remedy Rule Amendment as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

TURKEY HUNTING GUIDEBOOK, RULE AND PERMIT ALLOCATION R 657-54

MOTION: to approve the Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation as presented, except that provision be made for a yearly review.

PASSED: unanimously

WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION: to approve the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

COUGAR GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-10

MOTION: to leave the San Juan/Abajo unit as is.

PASSED: with one opposing vote.

MOTION: to make all four Manti units harvest objective and place all four Manti units under a predator management plan.

PASSED: with two opposing votes.

MOTION: to approve the remainder of the Cougar Guidebook and Rule as presented.

PASSED: unanimously

COUGAR MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: to approve the Cougar Management Plan as presented.

PASSED: with one opposing vote.

FURBEARER GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-11

MOTION: to approve the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule as presented.

PASSED: with one opposing vote.

SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

July 29, 2009

Commence at 6:30 p.m. Adjourn at 10:45 p.m.

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Albrecht, Kevin	U.S. Forest Service
Bates, Bill	Regional Supervisor
Eastman, Blair	Agriculture
Huntington, Todd	At-large
Kamala, Laura	Environment
Maldonado, Walt	Sportsmen
Micoz, Christine	At-large
Pehrson, Travis	Sportsmen
Riddle, Pam	BLM
Sanslow, Terry	At Large
Tracy, Charlie	Agriculture

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Horrocks, Jeff	Elected
Hoskisson, Wayne	Environment
Jones, Derris	Sportsmen

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

UTAH WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

DWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Aldrich, Tom
Bates, Bill
Bunnell, Kevin
Coons, Staci
Crompton, Brad
Johnson, Kenny
Olsen, Dave
Shannon, Justin
Shirley, J.
Stettler, Brent

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE 7

CONDUCTING THE MEETING

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Pam Riddle to approve the agenda as written.

SECOND by Kevin Albrecht

PASSED unanimously

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2009 meeting as written.

SECOND by Blair Eastman

PASSED unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Questions from the RAC:

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

Staci Coons reminded RAC members of the August 19 training meeting.

Terry Sanslow announced that the statewide elk committee would be reconvening.

Kevin Albrecht indicated his interest as being the southeastern RAC representative on the statewide elk committee. Travis Pehrson volunteered to be the elk committee alternate.

MOTION by N/A
SECOND by
PASSED:

REGIONAL UPDATE

-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Questions from the RAC:

Blair Eastman asked about the terms of the Range Creek trade.

Bill Bates explained that the trade with SITLA would be based on an even trade of appraised values rather than acreage for property in the Gordon Creek area.

Several RAC members asked for additional information about the scope, funding and advantages of the Walk-in Access Program. RAC members with further questions may contact Muggs Clark, the Walk-in Access Coordinator at the Price regional office.

Kevin Albrecht asked about future tiger muskie transplants to Joes Valley Reservoir.

Bill indicated that as many as 5,000 more muskies would be planted in future years.

Questions were raised about the sale of deer permits to the Navajos. Sueann Riley, DWR office manager in Price, may be contacted by RAC members for additional information.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Comments/Discussion from the RAC:

MOTION by N/A
SECOND by
PASSED:

PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE

-Kenny Johnson, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions and Discussion from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson and Kevin Albrecht discussed the ramifications of raising the fee for non-resident cougar pursuit, especially in the context that southeastern Utah has been overrun by Colorado pursuit hunters.

Blair Eastman asked about the history of the crane and swan drawing and permit fees.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION by Blair Eastman to approve the proposed fee schedule as presented.
SECOND by Laura Kamala
PASSED: unanimously

WILDLIFE BOARD AND RAC AMENDMENT-R657-39

-Kenny Johnson, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions and Comment from the RAC:

Kevin Albrecht asked for clarification on term limits for chairman and vice chairman. Kenny answered that neither the chair nor vice chair may serve more than two terms.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to approve the Wildlife Board and RAC Amendment as presented.

SECOND by Charlie Tracy

PASSED: unanimously

ERROR REMEDY RULE AMENDMENT-R657-50

-Kenny Johnson, Wildlife Licensing Specialist

Questions and Comments from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson asked if there was a remedy for medical issues.

Kenny indicated that there was.

Kevin Albrecht asked about the composition of the Error Committee.

Kenny replied that it consisted of program administrators. For further information, RAC members may speak with Staci Coons, who is a member on the Error Remedy Committee.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to approve the Error Remedy Amendment as presented.

SECOND by Charlie Tracy

PASSED: unanimously

TURKEY HUNTING GUIDEBOOK, RULE AND PERMIT ALLOCATION-R657-54

-Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions and Comment from the RAC:

Todd Huntington asked about the price differences in limited entry and OTC turkey permits.

Dave answered they were the same.

Todd asked questions and expressed his concern about the number of permits to be issued, and the potential for hunter over-crowding and reduced harvest success.

Dave explained that Utah's turkey management and permit system was in keeping with other western states' management and permit numbers.

Kevin Albrecht asked if points would be forfeited, if a hunter were to purchase an OTC permit.

Dave answered that points would remain intact.

Travis Pehrson asked about the minimum age for turkey hunters.
Dave answered that completion of hunter education serves as the minimum qualification.
Walt Maldonado expressed deep disappointment at the outcome of the turkey hunt in Green River and blamed habitat loss as having played a major role.
Blair Eastman and Chris Micoz challenged the large number of turkey permits to be made available.
Dave explained that hunters stop hunting as hunter success drops. In addition, turkeys become smarter and harder to find. The DWR has consulted with biologists in other western states and the seemingly large number of limited entry and OTC permits has worked out elsewhere. Dave indicated that he expected hunter success to balance somewhere between 20-30%.
Travis Pehrson asked about the statewide validity of OTC permits.
Dave answered that 2,500 would be issued statewide.
Kevin Albrecht asked if the plan allowed for a yearly review.
Dave answered that three years would be needed to evaluate the program.
Travis and Walt discussed the difficulty of late season hunting. Walt spoke of huge pushes in the Green River area and the need for hunter education concerning the ethics of turkey hunting.
Terry Sanslow read a letter from the Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW), endorsing the plan. A number of RAC members expressed concern about the number of permits offered for purchase, and its effect on harvest success and hunter satisfaction. Chris Micoz expressed concern about the length of the three year trial period.

Questions from the Audience:

James Gilson asked about future turkey transplants in the Joes Valley area and which subspecies would be selected for the transplants.
Bill Bates answered that Merriam's turkeys would be planted, and expressed his expectation that this subspecies would adapt successfully.

Comments from the Audience:

In behalf of the SFW, James Gilson voiced support for the turkey plan.
Stan Baker of the National Wild Turkey Federation expressed support for the plan.

MOTION by Christine Micoz to approve the Turkey Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation as presented, except that provision be made for a yearly review and report.
SECOND by Blair Eastman
PASSED: unanimously

WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

-Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions and Comment from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow read a statement from a special interest group, which proposed that the acreage reserved for motor-less craft be increased.
Tom Aldrich explained why increasing the proposed acreage was not justifiable.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

MOTION by Walt Maldonado to approve the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule as presented.
SECOND by Laura Kamala
PASSED: unanimously

COUGAR GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-10

-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions and Comments from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson asked about the San Juan/Abajo units and predator management on these units. Kevin Bunnell stated that the Abajo unit no longer met the requirements for protection under the predator management policy.

Travis Pehrson argued for keeping the Abajo unit under the predator management plan. He contended against the assessment of the deer herd being at 90% population objective.

Walt Maldonado also expressed doubt about the 90% objective figure.

Travis Pehrson related that all the houndsmen he had talked to favored leaving the San Juan/Abajo unit under a harvest objective strategy.

Charlie Tracy voiced his opinion that a split season on the San Juan unit was a bad idea.

Blair Eastman aired his reluctance to vote on a verbal definition of cougar kittens.

Questions from the Audience:

Lloyd Nielson argued against the proposed split season on the San Juan unit. He contended that the split season proposal would not promote hunter selectivity.

James Gilson argued for predator management protection of the Abajo, Nine Mile and Manti deer units.

Kevin contended that there must be evidence that cougars are responsible for depression of the deer population in order to justify protection under predator management.

Comments from the Audience:

Lloyd Nielson spoke against a split season on the San Juan/Abajo unit. He asserted that the harvest objective strategy was working and the deer population remained under objective.

James Gilson urged that the Manti deer herd be protected under a predator management plan.

Guy Webster of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen expressed support for the DWR proposal.

Leroy Nielson spoke against the split season strategy for the San Juan/Abajo unit.

Paul Peterson urged the DWR to leave cougar hunting on the Manti units as they have been.

MOTION by Charlie Tracy to leave the San Juan unit unchanged with no split season.

SECOND by Travis Pehrson

PASSED: with one opposing vote cast by Kevin Albrecht.

MOTION by Travis Pehrson to make all four Manti sub-units harvest objective and place all four Manti sub-units under a predator management plan.

SECOND by Todd Huntington

PASSED: with two opposing votes cast by Blair Eastman and Laura Kamala.

MOTION by Blair Eastman to accept the remainder of the Cougar Guidebook and Rule.

SECOND by Walt Maldonado

PASSED: unanimously

COUGAR MANAGEMENT PLAN

-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions and Comments from the RAC:

Travis Pehrson voiced his support for harvest objective hunting and for broader opportunity to hunt cougars.

Questions from the Audience:

James Gilson, Lloyd Nielson and Kevin Bunnell debated predator management protection and the criteria justifying its application.

Comments from the Audience:

Guy Webster of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen voiced support for the Cougar Management Plan.

Lloyd Nielson argued that a split season strategy doesn't help anyone.

MOTION by Kevin Albrecht to accept the Cougar Management Plan

SECOND by Pam Riddle

PASSED: with one opposing vote cast by Travis Pehrson.

FURBEARER GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-11

-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Questions and Comments from the RAC:

Terry Sanslow asked for an explanation of the coyote issue.

Kevin Bunnell explained that the problem lay in law enforcement. Uncontrolled coyote trapping would prevent effective enforcement of all other furbearer trapping regulations.

J. Shirley spoke of the mandatory 48-hour check and its importance in the interest of humane treatment of wildlife. He cited past problems in the San Flat area of Grand County as an example.

Questions from the Audience:

Comments from the Audience:

Kevin Peacock, president of the Utah Trapper's Association provided a statement to the RAC. He expressed support for the otter and bobcat management plans, but opposed references to coyotes in the furbearer guidebook.

James Gilson of the SFW expressed support for the Furbearer Guidebook.

MOTION by Laura Kamala to approve the Furbearer Guidebook and Rule as presented.

SECOND by Pam Riddle

PASSED: with one opposing vote cast by Todd Huntington

ADJOURNMENT

Terry Sanslow adjourned the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Triple C Arena
Panguitch, UT
July 28, 2009
7:00 p.m.**

REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as submitted.

VOTE: Unanimous.

TURKEY HUNTING GUIDEBOOK, RULE AND PERMIT ALLOCATION R657-54

MOTION: To accept rule R657-54 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

WATERFOWL GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-09

MOTION: To accept rule R657-09 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

COUGAR GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-10

MOTION: To accept rule R657-10 as presented with the exception that split units would start March 1st statewide, make the Conservation tag to hunt all open units year round, Sportsman's permit year round all open units. Zion unit permits stay the same at 21 permits and Paunsagaunt permits stay the same but make a split unit.

VOTE: Unanimous.

MOTION: That all the Conservation tags can hunt year round in the region.

VOTE: 7 in favor, 2 against. Motion carries.

COURGAR MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: To accept the Cougar Management Plan as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

FURBEARER GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-11

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 3 against. Motion carries

PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE

MOTION: To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

WILDLIFE BOARD AND RAC RULE AMENDMENT R657-39

MOTION: To accept rule R657-39 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

ERROR REMEDY RULE AMENDMENT R657-50

MOTION: To accept rule R657-50 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Triple C Arena
Panguitch, UT
July 28, 2009
7:00 p.m.

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Steve Flinders Rex Stanworth Paul Briggs Steve Dalton Cordell Pearson Clair Woodbury Layne Torgerson Dell LeFevre Mack Morrell Sam Carpenter	Douglas Messerly Natalie Brewster Teresa Bonzo Lynn Chamberlain Micah Evans Sean Kelly Dave Olsen Kenny Johnson Jim Lamb Kevin Bunnell Tom Aldrich Scott Dalebout Staci Coons Heather Grossman Dustin Schaible Jason Nicholes Vance Mumford Lynn Zubeck	Jake Albrecht	

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. There were approximately 20 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, Wildlife Board members and DWR employees.

Steve Flinders: . . . And Tom Hatch, and Paul Neimeyer, a former Wildlife Board member. Like I mentioned, I'm the chair, I represent the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest. Let's start on my left and let the RAC introduce themselves.

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

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson from Richfield, the sportsman's representative.
 Steve Dalton: This is Steve Dalton. I'm from Teasdale. I'm an at-large representative.

Clair Woodbury: Clair Woodbury from Hurricane. I'm an at-large representative.

Douglas Messerly: My name's Doug Messerly. I'm the Regional Supervisor for the Division of

Wildlife in the Southern Region. My staff and myself act as executive secretary to this committee.

Paul Briggs: I'm Paul Briggs. I'm the BLM representative from Cedar City.

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

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter. I represent the sportsman. I'm from Kanab.

Dell LeFevre: Dell LeFevre, agriculture, Escalante Boulder area.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, agriculture.

Steve Flinders: Welcome new members, Layne and Mac, appreciate you guys coming tonight. To let the audience know how this meeting will proceed, there will be a presentation from the Division of Wildlife. We ask you to please be respectful and let them proceed through that presentation. The presentations are based on for the most part the management plans. The Division is making a presentation that will progress whatever resource we're talking about towards the management plan objectives. We'll then have questions from the RAC, and then questions from the public. Feel free to ask whatever question's on your mind of the Division, but we're looking for questions. Comments will come next. And we need a comment card for that. Depending on the number of cards, if we get ten or more cards we may try to limit to three minutes, five minutes for a group, three minutes for an individual. We're glad you're here and we want to hear from you. Just fill out that comment card. Give us your name when you come to the mic so we have it for the record. We'll then proceed to comments from the RAC, a discussion and often a motion and then voting, sometimes several motions. Unless there's anything else let's move on to the approval of the agenda and last meeting's minutes.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Anybody have any issues or? We need a motion.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman.

Steve Flinders: Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I move that we accept the RAC agenda as presented to us, and also last meeting's minutes.

Steve Flinders: Do I have a second? Seconded by Paul. Motion from Rex. Seconded by Paul Briggs. All in favor? Any against? Unanimous.

Motion to accept agenda made by Rex, seconded by Paul Briggs, motion carried unanimously

Steve Flinders: Let's move on to the Wildlife Board update. Doug, you could catch us up. Typically the Chair will do that but we're in between Chairs at that meeting.

Wildlife Board Update:
-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Douglas Messerly: I don't remember, it's been so long. Jake can you help us? Frankly I don't even remember what the topic was. Remind me. Jake Albrecht, maybe you can help us out with it.

Jake Albrecht: I am a little unprepared on that, I can't remember either. Without looking at my minutes, but uh . . . The way I remember the things that happened in our Southern Region passed through the Wildlife Board. But to tell you the truth without looking back at the minutes I can't what they were.

Douglas Messerly: I am sorry Mr. Chairman I was unprepared to do this too. It just didn't occur to me or I would have brought those minutes. As I recall it was antlerless, and the primary controversy that was raised at the board meeting had to do with a boundary on the antlerless deer hunt that occurs in the Sevier Valley, with regard to the Glenwood area. The Wildlife Board came up with a recommended boundary, it was different than the Division's recommendation. However, it was similar to what it's been in years past. Other than that if I recall, the recommendations went forward. There was a resolution of the issues with the permit numbers for deer control permits. Unfortunately I'd be speculating at this point to try and remember those numbers exactly. But they've since been published and are in the antlerless proclamation. In fact the application period's over and the drawings been held. So I'll try to do better next time. I apologize for that.

Steve Flinders: Well that's all right. If that's satisfactory to the members we'll move on to the regional update.

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: In the interest of time because we have such a long agenda I'll try to keep this brief tonight.

- The RAC membership, it falls to my position to try to recruit suitable applicants for those positions. I'm glad to see Layne and Mac here tonight. I appreciate your attendance and look forward to a long and happy career as a RAC member. We still have three open positions on this RAC; that is an elected official to replace Jake Albrecht. And also two non-consumptive slots that are currently open to replace Jack Hill and Mike Small, former members of the Regional Advisory Counsel. We're in the process of recruiting an elected official to serve on this committee. There are a lot of people that are interested but the time commitment that these folks put into it has been difficult for them to come up with. But I do believe I'm on the track of someone that's interested and does have the time. So we'll forward that information as soon as it becomes available. On the other hand for non-consumptive representatives I'm still openly asking the public to forward any names of potential people that could represent the non-consumptive interest on this committee. It's an important interest that I'd like to see represented here. Finding people to represent that interest in proving to be difficult, but the search continues.
- It's that time of year when we have bear issues. We've had some incidents on the Boulder Mountains; some of those got some notoriety in the press. Of late there was a camper that shot a bear in self-defense there at the Barker

Reservoirs. It was one in a series of bears that has been shot under similar circumstances throughout Utah and attracted some attention. Fortunately since then the number of incidences has greatly diminished. Got a call based on an incident that happened this weekend at Fish Creek Reservoir on the Boulders, but it was less serious and we're handling that. But just remind folks to keep a clean camp and do things to avoid attracting bears. Once they get rewarded for breaking into a camp or a cooler they become habituated very quickly and it's very difficult to break them of that behavior. Often times a fed bear ends up being a dead bear, and that's unfortunate when that happens from one way or another.

- We have remaining bull elk permits available. Last I looked there were about 4,000 spike bull permits remaining, and actually more than that, I believe, any bull tags remaining for sale. They will probably sell out before the season occurs and would urge anyone that's interested to obtain those soon. We still have some antlerless permits available. It's a various list. They are not being sold over the counter so that list changes over time. You can check with our regional office or on the Internet to find out what's currently available.

Douglas Messerly: And with that, unless there are any questions about specific issues Mr. Chairman that's my regional update.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. We appreciate that, especially any fishing hotspots you pass on from time to time. Well let's move on to the turkey hunting guidebook, Dave Olsen.

Turkey Hunting Guidebook, Rule and Permit Allocation R657-54 (action) 10:10 to 23:27
-Dave Olsen, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Steve Flinders: Thanks Dave. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: On your turkey transplant, was there any significance for the dark colored versus the light colored? I couldn't, I didn't understand what that was talking about?

Dave Olsen: I apologize for that. Well that was my error, when I transmitted that to the Salt Lake office to be provided to you I didn't realize that that coloration was in there just as a regional key for them; so sorry.

Rex Stanworth: That's no problem. Dave I going to also ask you, I know we've got two varieties of turkeys inside the state of Utah. Are you going to keep those separate or at some time will there be both varieties in all areas?

Dave Olsen: First of all a few years ago the Board did change that in that now within Utah under

management scenarios a wild turkey is a wild turkey regardless of it's subspecies. However we do record harvest data from the hunters by species. But generally there is some inner breeding going on now and we would just probably continue to go down the road and put whatever turkey was best suited for the habitat we thought would go there.

Rex Stanworth: One last question, do you believe that at least the last two years for turkey hunting the weather has been so abnormal, snow drifts still on the roads, turkeys must be higher because they're certainly not lower. Hunters can't get higher because the roads are blocked. Are you seeing that as a problem with the start date of that turkey hunt or do you think you're okay on that April 9th?

Dave Olsen: In the past, as you are aware, we did allow, or did have a provision for some of the upper elevation units to have a little bit later starting date. We'd like to just go ahead and consolidate that now and try it and see if we can't keep it a little simpler. And you're absolutely right, across the whole west there were similar squirley hunting situations for turkeys this spring. It was kind of a weird year.

Rex Stanworth: You know the last two years, everybody that applied for the early hunt, for example on the Oak City, which was supposed to have been a premium hunt to them, they never saw turkeys.

Dave Olsen: Yeah.

Rex Stanworth: In fact the guys with the second hunt really never saw very many turkeys until the very end. And so that was why I wondered about that time frame. Going up Whiskey Creek, that road was blocked with snow; and even those guys that tried it with their 4-wheelers couldn't make it up there, it was too soggy.

Dave Olsen: That is a good question and a good consideration. And I guess that is another reason we'd like to make those regional boundaries what they are so a hunter that may run into that in an area he had planned to hunt could go elsewhere in the region where maybe things are a little better for him.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? I also want to make sure the members are aware that this is the guidebook and also those transplant sites, if there are any questions regarding those. I've got one question Dave. The harvest was about 2,700 birds last year, which is impressive if the state can sustain that number with this strategy. My question is: no more out of state transplant for turkeys, we haven't done it for quite a few years, right?

Dave Olsen: To bring into the state?

Steve Flinders: Yeah.

Dave Olsen: We haven't done it for several years and a lot of that deals with disease transmission, the expense of sending people and that. So we've got populations to kind of a threshold where we think we can do a lot of that using nuisance kind of birds or depredating birds and trap there extensively and move those.

Steve Flinders: Good. Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Dave on that transplant list I couldn't really see what was there for Millard County. But

Lower Sevier River. Sean where are you looking at? Where is Lower Sevier River?

Sean Kelly: Sean Kelly. Yeah, Rex, that Lower Sevier starts about Lindell, Leamington, comes around where the river dips down. It's all, most of that private land, that riparian, where the landowners have asked us to put birds.

Rex Stanworth: It would be a good place for them.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC? Well go to questions from the public. Any questions about turkeys?

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Seeing none, and no comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Thanks Dave well go to RAC discussion and motion.

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: Do you want a motion?

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Rex Stanworth: Well if there's no discussion I'll make a recommendation that we accept the Turkey Guideline Rule and Permit Allocation, R657-54.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Sam. Are we clear on the motion? It's to approve as recommended. We're clear about a vote. Everybody for it? Everybody against? It's unanimous.

Motion to accept rule R657-54 as presented was made by Rex Stanworth, seconded by Sam Carpenter, motion carried unanimously.

Dave Olsen: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Dave. Let's move on to Tom Aldrich and waterfowl.

Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R657-09 (action) 29:37 to 39:54
-Tom Aldrich, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Steve Flinders: Thanks Tom. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: All (unintelligible) a duck hunter on the end. Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Hi Tom. How are ya?

Tom Aldrich: Good.

Rex Stanworth: Good. Hey, so this year there's not going to be an opening and closing for pintail and an opening and a closing, it will just be the . . .

Tom Aldrich: The whole entire season.

Rex Stanworth: Aw, so that's great. And I'm assuming for your swan hunt that the number of permits that the length of the hunt and the place it's to be held, those are all federal standards?

Tom Aldrich: Correct.

Rex Stanworth: And one last question I've got for ya -----we talked about this last year and you had such a great answer but I can't remember what it was. Where you talk about closed areas, 657-9-30, I don't know about Lynn but for me it's easier when you go down and look through the closed area you have Millard County down here as a separate subsection for Gunnison Bend, it seems like to me that that would be an appropriate place to put Spring Lake to where it's in Millard County because it just says Clear Lake, Spring Lake as a closed area. Now I remember you told me there was some fancy, the explanation of why you left it there but for me it would be easier to say, okay in Millard County there's two places that are closed.

Tom Aldrich: I don't remember what my answer was last year.

Rex Stanworth: Well it must have been good because it's getting changed.

Tom Aldrich: Yeah we could probably put it in both places. It's listed as, closures on WMAs and we could probably put it down below as well.

Rex Stanworth: Well it seems to me where we're talking about Millard County and you've already listed one it would be good to put the second one down there which would end some confusion on that.

Tom Aldrich: Ok, I think we have time to do that.

Rex Stanworth: By the way I will tell you that I hunted swans again last year with no success. But personally I don't like that hunt and I'm not applying for it this year. But that's a very tough hunt. What's the percentage of success on that swan hunt?

Tom Aldrich: It's about 30 percent.

Rex Stanworth: About 30. One other question, I don't see it on here, but we were given, I was sent and I assume everybody else was, somebody was coming up with some proposal to eliminate having more walk-in areas and less boat traffic and . . .

Tom Aldrich: Right.

Rex Stanworth: Are you going to discuss that tonight or is that?

Tom Aldrich: I wasn't going to. I mean I can, I reviewed the proposal and just I guess in a sort of the executive summary, well a similar proposal was proposed in 2005 and that 's when we did the hunter survey that we also sent you. And basically we asked the question: What types of restrictions would hunters support in an effort to improve hunter satisfaction and success? And basically they said none. They said we're pretty happy. We're just as happy as we were ten years earlier. And about 75 percent of the hunters, specific to this proposal, opposed creating more motor-less areas. That's what that proposal basically does. It's taking some of the marshes where we allow motors and actually closing them to motors and only allowing kayaks and paddleboats. And we think it's based on the survey of several years ago, that it's not going to be popular and therefore we aren't recommended that we do it.

Rex Stanworth: Well I just got that and just wondered what the official response was going to be.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: We don't have any comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: So for the record there's nobody from the public that's going to present or endorse this proposal so we won't make it a matter of our record. Though it was e-mailed to several of us and it looks like it's pretty well thought out.

Tom Aldrich: It's well written.

Steve Flinders: Maybe they'll get with you in the future and work something up.

Tom Aldrich: I think you'll see it again next year.

Steve Flinders: Thank Tom.

Rex Stanworth: So what's your plans? Are we looking for a recommendation?

Steve Flinders: Yeah, a discussion and a motion if we're there.

RAC discussion and vote:

Rex Stanworth: Well since somebody else won't chime up I will. I'll make a recommendation that we accept the Waterfowl Guidebook and Rule R57-09, and accept it as presented.

Paul Briggs: I'll second.

Steve Flinders: Second by Paul Briggs. Are we clear on the motion? Again, to accept as recommended. Let's vote. Everybody for it? And against? Look like unanimous Natalie.

Motion to accept rule R657-09 as presented was made by Rex Stanworth, seconded by Paul Briggs, motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Let's move on. Kevin, you're up. Do you want to do both cougar agenda items together in your presentation? How do you want to proceed?

Kevin Bunnell: I think it would probably be better to separate them. There will be different questions and discussion around each one.

Steve Flinders: We can do that.

**Cougar Guidebook and Rule R657-10 (action) 45:53 to 55:50
-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator**

Steve Flinders: Thank Kevin. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: My first question would be on cougar, why do we have a limited entry on cougar? I mean I understand it with deer and antlered species, but what's the reasoning behind limited entry on cougar permits?

Kevin Bunnell: To provide a, same as it is with deer and elk, to provide a quality hunting opportunity where you're not competing with other people. You have an opportunity to look at maybe more than one. There isn't a motivation to try to harvest the first cat that you tree. You have an opportunity to look at several before you choose to harvest one.

Sam Carpenter: But we control the number of hunters on all of them, right? I mean if you do a quota, true you don't, but on a split isn't that like the premium entry for a certain period of time?

Kevin Bunnell: It is. A split is a hybrid between the two. It starts out as a limited entry unit and then after, currently it's about the middle of February, they transition into harvest objective units. I mean really Sam it's a social thing. A lot of the cougar hunters that their preference and the most sought after are the limited entry units. And so to the extent that we can provide that opportunity and still be within the plan we try to have some in all of those different categories.

Sam Carpenter: Ok, well I noticed a lot of limited entries are never filling their quotas. I've got some data here and the stuff that I've looked at, and you're usually under objective on a lot of these limited entry.

Kevin Bunnell: What do you mean by under objective?

Sam Carpenter: Well you're issuing eleven tags, killing seven cougars. You're not killing . . .

Kevin Bunnell: It averages about 50 percent. And so when the guys make the recommendation they figure about a 50 percent success rate and try to think in terms of how many cougars they think are available and make a recommendation accordingly so that; realizing that only about 50 percent of the people that draw a tag are going to be successful.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Anybody else? I've got a couple of questions Kevin. Could you go back to your performance slide, the eco region plan performance? Those (unintelligible) in yellow for southern mountains, does that include cougars harvested under predator management plans?

Kevin Bunnell: The stuff in yellow includes everything. So there are 164 total lions and that's the data for all 164. It doesn't separate out cougar . . .

Steve Flinders: It doesn't make it look very good in terms of how do you measure up to the plan.

Kevin Bunnell: It doesn't. And that's one of the confusing issues with our current plan. And as we move into the next presentation we're going to try to rectify that with the new cougar plan where we have a different set of performance targets that we're looking at, specifically under predator management plans versus not. It's been one of the weak points of our current plan.

Steve Flinders: Sounds good. The other questions I have is what is the kitten definition? Probably a lot of people in the room would like to know.

Kevin Bunnell: What we are looking at, and we haven't completely nailed it down yet, but probably defining it as a cougar that has spots on the side or back that are obviously visible in daylight or something along those lines. We're trying to get away from looking at barring on the legs because a cat that's maybe even past two years old may still have some barring on it's legs. So we're looking at spots that are obviously visible on the sides and back.

Steve Flinders: Are you considering eye color?

Kevin Bunnell: We aren't because it's, you know, you can't always see that. I mean but we're open to suggestion on that. It's something that we've . . . because you know it's hard to draw the line in the sand with that one.

Steve Flinders: That will be tough.

Sam Carpenter: While you have this slide up, looking at the data, would you look at that where everything's up as an increase in population? Wouldn't that be some kind of an indicator towards that or? Do they vary quite a bit year to year?

Kevin Bunnell: It does. If you look at it relative to the performance targets we're below on the percent females but we're not meeting the performance target of 65 percent adult survival, we're only at 61 percent. And we're not meeting the performance target of 15 percent of the animals greater than 6 years age at 10. So I think we're moving, we made a recommendation last year that moved us towards those but you're not going to get there in a year.

Sam Carpenter: But we are moving up.

Kevin Bunnell: It is. Yeah it looks like things are, the direction, I think, has changed. The trend has changed.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Sam. Any other questions? Questions from the public? Just questions on cougar guidebook.

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Thanks Kevin. Got a stack of comment cards.

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: Wade Lemon. Clint Mecham will follow.

Wade Lemon: I am Wade Lemon. I'd just to ask you to change the season dates a little bit on those split seasons. If you could move that to March 1st instead of mid February it will eliminate a lot of conflict with other hunters in the field. Also, on the Governors Tag, lion and statewide lion tag, could you let us hunt them year round on any unit? The way it is right now, my understanding is you're limited to the draw units when they're open. Deer and elk, you know on the Governors Tags, they can hunt early, they can hunt late, after the season's are closed. We'd like the same thing on the cougar. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Clint. Jeff Daniels.

Clint Mecham: Mr. Chairman, members of the RAC, appreciates the opportunity to address you. I'll just kind of go over some of the things that Wade talked to. We as uh, I should say I'm representing the Utah Federation of Houndsman. There's about 450 members in our group now, and also the Southern Utah Guides and Outfitters. And uh, we've been real concerned the past few years of the, when this split of the harvest objective begins because it's uh . . . Just to give you a little history, it's a race. It's a zoo, it's a nightmare and there's a lot of conflict and contention going on. We felt like that if we could move the season back to at least March 1st that it would eliminate a lot of that. And basically what we're thinking is that we would take away some of the better snow conditions. And I know there's been some concern that maybe those animals may not be harvested if we don't hunt them when the snow's good, but I can guarantee you that there are capable guides and houndsman that can do it whether there's snow

or not. So we would like to recommend that that split starts March 1st rather than mid February. And a lot of times too, like this past year it was Presidents weekend, the office was closed and some of the units were actually, they went over the objective because of the 48 hour check in. And then to go over it again what Wade was concerned was to allow the Governor's tag and the statewide tag holders to start earlier and hunt year round. Allow them to hunt anywhere in the state on any open unit, or closed as they do with the elk and deer. And then also, with the Conservation tag holders to let them hunt every unit in the region that the tag was purchased for, draw units, quota units even if they're closed. And we'd like to ask that the Zion unit be left at 21 permits. There's been a reduction to, I think 13, but a lot of the outfitters were concerned and we'd like to see that left at 21. And we'd just like to go on record of supporting the Division with their recommendations. And we'd also appreciate your consideration of those that we've mentioned.

Sam Carpenter: Can I ask him a question?

Steve Flinders: Sure Sam, go ahead.

Sam Carpenter: So you are saying you're okay with all the other cuts in the southern mountains that they're proposing, the 21 tags? And Zion's the only unit you're concerned with?

Clint Mecham: Yes

Sam Carpenter: Okay. Thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Clint. Jeff.

Jeff Daniels: Jeff Daniels, I'd also like to reiterate what they said about keeping the split season, changing it to March 1st and allowing the Governor's tag holder to be able to hunt year round and in any unit.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Jeff. That's all the comment cards I have. I've got one for Kim Payne for cougar management plan. Is that right Kim? Yeah Kevin.

Kevin Bunnell: Let me just clarify one thing on the Governor's tag. I asked that question because of the request from the houndsman came to us. And it's something that we could do but it requires a code change is what, what I've been told, because it defines those Governor tags in code as being relative to limited entry units. So it's something that could be done but not immediately because the way the Directors office explained it to me is it's something that will have to go through the legislature.

Sam Carpenter: There's just one Governor's tag, is that true?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes. Just one.

Rex Stanworth: Kevin, I was just going to ask before you left, as far as you're concerned, as a RAC we can make that recommendation to add credence to that.

Kevin Bunnell: Certainly, yeah. And there's no harm in that. Just so that the audience recognizes that if it doesn't happen this year that's the reason because it would have to go through the legislature.

Layne Torgerson: I have one question.

Steve Flinders: Sure, Layne.

Layne Torgerson: On that same line, would that same procedure be applied to the Sportsman's tag also, which is the same a Governor's tag?

Kevin Bunnell: I believe so. I would have to double-check that in the code book. And it's the same thing with the conservation tag, it's all either in rule or code. It's not actually part of the cougar rule and so there's other places where things would have to be changed to make those, to make it so that a conservation permit holder could hunt, for instance on a harvest objective unit that had already met the quota. There are some other rule changes in other places that would have to be made.

Steve Flinders: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Kevin could I ask the Division's opinion on the 15th of February versus the March 1st opening on that split season? I'm not familiar with that and why that's such a concern.

Kevin Bunnell: Currently the split units they start out as a limited entry and a guy can draw a tag. And if we had 10 limited entry tags on a unit come, currently come the middle of February if only 6 of the limited entry tags have been filled we would open that unit up as harvest objective with a quota of 4, to fill the rest of what wasn't taken under limited entry. There have been a few units where there's been a lot of conflict. I've heard horror stories of fistfights on the mountain and guys shutting and blocking roads with their trucks and not letting people on. And the request from the houndsman is to move that transition date instead of the middle of February to the first of March. We saw that as mostly a social issue and so we didn't address it in our recommendations but I have had conversation with the houndsman about it. And kind of because of the nature of it we thought it was appropriate for the RACs to deal with.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Doug.

Douglas Messerly: Clair what I would add to what Kevin had to say is that with most social issues, and this is similar to that, in order to benefit someone you have to take away from someone else. So I think it's important to understand what happens when you move that date later two weeks. And it was actually stated by the people that commented on it that it was to avoid conflicts with other hunters. And we were assured that the guides and outfitters would be able to catch the cougars. And frankly it's true that many houndsman don't have as skilled of dogs as the guides and outfitters do. And I think what needs to be considered is who benefits and who loses for making this change and recognizing that there are a lot of people that wait for that opening as their only opportunity to hunt cougars for the year.

Steve Flinders: Since we are commenting on this I'll add my two cents. I find it curious that the outfitters and guides would offer to do that because those two weeks, unless you have good dogs, that's a chance for you to catch a good favor with a snowstorm and get a cat caught in. Some of those limited entry hunters feel like they're giving it up too early and would like to keep those two weeks. You know the limited entry hunt on these split units is often the local guys who have drawn those tags, taken their family members and it takes good conditions to catch a cat. So that's an interesting offer.

Wade Lemon: I'm going to jump in. Of all the members in the Utah Federation of Houndsman there's not a lot of guides. And these are just average houndsman, just weekend hunters, and they were in favor of this; over 450 of them. And I don't know if any of them are here tonight that's not guides or outfitters. I guess we'll wait and see if they're represented.

Steve Flinders: Well what's your recommendation? Any other discussion from the RAC?

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: (unintelligible) we talked about a change in the split season date. The comments we heard were to change the split season date; roll it back to March 1st. Make the Governor's tag, and I guess that's up to you to mull over whether that equates to the Sportsman's tag, it probably should. And keep the Zion tag at 21 permits and support the rest of the recommendations is what I heard. Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Also along those lines, the Paunsagaunt being one of our premium units, and I spoke with Jeff Allen, I'm sure some of these guys know Jeff, and his comments----- He's trying to kill a bear right now on the unit ----- And he says there are so many lions that he's just having a devil of a time keeping his dogs in line. I've also spoke to several of the landowners and they're spotting cougars, seeing cougars where they've never seen cougars before. I would really like to get in this recommendation, and I know that we haven't formally done it yet, that we keep these Paunsagaunt tags as they are and not take any more cuts on that unit.

Steve Flinders: Okay. Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Did I understand right that the Zion unit was dropped by eight from 21? And why was, that seems like a pretty big drop, is there a reason for that?

Kevin Bunnell: There is, I'm glad you asked. The Zion unit has been under a predator management plan. This year that predator management plan ended and so we, to be consistent with the cougar plan we needed to make a recommendation that was consistent with that plan with it no longer being under predator management. And so that's why we made the recommendation to drop it from 21 to 13 because there's, the deer herd has recovered to a point there where the predator management plan was no longer in effect. And Sam, do you want an explanation on the Paunsagaunt? That unit, the recommendation has been 10. We dropped it down to eight, and part of that reason being is because there haven't been over six cougars harvested on that unit in the last five years. And so even with eight tags there's still plenty of opportunity there consistent with what's been going on in the last couple of years. And that in conjunction with looking at the performance targets in the plan.

Sam Carpenter: And my comment on that would be in speaking with the people that have hunted the lions and help guided and have been involved, if we would make this a split season and allow that the hunters that get into this limited entry are looking for a big tom, they're very selective. It's not . . .

Kevin Bunnell: And that could be that people are just being selective.

Sam Carpenter: I was told point blank by most everyone I talked to involved in this that that is the

reason that we are not killing the cougars in there that we're authorized to take.

Steve Flinders: I've got one more thing to add to this comment. Where's the Paunsagaunt, you mentioned it, the deer herd, where's it at in relationship to the objective? We're killing does, are we?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes. If you remember the big game (unintelligible) that unit's currently over objective so the deer herd wasn't considered. That's not part of the equation when we're talking about that unit for lions. We're just looking at the cougar data.

Steve Flinders: Thanks then. We're ready for a motion or a discussion.

Sam Carpenter: Can I try to do a recommendation?

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Sam Carpenter: Goodness. Okay a motion, there you go. I want to make a motion out of this. And I would like to make a motion that, providing I understood the recommendations I heard from the public, that we move the quota hunt to March 1st, opening date. Is that correct the quota hunt? I make a motion that the Governor tag be allowed to hunt all year, all units. And the convention tags will be able to hunt the entire region, is that correct? I would like to see the Zion unit tags remain the same. I would like to see the Paunsagaunt unit remain the same and change that to a split hunt.

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that motion.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dell. Did you get that motion? Do we need to restate it?

Sam Carpenter: Where do you want me to start?

Steve Flinders: Let me try it. We'll start with the changes to what we were presented. The split units would begin March 1st. Is that just the split units in the southern region?

Sam Carpenter: It's the hunter quota?

Douglas Messerly: Harvest objective.

Kevin Bunnell: The harvest objective already opened in November and so (unintelligible) it's just the split units.

Steve Flinders: So the split units begin March 1st in the southern region.

Layne Torgerson: I am confused

Douglas Messerly: Okay, the recommendation is as I understand it, or the motion as I understand it, that the harvest objective portion of the split seasons which begins after the limited entry portion of the split season be moved to March 1st rather than February 14th. So it's the harvest objective portion of the split

season on those split season units.

Steve Flinders: We may want to break this thing down. And you didn't say anything about the rest of the proclamation.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Is that included.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, we'll make a motion to accept the recommendation the DWR has put forth, Rule R657-10 as presented with the exception of the aforementioned situations as a recommendation, as a motion.

Steve Flinders: So . . .

Sam Carpenter: Do you want me to start all over. I'm glad to do it if it will work out. Okay. I would like to make a motion that we accept the Departments recommendation on the cougar guide book and rule R657-10 with the exception of the March 1st opening date be applied to split season, hunter quota hunts statewide, Governor tag will be allowed to hunt year round and on all units, Zion region will be left the same as before at 21 tags, Paunsagaunt unit will be left the same as before and moved to a split unit. I would like to address the conservation tags separately so that we can get that worked out. But that would be the recommendation at that point.

Natalie Brewster: The first time you said it you mentioned something about the Sportsman's.

Sam Carpenter: Now somebody mentioned the Sportsman's tag, is that the same of the Governor's tag? I don't think we ever determined that.

Kevin Bunnell: Utah doesn't have Governor's tags per say, they're statewide conservation permits.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. So what are we going to call that? Statewide Conservation permit. Okay. And let's get it right. Are you with me so far? The sportsman permit would be year round all units, same opportunity.

Steve Flinders: Have you got that? Second.

Dell LeFevre: I've already seconded it.

Steve Flinders: Dell's still seconded it. Discussion on that motion. Does everybody understand what that animal is doing, trying to do? Solve lots of problems. Let's vote on this motion, if everybody understands it. Everybody that's for it raise your hand. Against it? Well that part was easy. It was unanimous. Which means we really need to understand what it was we just passed. Does it make sense?

Motion was made by Sam Carpenter to accept rule R657-10 as presented with the exception that split units would start March 1st statewide, make the Conservation tag to hunt all open units year round, Sportsman's permit year round all open units. Zion unit permits stay the same at 21 permits and Paunsagaunt permits stay the same but make a split unit.

Dell LeFevre seconded, unanimous

Steve Flinders: Please read it.

Natalie Brewster: Sam Carpenter made a motion to accept the rule R657-10 presented with the exception that split seasons start March 1st statewide. Make the Governor's tag available to hunt all units year round and the Sportsman year round, all open units as well. Zion permits stay the same at 21 and the Paunsagaunt stays the same for the permits but make it a split unit. That's what I got.

Sam Carpenter: That sounds right. We got that squared away now how do we address the conservation tags?

Steve Flinders: Well you covered it if you talked about the remainder in conservation tags, there's nothing left to cover.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, we got it in there. Does it make sense?

Natalie Brewster: Make the conservation tag a Governor's tag, is that what you're saying (unintelligible)?

Steve Flinders: No, no. He first called them convention tags. Let's make that a second motion. That's not in your motion? Anything about conservation tags?

Sam Carpenter: I didn't think it was.

Steve Flinders: She's got Statewide Conservation tag and the Sportsman permit.

Natalie Brewster: I've got Governor tag, is what he said, and the Sportsman's tag. Nothing about Conservation tags.

Steve Flinders: Change that to Statewide Conservation permit, the Governor's tag.

Clair Woodbury: See there's more to this. I was afraid of that.

Layne Torgerson: Is that how you clarify Steve?

Steve Flinders: Yeah.

Sam Carpenter: I'm confused now

Kevin Bunnell: What they're asking for, currently a southern region Conservation tag can't hunt on a harvest objective unit once it's closed. And so they're asking that the Conservation tag for the region, Conservation tags for the region be allowed to hunt all of the units in the region regardless of whether or not they're closed. So that's what they're asking.

Steve Flinders: How many are there?

Kevin Bunnell: There are 19 statewide; in the southern region I think it's eight or nine.

Steve Flinders: Eight or nine Conservation permits in the southern region.

Kevin Bunnell: In the southern region.

Steve Flinders: That they want to be able to hunt anywhere.

Kevin Bunnell: In the southern region.

Steve Flinders: But they want to be able to hunt anywhere . . .

Kevin Bunnell: Anywhere in the southern region regardless of whether it's closed or not.

Steve Flinders: Limited entry versus harvest objective versus split, whatever statues the unit is.

Kevin Bunnell: Right. Right now they can hunt all of the limited entry units through the end of the season but if the harvest objective unit closes part way through the season then the conservation tags can no longer hunt there. So they're asking that even after a harvest objective or a split unit meets its quota that if you have a Conservation permit you'd still be allowed to hunt those units even though the quota has been met. Correct?

Steve Flinders: It's the same as cougar; I mean it's the same as elk and deer, buffalo and big horn sheep. Well there's still one thing left on the table if anybody wants to make a motion, and that is to turn what are currently eight or nine conservation permits that are good on limited entry units or split units while they're open or harvest objective units while they're open into something that would be worth a whole lot more money. Anybody want to make a motion? If not it will fail for lack of motion.

Cordell Pearson: I'll make a motion that all the Conservation tags good to hunt year round on all units in the state.

Steve Flinders: Anybody second that?

Sam Carpenter: I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Sam seconded that. Did you get that motion Natalie?

Natalie Brewster: Cordell Pearson made the motion that all Conservation tags you can hunt year round in the southern region.

Steve Flinders: He's recommending statewide.

Cordell Pearson: But they'd be statewide.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Sam Carpenter. Discussion on the motion?

Layne Torgerson: Yeah.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Yeah I'm a little confused. My understanding is the Conservation tags that I've been associated with are generally sold for a specific region, either southern, northeastern, northern, southeastern, and they're available to hunt, they can hunt in that region through the end of . . . either the harvest objective is met or the limited entry is closed, whatever the case might be. So I don't know whether I can amend that motion . . .

Steve Flinders: Well what I understood is that he meant he redefined Conservation permits in the state. They still might be issued by region but if you have a Conservation permit for the southern region you can hunt anywhere in the southern region. If you have a Conservation permit in the northeast. . . Is that what you intended?

Cordell Pearson: Yes.

Layne Torgerson: Yeah, that's the way it needs to be worded.

Steve Flinders: But not that conservation permits in the southern region are different than they are in some other region of the state.

Layne Torgerson: But they can only hunt in that region.

Steve Flinders: That's what he intended.

Layne Torgerson: Okay.

Steve Flinders: The rule applies statewide to those permits. Any other questions on the motion?

Douglas Messerly: If I understand the motion correctly then all eight Conservation permits could go to one unit that had previously been closed and harvest eight more cougars on that unit.

Clair Woodbury: That seems to me like we're losing control of our management of the cougars if we go this radical.

Unknown: Steve I think there was a comment made, I think Wade made a comment that something about some of those conservation permits, when the other units were, the harvest objective was met that they all ended up on the Monroe or something along those lines. I mean that was the only place that they could go which is, you know the way the rule is set now you're doing just what Doug just said, you know if you've got, say you've got five or six of those permits left the other region's closed because they've met their objective, all of a sudden in the months of March and April you've got six more guys camped on the Monroe.

Steve Flinders: Well yeah, it turns all those limited entry units, or the other harvest objectives that have closed into essentially split units for those hunters. They can high-grade the region.

Sam Carpenter: Can I say something?

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I'm confused now. My understanding was that if you had a conservation permit for the southern region you could hunt the southern region if it closed but you could not take that conservation permit and hunt the northern region. So we're still not putting . . . No what now? I missed that. No, that's not?

Steve Flinders: No, that's not what he intended. I'm sure that's the motion you seconded.

Sam Carpenter: Right. Isn't that what you intended.

Steve Flinders: It's that you can take eight more cougars on a unit that's closed to public hunters.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, but a Conservation tag is for a specific region.

Steve Flinders: Right. But it covers six or eight units that are in that region.

Sam Carpenter: Oh okay, okay. Oh I still agree with it.

Steve Flinders: Are we clear on a motion? Clear enough to vote? Let's vote on this motion. Let's restate it one more time. Restate it the way you have it typed and see if you captured the intent of these.

Natalie Brewster: Cordell Pearson made the motion that all Conservation tags can be hunted year round statewide. I had it regions, southern region but now it is statewide. So I need to know which is which.

Steve Flinders: Restate it Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I think after we talk to her a little bit it has to be region, okay, instead of statewide. Okay I'll change that to region.

Steve Flinders: Still seconded Sam? Everybody clear on this motion? Let's take a vote. Everybody for it? Against it? I got two against. Motion passes.

Cordell Pearson made the motion that all the Conservation tags can hunt year round in the region, Sam Carpenter seconded, 7 in favor, Clair Woodbury and Paul Briggs opposed, motion carries

Steve Flinders: Did you get the vote okay?

Natalie Brewster: Yeah, I got it.

Steve Flinders: Okay. Kevin let's jump into the cougar management plan. That was so fun.

**Cougar Management Plan (action) 1:32:21 to 1:46:13
-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator**

Steve Flinders: Thank you Kevin. Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: Do you have an estimate right now on what our cougar population is?

Kevin Bunnell: No.

Sam Carpenter: We have no idea other than . . .

Kevin Bunnell: No, because there's really no good way to measure it. There are some tools that are being developed in Washington and Montana, have been implemented that use a markary capture methodology where they are getting densities on specific units. We're going to implement those this year on the Monroe and the Oquirrh unit, the two that we're doing the research on to see if we can come up with a methodology that will allow us to actually get a density estimate on cougars. But you know that's kind of the silver bullet. . .

Sam Carpenter: Kind of like counting deer.

Kevin Bunnell: Even harder.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, I agree. I have another question: Define a female for me on this . . .

Kevin Bunnell: An adult female? I should have clarified that. I'm glad you asked. It's any female that's three years or older. So yearlings and two year olds would be considered sub-adults. Once an animal reaches three it's considered an adult.

Sam Carpenter: And this is defined by their teeth?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes. We collect a tooth on every cougar that's checked in.

Sam Carpenter: I've got more. In reading your, and I read completely through this and there are some things that I wasn't sure exactly what you were talking about. One of them was the true effect of cats in the wild, and along that the cougar prey interaction, you know that you talk about, you're going to educate. What's the difference and exactly what is it we're trying to teach on that?

Kevin Bunnell: We are just trying to, I mean there's a lot of propaganda out there relative to cougars. Some of it has some fact behind it and some of it doesn't. And there's been a lot of research done on the impacts of cougar on prey populations and we try to expose people to what the results of that research is.

Sam Carpenter: And this will be on that outlook . . .

Kevin Bunnell: On the outreach and education stuff. Yeah.

Sam Carpenter: You mention that you're going to educate the public and I also seen in there something about the 30 percent of the sportsman. By 2021, 10 percent of the public in 12 years, isn't that a little modest? Couldn't we . . .

Kevin Bunnell: Well that's 10 percent of 2.5 million. So that's educating a quarter of a million people.

Sam Carpenter: That still sounds like a small amount.

Kevin Bunnell: It is. But it's hard; it's hard to do when you're . . . I mean how do you reach the soccer mom in Salt Lake? And when the majority of the population is along the Wasatch Front.

Sam Carpenter: That just don't care.

Kevin Bunnell: And how do you get to them is the problem on that.

Sam Carpenter: One more . . . You mention in here population reconstruction. What, back here in your research, explore the population reconstruction. Do you estimate the population?

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah. That's a technique that's been applied more to bears than it has to cougars. But essentially what you do is you take the ages of all the animals that have been harvested. And you have to have a long data set; you have to have ten years or more. And using all of those ages you can go back and estimate what the population was in each of those years that you have ages for. But you have to have, like I say, a long-term data set and we have that now. We have ten years of ages on all of our cougars; and so it's something that we'll look into to see if it's a tool that's useful for us or not.

Sam Carpenter: I'm through.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Sam. Anybody else? Sure Clair.

Clair Woodbury: One question, you're talking about the sportsman's organization and getting the 30 percent of them. Could you restate that? I wasn't . . .

Kevin Bunnell: What we would try to do is we would solicit invitations like to a mule deer foundation, one of their meetings, or to an SFW meeting, ask if we can come and give a 20 minute presentation on the impacts of cougars on prey populations and try to open that dialog with those guys. You know I think communication is, we all benefit from it and it will go both ways. I mean certainly there are situations where cougars impact deer populations but there's somewhere they're not as well. And so trying to help people understand when and where that happens is what we'd be trying to achieve.

Clair Woodbury: All right. As a representative of the public at-large I'm feeling left out here.

Kevin Bunnell: The first two strategies kind of, then again it's how do we get to ya.

Clair Woodbury: Most of the people I know that hunt big game don't belong to these sportsman's organizations and they have an opinion.

Kevin Bunnell: If you could point out a venue where we could reach those people we'd be more than happy to apply it to them.

Clair Woodbury: All right, thanks.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Kevin I just have one question, on your depredation part of the plan . . .

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah.

Layne Torgerson: It specifically stated the depredation was occurring on private land.

Kevin Bunnell: Correct.

Layne Torgerson: If we've got a depredation problem with, say the livestock men that have the use of the public land and it's been an ongoing thing, is that going to be addressed through the same plan?

Kevin Bunnell: Well when we look through the data the places where we're having the problems are happening on private land. And it's largely a situation where people aren't allowing access to the public hunters, that the public has access to the lions on the public land. And so where guys aren't allowing the public to hunt they're, and in some ways creating their own problem, but because it's private land the advisory group recognized that that's different and we ought to treat it a little bit different.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Questions from the public about the cougar management plan and anything you've seen in the presentation.

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Okay, we'll move on to comments. I've got a card from Kim Payne. Thanks Kevin.

Comments from the public:

Kim Payne: Hi my name is Kim Payne. What I was concerned about was covered last time so there's no sense in taking up any more of your time.

Steve Flinders: Oh, I appreciate it. Any comments from the RAC? Further discussion? Go ahead Sam.

RAC discussion and vote:

Sam Carpenter: Just I'd like to complement the committee and I think they've done a terrific job in this. I certainly hope that the true, I guess population estimates and all this stuff can come to light and that this female definition and stuff will definitely be as low as we're talking because I look at 38 percent now or something statewide and it's kind of scary.

Kevin Bunnell: Just to, I mean we're trying to explain to people what's going on. Research that came out of Wyoming with Fred Lindsay that used to be here at Utah State University; they did a study where they looked at this in particular in Wyoming and two units, one that they were harvesting at a high rate and one where they weren't. And what they actually recommended is that once a unit reaches, it can

sustain 10 to 15 percent off take of adult females and maintain the population. We looked at our data and thought that was probably low. And so we've actually bumped up what the research said from, you know according to the research you'd stay below 15 percent, we've gone up to 17 to 20 because it seemed to fit what we saw in our past data better.

Steve Flinders: Dell.

Dell LeFevre: I'd like to make a motion that we accept the cougar management plan as presented.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Rex. Does everybody understand the motion? Please vote. Everybody for it? And against? Unanimous.

Dell made the motion to accept the Cougar Management Plan as presented, seconded by Rex Stanworth, motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Do the people want a 10-minute break or do you want to forge ahead? Ten minute break.

Furbearer Guidebook and Rule R657-11 (action) 1:54:48 to 2:02:57
-Kevin Bunnell, Mammals Coordinator

Steve Flinders: Thanks Kevin. Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Steve.

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Dalton: As I remember last year we had, you guys recommended a reduction of two bobcats last year and we settled on one. Is that was what was actually implemented last year?

Kevin Bunnell: Yes. Yes it went from six to five, and we're recommending one more this year from five down to four.

Steve Dalton: Okay, maybe this is the one from last year that should have went in last years, is what it's looking like.

Kevin Bunnell: Maybe so.

Steve Dalton: Okay, thank you.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I've got two different letters here that I'm looking at for the first time tonight that are talking about clearly defining protected furbearers only. Can you tell me what they're referring to? Is this in the proclamation? Is it something that you just covered that I missed?

Steve Flinders: Sam why don't we . . . Kevin let's let the public make comments and go from there.

Sam Carpenter: That's fine with me.

Kevin Bunnell: I'd be happy to clarify anything.

Steve Flinders: Let's hear their proposals and then we'll keep everybody on the same page. I'm assuming that everybody's seen the letters you're looking at, but I don't know for certain. Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the public on the presentation?

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Seeing none we'll move on to comments. Thanks again Kevin. Ronnie Hunt. Next will be Gary Sirus.

Comments from the public:

Ronnie Hunt: My name is Ronnie Hunt. I'm representing the Utah Trappers Association. I'm the vice president representing 750 members. First I would like to thank the board for your time and service and being able to address you here tonight. The Utah Trappers supports the bobcat management plan this year and also the otter management plan. And we did leave everybody a paper there on your desk. And the Trappers Association would like to recommend the following changes to the furbearer proclamation: Our membership feels strongly that all trapping restrictions found within the proclamation should pertain to taking of protected furbearers only. Coyotes as defined within the proclamation, page 5, definition number 7, say coyotes are not considered furbearers. On page 3 under coyote hunting it states coyotes are not protected in Utah. They may be hunted without a license year round. Under definitions 8, number 23, trapping means taking protected wildlife with a trapping device. Also, the proclamation itself is named Utah furbearer guidebook, therefore because of the aforementioned reasons we strongly feel coyotes should not be managed by the rules established in the proclamation for furbearers. Utah spends 600,000 yearly for coyote control efforts, which is spent on livestock protection. So why should we be restricting trappers from assisting this effort at no cost to the public? Any person in this state can legally pursue and harvest coyotes without a license, season, bag limit or restrictions except for trappers. Trappers are forced to abide by all the restrictions in the furbearer proclamation. Once again I'll point out that coyotes are not considered furbearers and are not supposed to be protected in Utah. The way they've singled us out appears to be borderline discriminatory. We ask this board to give this issue your serious consideration and we ask that the prior to your voting tonight we be given an opportunity to respond to any contrasting opinions or any questions that may arise before this issue is put to vote. As I mentioned before this issue is one of great importance to the Utah trappers. And thank you for your time.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Ronnie. Gary. Followed by Bill Franson.

Gary Sirus: I have got the other letter that Sam was referencing. I represent SFW. It just says the board of SFW met July 8, 2009 and by unanimous vote by all board members present, representing 16 separate chapters statewide, approved the Utah Trappers 2009 July recommendation. This recommendation will clearly define the taking of protected furbearers only. This action clearly needs to be done to allow the hunting and trapping of non-protected wildlife, more specifically coyotes, and will greatly help improve Utah's mule deer. We appreciate your consideration and vote to approve the Utah Trappers

recommendation. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Gary. Bill. Followed by Leroy Loftus.

Bill Franson: I hope you don't think I'm off the course here when I talk about deer for just a minute when we're talking about furbearers. But I picked up deer for the highway for 17 years. The area that I used to pick up was 300 miles. I'd average over 600 deer a year. Now I go over 600 miles on this trip, I pick up 200 deer a year. I see the fawns this time of year; I never see them when they're yearlings. My opinion, it's coyotes killing your yearling deer. I mean I know you guys think the deer herd's coming back. I think you're watching too much Walt Disney. It's not coming back. You better realize it. A cougar don't care if that deer is a fawn or it's got 4 points on it, it's going to kill it. A coyote it means a lot to. I was a government trapper for 10 years. I'm telling you I know what I'm talking about. You're deer are going to coyotes. And it's pretty tough to catch a coyote with a 48-hour check limit when one of the DWR is checking your traps in the middle of that 48 hours and digging your trap up. I think you ought to help us instead of chasing us away in catching your coyotes. Another thing I think you ought to do, the government trappers to kill a coyote is into it \$1,000.00 a coyote. You're making money on turkeys now, why don't you take that money and put it in bounty money? If we had a \$50.00 bounty on coyotes you'd solve a lot of your problems on deer, turkeys, everything else. But it's probably nothing you guys can consider but I'm just telling ya, I think that's what's happening. Anybody else got a different idea you can tell me. I've got 17 years of books on the deer too if anybody wants to see them. I know we built some deer fence. We've got like 30 miles of deer fence in them 17 years. I'll admit it helped a whole lot from Beaver to Cove Fort, but it still never solved the problem of where them other 400 deer are going. There's more traffic on I-15 than there ever was. And like I said, I think there's a problem there. And like I said, I think you ought to help us as far as the coyotes instead of chasing us away from doing it. Thank you guys.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Bill.

Sam Carpenter: Can I ask you a question?

Bill Franson: You bet.

Sam Carpenter: Aren't we currently, don't we have a bounty on coyotes, the SFW and whatever, that we're doing something on that?

Unknown: There's (unintelligible) counties and are (unintelligible).

Bill Franson: And the state puts in a little bit and the counties matches the rest. Ours just went from \$25.00 down to \$20.00 because they didn't have the budget, just the last day or two. Like I said, I'd like to see a statewide bounty. I really would. I know people's going to say well you're getting Idaho coyotes, and Wyoming, they don't know where the boundary is, the coyotes. I flew in an airplane for a lot of years and a helicopter hunting coyotes and they don't know them boundaries. One other little thing I'd like to bring up and it might raise a few ruffles but I would like to. And I'm going to ask Doug here because he's always been honest with me and give me good straight answers. It seems like the last 10 years in our area every time we get new people, young people, and I think everybody has the right to trap and hunt horns. I believe that. But I want to know Doug, is it against the law for your men to trap and pick up horns on government time in a government vehicle? And if it is and if we've got proof of it

can we go anywhere with it? Because it's happening with pretty near every guy, and I'm not trying to take their rights away, but maybe they ought to use their outfit like we do, is all I'm saying when they check their traps.

Douglas Messerly: The answer to your question is no. It's not against the law.

Bill Franson: To use your outfit and their time.

Douglas Messerly: It's against state policy but it's not against the law.

Bill Franson: Okay. What would you do if we had the proof of that?

Douglas Messerly: Send me the information and I'll show ya.

Bill Franson: Okay. Thank you.

Sam Carpenter: One more thing before you sit down to make sure that I've got this right. You are going along with the recommendation that have just been made then, that's what you're talking about.

Bill Franson: I support that all the way. You bet I do. Thank you guys.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Bill. LeRoy followed by James Ames.

Leroy Loftus: Leroy Loftus, I'm also a member of the Trappers Association. And I want to say I support the bobcat recommendation of the DWR and the otter program. But we also would like your serious consideration on the information that we set before you on the proclamation tonight. Thank you for your time.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Leroy. James Ames followed by Delmar Waters.

James Ames: I am James Ames. I'm a member of the Utah Trappers Association. I'm here to support them. Myself and everybody I talked to are behind them completely.

Steve Flinders: Thanks James. Delmar.

Delmar Waters: I just want you to know that I support what the association is trying to do and it is very important to us. I think it's important to you guys as well.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Delmar. I think maybe to help the RAC fully understand what has been asked of us, Kevin how about shedding some light from a Division point of view, and maybe Doug, what this recommendation is about.

Kevin Bunnell: It's a hard issue what it's about. Really what it comes down to is the 48-hour trap check. And we don't regulate the take of coyotes because coyotes are unprotected wildlife. What we regulate is the activity of trapping. And Doug chime in if you can add to this at all. And so if, the reason we have the 48-hour trap check is there's two main reasons, one comes from an animal just the ethics behind keeping an animal in a trap for an extended period of time. And that applies whether it's a bobcat

or a coyote or anything. You know that animal deserves some respect. And the second one and really the main one comes down to the trapping of non-targets. If you could put a coyote trap out there and you could guarantee that it wouldn't pick up anything but a coyote that would be one thing, but trapping is not that specific. And so with the 48-hour trap check it gives guys an opportunity to release non-targets, to release bobcats, to release kit fox, to release badgers, to release other species of protected wildlife. And that's why we're regulating. What the laws do is they regulate the activity of trapping; they don't regulate the take of coyotes. With a tool that's specific to coyotes like a rifle you can take them year round. And so that's why some clarification there; that it's the activity of trapping not the taking of coyotes that's regulated by this rule. I hope that helps.

Douglas Messerly: I'd like to add to that a little bit. As this is worded it says all restrictions applying to trapping. And as I understand that that would include not only 48-hour check law but the requirement to mark traps so that we can identify the owner, the requirement to have off set jaws to protect non-target birds that are caught in traps, and also the requirement to use bait. So as I understand it if this recommendation were to pass it would be legal to set traps around say a dead cow, within 10 feet, as many as you wanted to, not mark them, not have off set jaws, and not check them for two weeks. And I think that that would not be good, the results of that would not be good for trapping in general and I think that needs to be considered here. One of the problems that we've had, and most of my career's been in law enforcement over the years, is proving the species that was intended to be caught. For example this argument has been made in the past when people haven't checked their traps, we've documented bobcats in traps for . . . personally I've documented for up to 13 days. And it's not a pretty sight when those animals are in those traps that long. When we attempt to prosecute those people one of their defenses is that the trap was set for coyotes; it wasn't set for protected wildlife. And this essentially legitimizes that. And I'm afraid that the result would be that it would be very difficult to prosecute anyone for not checking their traps, not marking their traps, or not having the proper equipment because the claim would be that the trap was set for coyotes rather than for others. And I think that's an important consideration here. I think that the intent of the recommendation as stated here tonight is not a bad one. And I don't think that we're trying to interfere with the taking of coyotes whatsoever. I think by setting regulations for the taking of wildlife by the use of leg hold traps we're doing a couple of things, we're providing for the humane treatment of animals that are caught in leg hold traps, which protects trapping in the long run, and the ability to trap. And there are some neighbor states that haven't been able to do that. And I think that's important. The second thing that we're doing is we're protecting our ability to be able to regulate this activity by requiring the marking of traps etc. And I think that's a very important . . . and then the use of bait. The use of bait has been shown to catch many many non-target birds in particular. Eagles, hawks, ravens, blue birds, jays and then a lot of animals that are maimed or killed when traps are set too close to bait; and hence our regulation of 30 feet within bait. As I understand this proposal it's to remove all restrictions, all trapping restrictions. And I believe the scenario that I described is very likely if not potential.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. Not to get into a big debate here but Ronnie if there's one of you guys from UTA that wants to reemphasize or rebut.

Ronnie Hunt: We are fur trappers and we're not out there to let anything set in our traps for 13 days. I mean we're there to get the fur and the pelts and that's the reason why we're out there. Everybody in the state already has their trap ID number on their trap and their offset jaws. If they're trapping fox, bobcat, it's in the furbearer guidebook you got to have it. And I don't know of anybody that's going to have a trap for a bobcat one day and a different trap for a coyote the next day; it's going to be the same

trap, it's going to have the number on it, it's going to have the offset jaws on it. And it would be counterproductive to go set a coyote trap within 10 feet of a dead cow. There's no trapper in their right mind that would imagine they could catch a coyote there before an eagle or a bird would jump into it. It's just, that was something that was in print in the 1900's in trapping books. Now days you don't see trapping books or information on the Internet that says you got to set a trap within 10 feet of a cow to catch a coyote. That's highly discouraged and highly unlikely that would happen. So anyway thanks for your time and that's it.

Steve Flinders: I've got one question Kevin, how many furbearer licenses were sold last year in Utah?

Kevin Bunnell: I'd have to look. I've got the data on my computer if you give me a minute while you're discussing I'll come back with it.

Steve Flinders: He's got 750 members in UTA, I wonder what percentage of people that are trapping are members of UTA.

Kevin Bunnell: Oh there's more, it's safe to say over 2,000 that are sold. But I can tell you exactly if you want to give me just a minute while you're talking about things.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Why don't all trappers, I mean we're talking not just about furbearers but don't they have to buy a trapping license to trap or is that just anyone can just go out and set?

Kevin Bunnell: No if you're, you have to have a . . . similar to hunter's you have to pass it, if you were born after a certain day you have to go through a trappers education program. You have to have a number that you put on your traps and you have to have a furbearer license. In addition to that you also have to have bobcat tags if you're going after bobcats.

Sam Carpenter: So are you finding a large number of traps that are not marked, that do not meet these qualifications? Is that what Doug's referring to? Is there a problem with that?

Kevin Bunnell: Right now any trap that's out there has to be tagged.

Sam Carpenter: I understand that. But are you finding some that are not?

Kevin Bunnell: You know I'd leave that to the law enforcement guys to address.

Steve Flinders: Do you want to respond Doug?

Doug Messerly: Certainly. Yes we are. We are finding traps that are not marked. We are finding traps hung under jackrabbits, or under hanging jackrabbits. Unfortunately it's, my experience with trappers is that most of them are as has been described by the Trappers Association representative. Unfortunately there are a few bad apples. The other requirement as pointed out here is that no license is required to take coyotes. So if no license is required to take coyotes and there are no restrictions on the trapping methods that can be used these people, there may be new people get into the business or into the recreation or into the practice of trapping coyotes that will have no education and they will have none of

this instruction that's required for people that are required to have a furbearer license.

Sam Carpenter: Okay now aren't these people that are doing these kinds of sets pretty easy to apprehend? Don't they eventually come and check their traps so you can find them, weed them out?

Doug Messerly: I sat on one for 13 days before he came back and our officers don't often have the luxury of doing that. So the answer to your question is no, they aren't that easy to catch.

Sam Carpenter: Okay what about trail cameras, things of that nature? It works for deer.

Steve Flinders: Before we, let us hash this out for a minute up here. Sam the issue is about a trap, can one set a trap just coyote specific? I've trapped. I'm not a good trapper. I can't. It seems like an easy ticket for the division because a badger may wander into that trap, a kit fox could wander into that trap. All these protected wildlife, a ringtail may wander into that trap you're setting anywhere around rocks, or a bobcat.

Sam Carpenter: I understand that especially if they're set (unintelligible) proper equipment. (Unintelligible).

Steve Flinders: Yeah. Any other discussion? Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I was just going to mention that I like the idea of knowing who's out trapping, and with the encouragement of those trappers of taking those coyotes. I mean that's an awesome idea. I guess inside this rule book, the furbearer rule book, somewhat, it's not going to accomplish anything if we take out the coyote and leave in the fact that anybody that traps inside the state of Utah is going to have to have these requirements. It's one in the same. Am I thinking of that wrong?

Steve Flinders: No I think you are thinking it right. In fact I think I'd form a question and pose it to Ronnie is how will this help you catch more coyotes?

Ronnie Hunt: Well I think one thing, we have a lot of elderly trappers in the fall of the year that can't get out there in January and chain up their 4x4 and charge the snow drifts. These guys are the old dyed in the wool type coyote trappers and they want to set a coyote line out, you know, maybe a hundred miles, you know, from their house or so, and do a little circle. And not have to go back and abide by all these other restrictions that's set up for protected furbearers, you know.

Steve Flinders: How do those guys set pan tension such that they don't take a badger?

Ronnie Hunt: Well I don't know that. I think the possibility is probably there. But I do think, you know, if they're trapping for fur there's the option there that they can release it, you know. I don't think they're going to leave something in their trap there and plan on skinning it 13 days after they've caught it. I just think that's totally unreasonable.

Sam Carpenter: Can I ask another question of him while he's up there?

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Sam Carpenter: What would you recommend, or how would you look at this to satisfy what Doug is presenting on the problems that are coming up? Is there a way to reword the proclamation to address that kind of stuff or is this just black or white on that as far as the way it's written?

Ronnie Hunt: Well that's the problem we've had for years is we've felt it's a gray area, and we would either be. . . But it's black and that we can go trap coyotes like people can go trap a gopher or a mouse or a rat and not have to abide by that. Or else they set them up as a protected species and we'll trap them as that; either black or white but not the gray. That's our opinion.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I have one question for ya. Is there any other state that lets trappers trap coyotes?

Steve Flinders: Different than other species?

Cordell Pearson: Right, different than other species of furbearing animals?

Ronnie Hunt: I really don't know that.

Bill Fransom: You can buy all the cat tags in WY, 96 hour check period and I think coyotes are (unintelligible).

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Kevin.

Kevin Bunnell: Just to answer your previous question, I just looked it up. Over the last several years we've averaged between about 1,600 and 2,000 furbearer licenses sold.

Bill Fransom: Can I say one more thing on the humane part?

Steve Flinders: Sure.

Bill Fransom: I know we are at this 48-hour check period and I guess it's a humane law is what we're looking at, the way it sounds. Like I said, I was the government trapper a lot of years. Their rules is they drive a new truck, they get paid a budget, they set a trap or snare, none of these restrictions. If they want to set on top of that dead cow they can. And they never have to go back to that trap or that snare, never. So if we've got guys running around in uniforms setting examples doing that then what makes us look so bad here as Utah trappers?

Steve Flinders: Well we've all seen on TV helicopters flying back into the airport with coyotes attached to it and the public sees that and they think that's what trappers do. They have a tough time making a distinction. We're smart enough in this room to be able to make that distinction.

Bill Fransom: But is them guys allowed to drive drunk or whatever just 'cause they work for the government, is that what I'm trying to say, and then put these rules on us? It don't sound right to me.

Steve Flinders: I don't know about that.

Bill Fransom: I mean they're the ones getting paid to do it everyday. Because like I said, I did it for a lot of years.

Steve Flinders: I don't know about that. Thanks for your comments.

Rex Stanworth: I guess I would just make one comment in regards to that, two things; number one, with you folks having a furbearer license and going through the steps you're actually kind of protecting your own organization. Whereby some of these young people, I heard somebody say young people, I think it was you, that go out and they may raise havoc with the rest of the guys that are trapping, it may become a very dismal thing. We look at coyotes as nothing but junk out on the desert but the bottom line comes down to is there are those people in our areas, and each community's got it, that think that if it breathes and walks it's one of God's creatures and they're going to protect it. So I look at this as, we could take it off and say okay we're going to open it up but on the other hand it may come back to bite ya. You know two years, three years, four years from now when all of a sudden people go out and they say here's 25 documented cases where somebody left a coyote, well it wasn't a coyote this time it was a bobcat, to where it would really come back to bite ya. And I guess the bottom line comes down to is that not only that but if some of these people who do not want to be controlled just go out and trap they may very easily have some impact upon the very resource that you folks are trying to protect with your recommendations for cats and those. Believe me, there's nobody that would love to see more coyotes killed than me, but on the other hand not having some sort of rule by which everybody plays by in the long run may come back to really bite the organization, of saying you know what, hindsight tells us maybe this wasn't such a good idea because now we're getting blamed for all this other crap that's taking place and they're not even a part of our organization, they don't even have a furbearer license. So I guess that would be my concern for you folks, is what may sound sweet and nice today may all of a sudden turn rancid and have a bad taste a year from now or two years from now as this thing progresses.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rex. Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Steve I'm still not clear on exactly what's being asked for here. Is the trappers association asking for an extension of the season dates to trap or trap outside of the regular season dates? What's being asked for here?

Steve Flinders: Well as I understand it it's to remove coyotes from regulation as it deals with the furbearer proclamation so they're outside of that.

Clair Woodbury: So they would be able to be trapped at any time year round, is that what you're asking for?

Steve Flinders: Yeah, kind of a free for all. And if we try to break it down any more then the Division could sit down with the UTA and try to work something out.

Clair Woodbury: Can you help me out here?

Ronnie Hunt: Yeah. We're just asking that all trapping restrictions within the proclamation shall pertain to the taking of furbearers only and not non-protected species.

Clair Woodbury: So is that asking to be able to trap year round outside of the other season limits for the other animals?

Steve Flinders: Everything in the proclamation that applies to trapping is out the window.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Ronnie Hunt: Pretty much it's just coyotes only but that's . .

Clair Woodbury: You already can do year round on bobcats and such?

Ronnie Hunt: Just coyotes only.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Ronnie Hunt: There is other species like gophers, moles, rats. . .

Steve Flinders: Well that's beyond the point of what we're talking about.

Ronnie Hunt: We're dealing about, talking about coyotes.

Steve Flinders: Bigger animals, yeah. Anybody else? Steve.

Steve Dalton: I guess I am in about the same position as Clair is here trying to figure out what it is you guys are actually asking for. You oppose the 48-hour requirement to check your traps every 48-hours? Are you opposed to that or are you trying to address that at this time or not?

Ronnie Hunt: No we've never asked for anything on the 48-hour trap check. That's not what we're asking for tonight.

Steve Dalton: Okay so if you set a coyote trap you don't have to check it in 48-hours if you can get this removed from the furbearer proclamation, is that essentially what will take place?

Ronnie Hunt: That is correct.

Steve Dalton: So I guess that is what you are asking for.

Ronnie Hunt: Well there's actually more than one thing in the proclamation that the restrictions are there listed on the papers that we handed out there, definitions I guess I should say, on the paper we handed out during the break. But that is one of them, so . . .

Steve Dalton: So that would be one of the changes that would take place if we agreed with what you're recommending here?

Ronnie Hunt: Yes.

Steve Dalton: Well I think Rex made a good point. I think you guys might be stepping on your own feet

here. You'll probably get this thing shut down and you won't be able to set for coyotes.

Ronnie Hunt: Well uh, you know I realize there are some bad apples. You know I've seen on TV and the archery where, you know, there's the Hereford cow there with the full of arrows and the big bull elk that's been shot and his horns cut off. We're, you know we have a few bad apples. We're not immune from it. I don't think any organization around is, and we realize that.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Ronnie. Any other discussion? If not, ready for a motion on the furbearer guidebook and rule.

RAC discussion and vote:

Mack Morrell: I think what they want is to take coyotes off the furbearer list, right? Okay, then I would make a motion that coyotes be taken off the furbearer list according to the proclamation.

Steve Flinders: That was Mack. Did you get that? And is it seconded?

Mack Morrell: And recommend, and I would also make a motion to accept the furbearer guidebook rule R657-11. So motion includes two things, one: take coyotes off, one: to approve the new rule R657-11.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Mack. Will you read that back Natalie?

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dell.

Natalie Brewster: Mack Morrell made the motion that coyotes be taken off and that they accept the rule as presented.

Steve Flinders: Taken off of?

Natalie Brewster: He said taken off.

Steve Flinders: Give us a minute to hash this out.

Natalie Brewster: Taken off of the . . .

Mack Morrell: Furbearer.

Natalie Brewster: Furbearer proclamation?

Mack Morrell: Right.

Kevin Bunnell: They're already not considered furbearer. And it's not the take of coyotes that are being regulated; it's the use of traps that's being regulated. And so what you just did wouldn't change anything because they're already not considered furbearers.

Steve Flinders: The recommendation is, the point of the presentation was coyotes aren't furbearers, why is trapping of them regulated by the furbearer proclamation? And so to grant their request would mean to not only acknowledge that but to take the next step and say that you can trap them by any means I guess, or to say that the furbearer proclamation doesn't apply to coyotes.

Unknown: The general public can take coyotes any way they want.

Steve Flinders: No they can't. Tell them how we can take coyotes Doug. It's pretty close.

Douglas Messerly: There are certain methods for taking any wildlife that are currently prohibited: explosives, the unlawful use of poisons, illegal weapons. And the issue here needs to be clarified, as Steve said, or maybe it was Kevin or maybe both, what we're talking about here is the method for taking animals. It's not really the classification of animals. It's actually the code that says that coyotes, it's Utah Code; it's in statute, that says coyotes are not included in the definition of protected wildlife. So they're not protected wildlife, never have been. The rule says that traps used to take wildlife, and that doesn't say protected wildlife, but it says traps used to take wildlife must meet the following conditions and those conditions include that the traps must be marked, they have to have offset jaws, they have to be checked within 48-hours, and they can't be used around bait. And those are generalizations because snares have a little bit different and lethal traps have a little bit different regulations, but there are regulations specific to those kinds. What the trappers association is asking for is that there be no restrictions, as I understand it, on the use of trapping devices to take coyotes. Do I have that correct?

Ronnie Hunt: Yeah, that's partially correct. But we're asking that the furbearer proclamation is for furbearers and a coyote is a non-protected species and it should not be listed in the furbearer proclamation with the same regulations.

Douglas Messerly: Okay I appreciate that. But the net result of that would be that there would be no restrictions on the use of trapping devices to take coyotes, correct?

Ronnie Hunt: Correct.

Douglas Messerly: Okay. So what would happen is that we would find, say our officers found a trap in the field that was set near bait, that was unmarked, that did not have offset jaws, and he watched it for 5 days straight and it wasn't checked. Or let's say he watched a coyote in it for 5 days straight. If there was a coyote actually caught in the trap when the person arrived if this were adopted there would be no violation, none whatsoever, whether it was 5 days, or 15 days, or 1 day there would be no violation. On the other hand if nothing were caught in the trap and he watched it for 5 days and the person showed up and they had no license and there were all these other violations for the taking of furbearers, what would they say? I'm trapping coyotes. And in reality this would make it very difficult to enforce any of the trapping device restrictions even on furbearers because we would have to prove what kind of animal that trap was set to catch and that's a difficult task. So that's the challenge here. And what they're doing by removing any restrictions under the furbearer proclamation for coyotes is essentially deregulating the use of trapping devices to take coyotes. Have I misstated any of that?

Unknown: I don't think so.

Douglas Messerly: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Now the motion on the table, Mack do you want to get back to it? Restate it?

Mack Morrell: Yeah. I think that uh, if the trappers want to take coyotes

Steve Flinders: They're not necessarily listed. They're just, it's just stated that they're not a furbearer. But it's trapping that's regulated; the use of traps. And the hard part is discriminating between a trap set for a coyote and a trap set for everything else.

Mack Morrell: Okay, then in today's world anybody can set a trap for a coyote . . .

Steve Flinders: They can pretend to

Mack Morrell: Yeah, and right now though.

Douglas Messerly: Well they can but they're required to . . .

Steve Flinders: Any trap used to take wildlife had to be labeled (unintelligible).

Mack Morrell: Have a label, yeah.

Steve Flinders: And set accordingly.

Mack Morrell: Right.

Steve Flinders: And so all those rules go out the window if we're talking about coyotes. But the dilemma is how do you do that. How do you, coyote traps won't be blue.

Mack Morrell: That's correct.

Steve Flinders: So how do you tell that's a coyote trap?

Mack Morrell: Is it labeled? I mean don't they have them numbered?

Steve Flinders: They do now but if you throw all this out the window then we start over on what we do for coyotes specifically. They don't want any regulations against trapping coyotes.

Steve Dalton: Just because you're trapping for a coyote doesn't mean that's the only animal you can get in that trap.

Mack Morrell: I understand that.

Steve Dalton: I'm still trying to figure out how that enables them to catch more coyotes. You know what that

Rex Stanworth: I think Steve there is . . .

Mack Morrell: Like I'm saying, if I can go out and shoot a coyote any time I want. . .

Steve Dalton: Go ahead.

Douglas Messerly: You can.

Steve Flinders: You know what a coyote looks like in your scope.

Mack Morrell: That's right.

Steve Flinders: Even in your headlights. But that trap will catch a coyote, it will catch a badger, it will catch a kit fox.

Mack Morrell: It doesn't know.

Steve Flinders: And some are more sensitive to the public, even the sporting public than coyotes. And this is a big sleeping dog and we're going to give it a big old kick in the butt is what I've heard some other RAC members . . .

Rex Stanworth: Steve, there is an option here. If everybody wants a warm fuzzy feeling you remove coyote from the furbearer proclamation but in that furbearer proclamation you say the state of Utah has an aggressive policy regarding trapping and anybody that traps has to follow these steps, dah, dah, dah, dah, including . . .

Kevin Bunnell: That's exactly what is says right now.

Rex Stanworth: Okay. So I guess that's the only option you've got, is leaving it as is. It tells them that they can go trap but it's going to tell you who is trapping and that's basically what you're looking for is an enforcement on that trap line. Knowing who's there and who it belongs to. That's the crux of the problem.

Kevin Bunnell: That's part of it but it also regulates how they can set that trap. Regulation says that that trap has to be labeled, it has to have an offset jaw, it can't be set over bait. So it's again, it's not the take of coyotes that's being regulated it's the activity of trapping that regulated in the furbearer proclamation.

Steve Flinders: And again, we heard this is not unique to Utah. Most of the western states they're know as best management practices that are adopted by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. And by that you gain some clout, but (unintelligible) state to state. Having said all of this Mack still has a . . .

Dell LeFevre: Ok we've got a motion and a second on the floor. I call a question on the motion. I say we vote it up or down and get on.

Steve Flinders: Let's restate the motion. When the motion was restated we had nothing but confusion.

Natalie Brewster: Is he going to restate his motion?

Steve Flinders: If we're voting on something I want to know what we're voting on. Restate what you have.

Natalie Brewster: What I have is that Mack Morrell made the motion that coyotes be taken off the furbearer guidebook and accept the rule as presented. Dell seconded.

Steve Flinders: It's already outside the rule. It's not . . .

Dell LeFevre: Mr. Chairman, you have a motion on the floor with a second. You have to vote it up or down.

Steve Flinders: I want to make sure all the members know what it is. Rex do you understand it?

Rex Stanworth: Yep.

Steve Flinders: Layne, everybody understand the motion? Let's take a vote. Everybody that's for it? Against it? Motion fails.

Mack Morrell made the motion that coyote be taken off the furbearer guidebook and accept the rule as presented. Dell LeFevre seconded, 4 in favor, Mack, Dell, Sam, and Cordell, 5 against, Paul Briggs, Clair Woodbury, Steve Dalton, Layne Torgerson, Rex Stanworth. Motion failed

Steve Flinders: More discussion? New motion?

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I'd make a recommendation that we accept the furbearer guidebook and rule R657-11 as proposed and presented by Kevin.

Paul Briggs: And I'll second it.

Steve Flinders: Paul Briggs seconds. Everybody understand the motion? Everybody for it? Against? Motion passes.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the rule as presented, Paul seconded, 6 in favor, 3 against, Mack, Dell and Sam.

Steve Flinders: Greg's buying you lunch huh? Sorry bud. We're going quick. Thanks Kevin. Moving on, Proposed Fee Schedule. Greg's stand-in.

**Proposed Fee Schedule (action)
-Kenny Johnson,**

2:46:12 to 2:2:50:32

Rex Stanworth: I'm assuming since there's not a lot of people grabbing the microphone, are you ready for a uh . . .

Steve Flinders: We're going to do them all together. Naw, I guess we'll break them up. Any questions?

Questions from the RAC:

None

Steve Flinders: Questions from a handful of public?

Questions from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Any questions Jake? I don't have any comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Discussion, motion?

RAC discussion:

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I make a motion to accept the proposed fee schedule as presented to us.

Steve Flinders: Second. Steve Dalton seconds. All in favor? Opposed? Unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented. Steve Dalton seconded, motion carries unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Move on.

**Wildlife Board and RAC Rule Amendment R657-39 (action) 2:51:37 to 2:53:20
-Kenny Johnson,**

Steve Flinders: It's two years now.

Kenny Johnson: It's a two-year term now.

Staci Coons: No, (unintelligible) some RACs that were doing eight years with the (unintelligible). So our (unintelligible) here was to make for their (unintelligible).

Steve Flinders: What happened to stand up to the mic, Staci?

Staci Coons: I yell very loud.

Steve Flinders: She gave me a speech earlier.

Clair Woodbury: Is there a limit now to these term limit?

Staci Coons: I'm Staci Coons. I'm the Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Board coordinator. Currently the limit is up for debate. Some regions read it as no there's no limit and others said after two we need to replace it. So we wanted to make it very clear that a chair could serve four years as chair with a reappointment after two years. And then that would be the full amount that he could serve as the chair. He could then be appointed to vice chair if the council wanted to go that way. Does that answer your question?

Clair Woodbury: Yes.

Steve Flinders: Thanks for that clarification. Any other questions?

Sam Carpenter: But you can be on the RAC for the same, they have the four years right? On the RAC and two terms?

Kenny Johnson: Right.

Sam Carpenter: So you've got eight years but you can only do that for two as well.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman if there's no further discussion I'm make a . . .

Steve Flinders: Go, go.

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

RAC discussion:

Rex Stanworth: I make a recommendation that we accept the Wildlife Board and RAC rule amendment, R657-39 as presented

Clair Woodbury: I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Clair, motion by Rex, to accept. Everybody for it? Against? Unanimous

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept rule R657-39 as presented. Clair Woodbury seconded motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Go next Kenny.

**Error Remedy Rule Amendment R657-50 (action)
-Kenny Johnson,**

2:55:12 to 2:59:58

Steve Flinders: Questions?

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Are you starting to have a lot of problem with errors in these applications where people do them online where we have to set up a board to go through them?

Kenny Johnson: You know it's not any one thing. It's just, you know, we'll have this meeting a couple times a month and it's all over the board. Sometimes it's similar problems and other times it's just stuff that's really off the wall. And so it's hard to put a finger on it.

Cordell Pearson: What I'm asking is like what? Give me an example of an error.

Kenny Johnson: A lot of times there's a couple of obvious ones, you go to Wal-Mart and get your spike elk and they give you an any bull elk. But in the mean time spike elk sells out or something strange like that happens. We've got to have a way to try and address that; and usually it will involve a Wal-Mart. And you know that's on one side of it. The other side would be something to do with like a missed harvest survey or something where a bank or a post office or somebody's Internet service crashed at the last minute and they couldn't complete their harvest survey, those kinds of things. So where the rule is really hard and fast before it's just broadened enough that this group can still be effective and hopefully help in some of those instances.

Steve Flinders: (Unintelligible).

Kenny Johnson: Oh yeah, yeah and a lot faster. I mean we're real-time with our applications and so most everything we catch in that time right before the draw actually happens and so that makes like a little bit easier too.

Rex Stanworth: One question. If we're on real-time why does it take, why is the lag so long on elk and deer and those species? That's what bothers me, we've gone to a computer system which everything should come in and boom, we could hold the draw so everybody can get their vacations put in line and figure out what they're going to do. This waiting until the end of April is an absolute joke.

Kenny Johnson: Yes we get that a little bit. You know it still does take a lot of man-hours to pull the thing off. There's still a lot of administration, a lot of double-checking, verification, audits, audits of the draw before we release the results, those kinds of things. I'm not saying there's not a chance to curtail that a little bit, to shorten it. I think you raise a valid point. It's a lot closer to real-time and certainly technology's given us a chance to streamline some of that.

Rex Stanworth: I mean quite honestly Utah's system is antiquated in relationship to other places. For what it's worth send that back to me Shehan will ya?

Kenny Johnson: I will.

Rex Stanworth: Tell him we're holding him totally responsible.

Steve Flinders: One answer to that question would be Rex, is that we don't provide them buck and bull permit numbers until our March meeting. So if you notice the March board meeting, if you're up there, the guy from System Consultants is sitting in the audience, he's that eager to get the numbers to his programmers. So that's probably the major hang-up now.

Kenny Johnson: That's a good point.

Rex Stanworth: And I don't know why, it seems to me that we talk about a two-year, three-year plan of using some numbers, and I realize that there could be some decision making there, but it looks like to me . . . let's say if on the Fish Lake that you're going to give 100 bull permits consistently over the last four years you've given 100 or 105, let's give 100 and with five that are, you know, that are still in the draw process or whatever. But gee Christmas I'll tell you what, it's . . .

Steve Flinders: If you're those five guys that would have got those tags you'll wait till March.

Rex Stanworth: Yeah.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions?

Questions from the public:

None

Comments from the public:

None

Steve Flinders: Ready for a motion. I don't see any public for comments.

RAC discussion and vote:

Kenny Johnson: If we do it too early Rex, too, we open the window to have to duplicate a bunch of permits. So that's kind of an interesting thing too. We hurry and get them out to people and then the next thing we know we're duplicating them, a couple thousand of them, so . . .

Steve Flinders: Anything else?

Paul Briggs: I make a motion we accept the proposed rule change as presented.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Cordell. Everybody for it? Any against it? Let the record show we lost Dell.

Paul Briggs made the motion to accept rule R657-50 as presented. Cordell seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Other Business (contingent)

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: One last matter of business guys, briefly. There are a couple of things, one of them we need to take action on, statewide elk plan committee representative. The Division is reconvening to draft a new statewide elk plan. Rex was on the last committee, responded back to us. Some of you were on the RAC and remember that. I talked to him to see what his interest might be. It sounds like he's willing to make the drive from Delta up there. I've also talked to Layne about being his alternate and maybe accompanying him or standing in if he needs to or both. But I thought we ought to deliberate that amongst ourselves if we want to and maybe formalize it with a motion. If somebody wants to nominate those guys or . . .

Sam Carpenter: I think that's a great choice and I would like to make a motion that we put them in that position as you stated.

Paul Briggs: And I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Paul. Any discussion? Get your information to those guys. Tell them what you think. When they come back with feedback, you know, give them, let them know we have our support and what we want. Let's take a vote. Everybody for it? Against? Unanimous

Sam Carpenter made the motion to place him in that position as you stated, Paul seconded, motion carries unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Last two things, just a reminder about the August 19th RAC and Board training. If you have any questions I think you've got the information. If not me or Staci can get it to you. And also, we need to pick meeting locations and I'll, I think everybody's got e-mail addresses. I don't know whether you all want to meet in Beaver. Just give me a sense of whether you want to move around a little bit. I know everybody has to do a little bit of driving; if we move things around a little bit. Some of these meetings may be a little smaller than they used to be with dedicated hunters. We might be able to pick some other venues. I don't know if there's anything in Wayne County even. When's the last time a RAC was in Wayne County? So think about that. Piute County's got a spot? So let's think about that. I think we may serve the public a little bit better in moving around. But of course it depends on the meetings we pick. There are different schools of thought. Yeah, we'll set that in November. That's all I've got, anything else?

Unintelligible: Move to adjourn.

Unintelligible: Second.

Steve Flinders: Unanimous. Thanks everybody.

Meeting adjourned 10:22 pm