

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Beaver High School  
Beaver, UT  
May 11, 2010, 7:00 p.m.**

**REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA**

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

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**R657-12 HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR DISABLED HUNTERS**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-12 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**R657-55 WILDLIFE CONVENTION PERMIT RULE AMENDMENT**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-55 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous

**R657-41 CONSERVATION AND SPORTSMAN PERMITS RULE AMENDMENT**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-41 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**R657-17 LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE RULE AMENDMENT**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-17 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**R657-42 REFUND RULE AMENDMENT**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-42 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**R657-60 AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES INTERDICTION RULE AMENDMENT**

**MOTION:** To accept R657-60 as presented.

**VOTE:** Unanimous.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
 Beaver High School  
 Beaver, UT  
 May 11, 2010  
 7:00 p.m.**

<b>RAC Members Present</b>	<b>DWR Personnel Present</b>	<b>Wildlife Board Present</b>	<b>RAC Members Not Present</b>
Chairman Steve Flinders Steve Dalton Mack Morrell Layne Torgerson Cordell Pearson Rex Stanworth Dale Bagley	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Mark Ekins Richard Hepworth Mike Ottenbacher Mike Hadley Alan Clark Roger Wilson Staci Coons Judi Tutorow Drew Cushing Kenny Johnson	Jake Albrecht	Clair Woodbury Sam Carpenter Dell LeFevre Paul Briggs

Chairman Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. There were approximately 7 interested parties in attendance, in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves.

Steve Flinders: It looks like it's 7 o'clock. Technology is working tonight. Let's get started. Thanks for braving the storm. I'm Steve Flinders the RAC Chairman. I represent the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forests. Let's start down on my left and introduce the RAC please.

Steve Dalton: My name's Steve Dalton, I'm from Teasdale. I'm an at-large representative.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, Bicknell, agriculture.

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson from Richfield. I'm a sportsman's representative.

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

Douglas Messerly: My name's Doug Messerly, Regional Supervisor with the Division of Wildlife. My staff and myself act as executive secretary to this committee.

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

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale. I represent an elected official.

Steve Flinders explained the RAC meeting procedures.

Steve Flinders: I'd like to recognize Jake Albrecht, out in the audience; he's a current Wildlife Board member. I appreciate you coming Jake. And next to him I see Paul Neimeyer, former Board Member. For the meeting tonight we'll have a presentation from the division. We'll then proceed to questions from the RAC and then questions from the audience, and then to public comment. If you want to make a comment please fill out a comment card and note the agenda item you want to discuss and hand it forward. I'll take a motion on the agenda and last meeting's minutes.

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

Rex Stanworth: I'll make the motion to accept the agenda as outlined. I'll also make a motion that we accept the minutes last month. I will say on page 26, there was an unknown second on Clair Woodbury's motion. And that was me that made that second. So if they want to put that in I just thought I'd make that mention that, I'll help them know the unknown, which was me. And with that change I'd move we accept the minutes.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex. Seconded by Steve Dalton. Those in favor of approving the agenda and minutes? Any against? Unanimous.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the agenda and to accept the minutes from the last meeting with one correction. On page 26 an unknown person was noted as seconding a motion made by Clair Woodbury. Rex Stanworth was the person that seconded that motion. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

### **Wildlife Board Update: -Steve Flinders, Chairman**

Steve Flinders: Let me bring you up to speed real quick on the Wildlife Board meeting. It was a quick turnaround, having all the RAC meetings on the same night. Let me make note of the various motions that are different than what was presented by the Division and discuss a little how they relate to what went on. I wasn't here. You guys need a clear memory as to what went on the last time we met. I'll just read the motions verbatim.

- I move that we review and consider a boundary change on the Boulder and Fish Lake/Plateau units for antlerless elk. That was a motion by Jake. The rationale and discussion is that the new boundary on Highway 24 be moved back across the Moapa Plateau there on the Parker, back to where those elk aren't run back and forth across that highway by Fish Lake hunters. It passed unanimously with the Board.
- Next motion was the season date on the Boulder and Fish Lake units coincide to December 12<sup>th</sup>. We move to December 12<sup>th</sup> on both and it will be the same day. That also passed unanimously.

- Tags on the Southwest Desert antlerless elk permits were increased by 25, also passed unanimous.
- Paunsagaunt Deer Plan, the motion says that we ask the Division to review the Paunsagaunt Deer Unit Plan in early 2011 following State Code. That's related to the motion that came from the RAC. There's no mention of a preconceived number but that it be revisited. And I think many of the deer plans will be revisited then. It will follow the (unintelligible) outline and code, bring work groups with various interest groups involved.
- The Mt. Carmel Unit, permits were reduced to 25 antlerless deer and the Buckskin Unit to 50; passed unanimously.
- Monroe antlerless deer, that Sevier Valley deer hunt, the boundary description remain unchanged. That was a motion by Jake as well. And if I recall it has to do with keeping public land out of that boundary. Also passed unanimously.
- And lastly, the Alton CWMU doe permits went from 37 to 25. That motion was from Keele Johnson and it passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: That's all I've got from the Wildlife Board Meeting. Unless anybody has any questions we'll move to regional update, Doug.

**Regional Update:**  
**-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor**

Doug Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

- All the big game permits should be mailed by this point. And if people are aware that they've drawn and they haven't received them, probably by the end of this week, they should contact our office and let us know. We're not aware of any problems but they should be all mailed.
- The antlerless proclamation should be on the web, which was the subject of the last board meeting that Steve just reported on, by May 17<sup>th</sup>. The application period will be June 1<sup>st</sup> to June 17<sup>th</sup>. That's only a couple of week application period, so people need to remember to get that in.
- Remaining big game permits go on sale June 17<sup>th</sup>. As I recall there aren't very many remaining but what there are will go on sale the 17<sup>th</sup> of June.
- Free Fishing Day will be June 5<sup>th</sup> this year. That will be before our next meeting.
- We are organizing some spring range rides to look at range conditions and get some idea of winter mortality. Anyone on the RAC or the public that's interested should contact their local biologists or our regional office and we can help you with dates and times for those things.
- Fishing is coming on good. You'll hear some more about it today. I was excited to hear that the gill nets at Panguitch Lake, which were actually pulled this morning, show some really promising fish there. We should have an outstanding year of fishing at Panguitch Lake and other places. Lake Powell is going to be very outstanding this year in terms of Large Mouth Bass fishing, and others, but particularly with Large Mouth and Crappie.

Douglas Messerly: So with that Mr. Chairman, unless there are any questions from the RAC I'll conclude my presentation.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. Seeing none let's move on. We've got a pretty lengthy RAC agenda. Item number 5, Aquatic Information, Roger Wilson.

**Aquatic Informational (informational) 8:47 to 23:31 of 1:43:48**

**-Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program**

(See attachment 1)

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

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: In regards to those crustaceans they catch with a chicken leg. I'm trying to be serious here because it's funny but I've seen those, I've seen the kids with the hand-lines. They don't have a pole, they've got a hand-line, sitting on the end of a dock and there's just a black blob out there with these crustaceans. What do you do for the youth? I mean obviously to take those they need to have a fishing license if they're of a certain age?

Roger Wilson: Yes. They need a fishing license. You know there's really no limit on crayfish. It's a great opportunity for kids. Kids like cray-fishing. They have a lot of fun doing that because they can actually see the critters. You know there are some places to go around the state that are very good.

Rex Stanworth: But if they fish with two chicken legs they've got to have a two chicken leg pole.

Roger Wilson: Well if they're hooked. If they have hooks on it.

Rex Stanworth: If they have hooks.

Roger Wilson: Yeah.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Roger Wilson: Yeah. Otherwise there's uh, you know they can pretty much have unlimited strings but there's a stipulation in the current regulations that they can only have one baited hook. And if they have a second pole permit we're proposing they can have two.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Roger, how long is the list of AIS affected waters now?

Roger Wilson: We really only have two. It's up and running on our website, it's Red Fleet and Electric Lake. And both of those, by the way, turned up, we ran a test again on the water and it came up negative. So we saw suspicious and verified with PCR testing last year, but uh, and who knows what will happen, but I think maybe Drew can remember, I think we have to go two years of a negative test before we can declare them unaffected. So we need to go through one more year and at that point it time

maybe we can bring them off the list. Is that right Drew?

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the public for Roger?

**Questions from the public:**

None.

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

**Comments from the public:**

Steve Flinders: Moving on to agenda item 6, R657-12, Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters.

**R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters (action) 26:36 to 37:34 of 1:43:48**

**-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Staff**

(See attachment 1)

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

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: This may just be a semantics, and this isn't really on your proposal and what you're presenting Kenny, but on the definitions . . . on 12-2 it talks about crutches; means a staff or support designed to fit under or attach to each arm including a walker, which improves a person's mobility that is otherwise severely restricted by a permanent physical injury or disability. In regards to that if somebody suffers an illness and it renders their legs literally useless, I mean he can move from a wheelchair to his bed, or from his wheelchair to the truck, is he going to qualify underneath that where it's talking about disability, permanent injury or disability?

Kenny Johnson: The key is permanence. I mean in all of our requirements like he's permanent. So it sounds like that's the case. You know maybe not specifically under crutches there but if you look down a little bit further under D: Lose of either or both lower extremities. We consider that the lose of use of . . .

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Kenny Johnson: So the intent is the guy that really struggles getting about he gets help and he has a way (unintelligible)

Rex Stanworth: Okay, I missed D because when I looked at F it's talking about upper extremity disablement and that talks about disease or congenital or acquired.

Kenny Johnson: Yeah.

Rex Stanworth: And it looks like to me that that would have been, should have been somewhat the same discussion up on B, under crutches. But okay, so he would be covered.

Kenny Johnson: Yeah.

Steve Flinders: Question Dale?

Dale Bagley: I was just curious on the experimental season on the South for the 8<sup>th</sup>, why that was removed if it was because of the high success rate or what was the reasoning on that?

Kenny Johnson: Well I think in general, you know talking to Jim, hunting mule deer in the rut with rifle's is it's going kind of above and beyond just leveling the playing field. And so what we didn't want to do is create an incentive to now try to come in and be qualified for something that you may or may not. And that was kind of our concern over the last few years is seeing the increase in applications every year and then kind of a subsequent increase in the number of applicants that were denied. And so we didn't want to create kind of an extra incentive to participate. We just wanted to kind of level that playing field and give them a similar opportunity. And we kind of felt that 60 percent was probably going above and beyond.

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

**Questions from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Any one have any questions for Kenny. No comment cards.

**Comments from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: I'll entertain a motion or discussion.

**RAC discussion and vote:**

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that we accept R657-12, the Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters and move for passage of that.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex. Seconded by Layne. Any discussion? Those in favor? It's unanimous.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Flinders: Thanks Kenny. Agenda item number seven, R657-55, Wildlife Convention Permit Rule

Amendment. Alan Clark, back from Oregon.

**R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment (action) 41:38 to 51:51 of 1:43:48**

**-Alan Clark, Assistant Director**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Alan. Questions from the RAC?

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I'm sure you can give this, if not I see there's others in attendance that can, but on the applicants they're, you know you start at 10-5 and it's come down to 97. What does that translate into the number of individuals that come and go through the show? Because on the uh law it says they have to have 10,000 individuals that go through the show. What's the attendance of the show?

Alan Clark: I'll let the groups address that. It's well over 10,000.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Alan Clark: But I'll let them address the actual numbers. I'm sure they can do that.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Other questions from the RAC? Questions from the audience?

**Questions from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Seeing none, we've got a couple of comment cards. Thanks Alan.

**Comments from the public:**

Steve Flinders: Byron Bateman. Go-ahead Miles, you're next. Somebody start the clock.

Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation: Tie my hands and I won't be able to talk to ya. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Regional Advisory Council. My name is Miles Moretti, and I'm the President and CEO of the Mule Deer Foundation. And I'm here tonight as also a partner in the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo. And I wrote some thoughts down here so pardon me for reading a little bit. You're being asked to authorize the convention tags for another five-year time period. I urge you to approve the Division's recommendation. NDF and our partner SFW and our former partner the Wild Sheep Foundation, have made the WHC one of the premier hunting shows in the country. In our four short years of holding the WHC we have proved a lot of doubters wrong. We were told that we could not hold a successful national convention or expo in Utah. Most wildlife conservation groups hold their conventions in Reno or Las Vegas. We have found that with the partnerships we have developed with



our sponsors, the State of Utah, that Salt Lake City is the place to be for our exhibitors, corporate sponsors and our attendees. We are not attracting over 25,000 attendees, Rex that answers your question, over the four days of the expo. We have created a national buzz. With the sale of the State auction tags, Utah, Colorado and Arizona all set records for the sale of their mule deer tags. Who ever thought a mule deer tag would sell for \$280,000 dollars but it did this year. (Unintelligible) Arizona's \$177,000. So it's got the attention of the country. This unique partnership with the Division of Wildlife Resources and the Expo has contributed to the success of the show. The 200-tag drawing is a tremendous value added to the Expo. Other states, no other state has stepped up like the State of Utah and DWR to help bring this world class show to Salt Lake City. The renewal of these 200 tags will help insure that the WHCE stays in Salt Lake for another five years. The economic impact of the WHC to the State of Utah is tremendous. We bring hundreds of nonresidents to the state. Most of our exhibitors are from out of state. According to the State of Utah, the Expo has an 8 to 10 million-dollar impact to the State of Utah. The money raised from the 200 tags goes to help offset the cost of holding the Expo. The cost to put on a show of this size and quality continues to increase each year. Bottom line, we are here in Salt Lake City and a partner at the Expo because at the end of the day we make money. If MDF is not profitable we cannot do our mission. MDF believes we are a great partner with DWR. We will sell 800 to 900 thousand dollars in conservation permits, each year of which 90 percent goes on the ground for habitat improvements. In addition MDF spends thousands of dollars each year of MDF money on projects that are not funded by or through the watershed initiative here in the state. Another way MDF contributes to habitat projects and saves the UDWR money is through the use of our hunter, our members and our volunteers helping on habitat projects. And an example is deer feeding in the hard winter of 2008 in northern Utah. MDF member volunteers mobilized in the winter of 2008 to haul feed, feeding troughs and feed deer in northern Utah. We have many examples of how MDF partners contribute to mule deer and wildlife in the state. And I'm just about done Mr. Chairman. We are proud of our contribution and partnership with the State of Utah and UDWR and ask that you approve DWR's recommendation to renew the convention permits for another five years. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Sure Byron.

Byron Bateman, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife: I've got to raise this up. I just want to thank you too for the opportunity to come tonight to speak to you about the Expo. I've seen most of you there at the Expo over the past four years so I know that you've been there, you've seen it, you know what it is, you've felt the excitement and felt the buzz. And like Miles mentioned, the State of Utah conducted a survey called the Beaver Report, which they contracted with the University of Utah. They surveyed 377 people at the Expo. They surveyed people from every state in the union, and there's like 22 foreign countries, part of that 377 people. But like Miles said, it generates eight and a half to ten million dollars in that four-day period. But that's just the money that people are spending here in the state during that four days. Then you have the sales tax to add to that plus the state tax, which is almost another million dollars that comes back to the state in that four-day period. In addition to that it opens up the world to see the quality of the wildlife that the State of Utah has. You know we are world known now for what we have here. All the other states around us are envious of the wildlife programs and stuff we have. The way that we're able to finance our programs, you know like the conservation program like Miles mentioned, that by selling these permits we can raise, you know, with all the conservation groups here in the State of Utah combined, you know, close to 3 million dollars a year that goes into the watershed initiative project. Well in addition to that Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, we spent close to 600,000 dollars of money that didn't all come from the Expo but it's come from the Expo and the banquets that we put on throughout the state here, and projects that we've done with money, it's not conservation

permit money, but it's actually hard earned dollars that, you know, like Miles mentioned, it takes a lot of money to put on an Expo. Our costs go up every year. The cost of the Salt Palace goes up every year, just like in your own personal businesses and life; you know how expenses go up every year. Expenses aren't going down. Revenues are getting tougher like that; but uh, the number of people is pretty steady now; we're actually coming to the (unintelligible) and stuff like that, as Miles said, 25,000 people. We went up this past year 5,000 people from the previous year. More people are attending; they just don't have that discretionary money to spend like they had in the past. But it's very important and very critical to us because we have to book the Salt Palace. If we get the contract for the next five-year extension, we need to put those dates out three and four years in advance and, you know, so we have the secure days to have a convention. Our convention next year, which is our last one in this five-year program, is February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>. And we'd like to see you all there. And we just ask for your support to keep this, you know, great program in place that's really helped out the State of Utah, and especially the wildlife in the State of Utah; it's really the beneficiary. And then uh, generations to follow behind us what we're going to leave here as part of this legacy to the State of Utah by, you know, continuing the Expo, the convention with these convention permits. If we get the 200 permits they are a big draw for people to come; our own people here in the state. It's just double opportunity to give you a double chance to draw one of these once in a lifetime tags or premium limited entry tags, or just limited entry. But not only that it gives the youth an opportunity to draw some of those turkey tags and other things. So if there's any questions that you have, you know, concerning, you know, the Expo and what we do I'd be more than happy to answer those. If not I just ask you to please, you know, go ahead and approve this. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Byron. Any comments from the RAC?

**RAC discussion and vote:**

Steve Flinders: Discussion? Otherwise I'd entertain a motion.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I guess I'll make a motion to accept Rule 657-41 on Conservation and Sportsman Permit Rule.

Steve Flinders: It's actually 657-55.

Rex Stanworth: Okay, excuse me, R657-55, okay. And ask approval.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex. Seconded by Steve. Any discussion on that? Those in favor? It looks unanimous.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment as presented. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Flinders: Alan, do you mind if we take a ten minutes recess?

Steve Flinders: Let's jump back into it, if those in the hall will join us. Next up in agenda item number 8, R657-41, Conservation and Sportsman Permit Rule. Alan it's your show again.

**R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment (action) 1:08:41 to 1:23:23 of**

**1:43:48**

**- Alan Clark, Assistant Director**

(See attachment 1)

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: Alan I'm assuming that Boone and Crocket will consider the mule deer and California bighorn fair chase won't they? They do the bison the last time I heard.

Alan Clark: Who will?

Steve Flinders: Boone and Crocket.

Alan Clark: I, I don't know. I haven't had any conversations. I mean all of you know what Antelope Island is. And you know it's not, some people picture Antelope Island as being an island about the size of this auditorium. You know, and so it's uh, shooting fish in a barrel, you know, that kind of thing. It's not that situation. It is, it's a big chunk of real estate. I, at one time I knew what the square miles were, but it's considerable square miles. And so it's not a, you know, a canned hunt situation or anything like that. So . . . so I would assume they would Steve but we haven't asked them that question.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Alan, I'm assuming at this time since we're at this point in this ball game that the state parks are a willing participant?

Alan Clark: Well that's an interesting question. I don't know if there's anyone here from state parks, either listening or wanting to comments. But. . . Um, Mike Styler, who's both state park's boss and our boss says that, when the legislature passes intent language we don't ignore it. Okay? So, so ignoring it is at your own peril. Groups that have ignored intent language sometimes have ended up with no budgets the following legislative session. So I would say that, Mike Styler has said publically to the parks board that the intent from our perspective is that we'll do this and that we will hold these hunts for this one year. Now what the parks board does, they're a policy board the way the Wildlife Board is. And so I can't predict where they'll come out. Mike Styler actually presented this to them last Thursday; and I stayed for the first half hour. I don't know if you followed, there were a number of newspaper articles, but it's fairly controversial, uh, doing this. But Mike has indicated that at least the administrative, the agencies are following the intent language; what the two boards do we don't know because they are policy boards. They do have leeway under code to decide issues.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions"

Alan Clark: Is that a diplomatic answer enough Steve?

Steve Flinders: Yeah, that was good.

Alan Clark: Or Layne, sorry, you asked that question.

Steve Flinders: I remember this issue.

Alan Clark: Yeah. You did, yeah.

Steve Flinders: Ten years ago. Any other questions from the RAC? Questions from the audience for Alan?

**Questions from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: We don't have any comment cards do we? Oh yeah, we do. Miles you still want to go first again? Followed by Byron Bateman.

**Comments from the public:**

Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation: Miles Moretti, Mule Deer Foundation. A couple of real quick points, not that I'm bragging but I'm the only professional member of the Boone and Crocket Club in the State of Utah right now and I will take that to them and ask them if they will certify those as Boone and Crocket species since that is coming up. And I just wanted to support this rule change. First of all the Antelope Island thing, there's lots to be happened there yet, but if uh, we believe if we're successful in getting the, being the groups, MDF and SFW at the Western Hunting the auction is that we'll raise a tremendous amount of money for Antelope Island and State Parks. We have a great track record of selling these conservation tags at a high level and these will be very attractive. And also, we support the change in the ten-day to the thirty-day. As Alan said a lot of our banquets are run by volunteers and even though we have somebody that coordinates a lot of those tags, it's just getting that paperwork back into the Division is kind of sometimes a little bit of a nightmare. So that we appreciate that, that change in helping us out there. So with that, thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Miles. Byron.

Byron Bateman, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife: Thanks again, Bryon Bateman, president SFW. The housekeeping changes we definitely need to get that done, like Alan and Miles mentioned, that ten days to thirty days to give us, you know, ample time to get that information back to the Division. And then the Antelope Island issue, I mean it's been a contentious issue since the first time it was brought up. But one thing it will do is bring some fiscal responsibility hopefully through the parks department throughout the State of Utah, that there are ways to raise money with renewable resources, which is wildlife. I mean that park has operated in the red for years. This is a chance to bring it out of the red into the black by offering, you know, two mule deer, two California big horn hunts. So people just need to be creative in these tight times, you know, whether you're a state employee, federal employee, and private business. You know, what's the best way to raise money? With something we already have. But a lot of these rams out there on Antelope Island are just going to die out there of old age. When we do the transplants, we haven't been transplanting the older age class rams; they've been staying there. So it's going to give, you know, a couple of people the opportunity to go out there and shoot, you know, a really nice ram. So it's just another way that we can utilize a renewable resource and make money at the same time and help put parks back into the black. Hopefully, it will open some other people's eyes throughout the state in the other parks and areas and stuff like that; other ways to create revenue. So we just ask your support to help get that done. The big thing would be the rule change and then the

opportunity to, you know, raise revenue for parks on Antelope Island. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Byron. Just a comment, I think this proposal that we've seen tonight, especially with the aspects of the same opportunity to the public in the way of a drawing is a neat wrinkle. That's all I have. Any other comments? Otherwise I'd entertain a motion.

**RAC discussion and vote:**

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I make a motion that we accept Rule R657-41 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Layne, seconded by Mack. Any discussion? Those in favor? Unanimous.

**Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment as presented. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Flinders: Great, moving on. Item nine, R657-17, Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment, Judi.

**R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment (action) 2:31:03 to 1:32:17 of 1:43:48**

**- Judi Tutorow, licensing coordinator**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: That was quick. Anybody have any questions?

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: I have one. The Board's asked the Division to look at unit-by-unit limited entry. How would that affect lifetime license holders?

Judi Tutorow: They have. We have a committee that's been formed right now and we're meeting biweekly. We don't know yet what that recommendation is going to be from the Division. But we are looking at it and brainstorming some thoughts and some ideas, but right now I wouldn't be able to tell you where we might be heading with that. But we will be bringing it out to you, you know, this next year.

Steve Flinders: So these changes are for region of choice?

Judi Tutorow: Uh huh. This is just for a region of choice, nothing to do with unit-by-unit or any hunt structure.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions, RAC? Questions from the audience?

**Questions from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: No cards.

**Comments from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Comments.

**RAC discussion and vote:**

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I better tell you I have a conflict of interest because I am a lifetime license holder, so I want to disclose that right now.

Steve Flinders: I don't know if that's a conflict or an advantage. Anybody want to make a motion? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I make a motion that we accept Rule number R657-17 as presented by the Division of Wildlife Resources.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Cordell, seconded by Steve Dalton. Any more discussion? Those in favor? Unanimous.

**Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment as presented by the DWR. Steve Dalton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Dalton: Thanks Judi. Are you doing the next one?

Judi Tutorow: Yes, I'm doing the next one as well, our Fees, Exchanges, Surrender, Refund and Reallocation of Wildlife Document Rule.

**R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment (action) 1:34:13 to 1:36:37 of 1:43:48**  
**- Judi Tutorow, licensing coordinator**  
(See attachment 1)

**Questions from the RAC:**

Steve Flinders: Can you remind us Judi about speaking of limited entry permits, now if somebody brings in their permit 30 days, at least 30 days before their hunt they can get a refund. Explain their bonus points.

Judi Tutorow: They would still get their bonus points reinstated and their waiting period removed. They get all of that. And even if they don't, they can still bring their permit in one day before the hunt and still get their bonus points and their waiting period fixed, they just can't get the refund. The refund's tied to the more than 30 days but their bonus points and their waiting period are not. That would stay the way it is unless you're linked to a group, and as you know last year we passed a law that if the group surrender,

the whole group has to surrender to get that back. So they're still under that same law.

Steve Flinders: Has it looked cleaner now with?

Judi Tutorow: Well, it has been difficult in some situations where the whole group does not want to surrender their permit and it has caused, created some havoc but we've had to hold to that law and make them surrender, you know, because that's what it is. So it's been kind of uncomfortable but we've been getting through it. So that's it. That's the two parts to the rule. Any questions?

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

### **Questions from the public:**

Paul Neimeyer: (Speaking off mic.) I've just got one question.

Steve Flinders: Sure Paul.

Paul Neimeyer: (Speaking off microphone): If you turn your tag back, do you get your preference point? Like if you draw this year (inaudible). But if you turn it back do you get your points for this year?

Judi Tutorow: You do. You get all your points reinstated to make you whole again; everything on file plus the one.

Steve Flinders: And the next person in line gets that permit.

Judi Tutorow: That's correct.

Steve Flinders: Up until, now soon before the hunt?

Judi Tutorow: We will even reallocate after the hunt has started. If the hunter wants to take that permit and he knows he doesn't have that much time, but we do have some that will take them. We'll call them, we'll give them, with a week into the hunt we've even called them and they've taken the permits. So . . .

Steve Flinders: Yeah, that's good. No comment cards.

### **Comments from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Any comments from the RAC? Otherwise I'll entertain a motion.

### **RAC discussion and vote:**

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion that we accept R657-42, a Refund Rule Amendment.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex, seconded by Layne. Any further discussion on that motion. Those in favor? Unanimous.

Judi Tutorow: Thank you.

**Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment as presented, Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Flinders: Thanks Judi. Moving on to agenda item 11, R657-60, Aquatic Invasive Species. You don't look like Larry Dalton though. Now you do. Stand up. I'm going to have to buy Larry a drink next time I'm in Salt Lake. Pepsi, I owe Larry a Pepsi.

**R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment (action) 1:39:55 to 1:42:20 of 1:43:48**

**-Mike Ottenbacher, Regional Aquatic Program Manager**  
(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Any questions from the RAC?

**Questions from the RAC:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Questions from the audience?

**Questions from the public:**

None.

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

**Comments from the public:**

None.

Steve Flinders: Comments from the RAC, or entertain a motion?

**RAC discussion and vote:**

Steve Flinders: I was looking at a couple of notes that I had but this program's growing.

Dale Bagley: I'll make a motion that we accept R657-60 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Dale. Seconded by Cordell. Any discussion on the motion? Those in favor?  
Unanimous.

**Dale Bagley made the motion to accept R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule**



**Amendment as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Other Business**

**-Steve Flinders, Chairman**

None.

Steve Flinders: I don't have any other business. Next meeting is July 27<sup>th</sup>. Entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mack Morrell: I move that we adjourn.

**Mack Morrell made the motion to adjourn. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

Steve Flinders: Thank you all.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:45.**

Southeast Region Advisory Council  
John Wesley Powell Museum  
1765 E. Main, Green River  
May 12, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

## Motion Summary

### Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written  
Passed unanimously

### Approval of April 27, 2010 minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes of April 27, 2010 as written  
Passed unanimously

### R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters

MOTION: To accept R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters as presented  
Passed unanimously

### R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment as presented  
Passed with one opposing vote

### R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment as presented.  
Passed with one opposing vote

### R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment as presented  
Passed unanimously

### R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment as presented  
Passed unanimously

### R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment as presented  
Passed unanimously

Southeast Region Advisory Council  
John Wesley Powell Museum  
1765 E. Main, Green River  
May 12, 2010 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

---

Kevin Albrecht, USFS  
Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor  
Blair Eastman, Agriculture

Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official

Wayne Hoskisson, Non-consumptive  
Todd Huntington, At Large  
Derris Jones, Sportsmen  
Laura Kamala, Non-Consumptive

Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.

Christine Micoz, At Large  
Travis Pehrson, Sportsmen  
Pam Riddle, BLM  
Terry Sanslow, Chairman  
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture

Others Present

---

- 1) Welcome, RAC introductions and RAC Procedure  
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

- 2a) Approval of the Agenda (Action)  
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed unanimously

- 2b) Approval of the April 27, 2010 minutes (Action)  
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Charlie Tracy to approve the minutes of the April 27, 2010 meeting as written.

Seconded by Travis Pehrson

Motion passed unanimously

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update  
-Terry Sanslow, Vice Chair

The Board voted unanimously to accept the DWR antlerless recommendations on pronghorn and moose. The second motion was to consider boundary changes on the Boulder and Fish Lake Plateau units for elk. This motion passed unanimously. The end date on the Fish Lake and Plateau units was moved to Dec. 12. That passed unanimously. They increased the number of pronghorn permits on the southwest desert by 25. That passed unanimously. The northeast RAC's motion on Diamond Mountain with 125 permits on the two early seasons and 50 permits on the late season passed unanimously. The Board voted unanimously to accept the remainder of the division's antlerless elk recommendations. The recommendation that the division review the Paunsagunt unit plan passed unanimously. The motion to reduce the number of permits on the Mount Carmel unit to 25 and the Buckskin unit to 50 passed unanimously. The Board voted to leave the boundary unchanged on the Monroe unit. The Board's vote to accept the balance of the antlerless addendum passed unanimously.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

4) Regional Update  
-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Bill Bates-

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- I DON'T REALLY HAVE A QUESTION, BUT THOSE WHO ARE INTERESTED IN THE BIG HORN SHEEP, THEY ARE ALREADY IN SUNNYSIDE. YOU CAN SEE AT LEAST TWELVE THERE ALREADY.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- ARE THE BUFFALO ALL COLLARED?

BILL BATES- I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW MANY, BUT THEY PROBABLY PUT COLLARS ON ABOUT SIX OR SEVEN. WHAT WE TRY TO DO IS GET A SAMPLE. I GUESS AS FAR AS BISON ARE CONCERNED, I WILL MENTION THAT IT IS REALLY PRELIMINARY RIGHT NOW, BUT YESTERDAY WHEN WE WERE DOWN WORKING ON THE CAVE FLATS FENCE, WE TOOK A RIDE UP TO TARANTULA MESA AND WE FOUND SOME VERY LARGE TRACKS BY ONE OF THE GUZZLERS. WE HOPE THAT IT TURNS OUT TO BE WILD RATHER THAN DOMESTIC. IT MIGHT BE GOOD NEWS.

DERRIS JONES- WHEN DID YOU SAY THAT THE BIG HORN SHEEP FESTIVAL WAS?

BILL BATES- IT WILL PROBABLY BE THAT THIRD FRIDAY AND SATURDAY IN NOVEMBER. IS THAT RIGHT BRENT?

BRENT SETTLER-YES!

TERRY SANSLOW- THANKS BILL. WE WILL MOVE TO THE DISABLED HUNTER ACCOMMODATIONS.

- 5) R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters (Action)  
-Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Staff

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC?

BLAIR EASTMAN- MY QUESTION IS, AND I MIGHT HAVE MISREAD THIS, BUT MAYBE YOU CAN CLARIFY THIS FOR ME. ON YOUR DEER LATE SEASON EXTENSION, I THINK YOU SAID THAT THERE WAS 59 PERCENT SUCCESS. IS THAT RIGHT? WHAT IS YOUR SUCCESS ON THE LATE SEASON HUNT? LEAVE THE DISABLED HUNTER OUT OF THE EQUATION. WHAT IS THE SUCCESS RATE?

KENNY JOHNSON- THIS IS ONE OF THE LATER GENERAL SEASON DEER HUNTS. THERE IS REALLY NOTHING TO COMPARE IT TO, BECAUSE GENERAL SEASON HUNTS ALWAYS END JUST PRIOR TO THAT.

BLAIR EASTMAN- LET ME ASK YOU A DIFFERENT QUESTION THEN. WHAT IS THE OVER-ALL SUCCESS RATE ON THE GENERAL SEASON DEER HUNT?

KENNY JOHNSON- IT'S ABOUT 30 PERCENT. IF WE GO TO THE BOTTOM OF THE PAPER, IT STATES ABOUT THIRTY PERCENT STATE WIDE. SO, THE LATE HUNT WAS DOUBLE THAT. WE WOULD STILL OFFER THEM A COUPLE OF DAYS AFTER THAT.

BLAIR EASTMAN- FOR THE DISABLE HUNTER, ARE WE OFFERING THEM A PRE-SEASON EXTENSION AND A LATE SEASON EXTENSION?

KENNY JOHNSON- YES, AND IT CONTINUES THIS YEAR, SO REALLY THE 18TH THROUGH THE 22ND IS THE PRE-SEASON EXTENSION, AND THEN THE LATE EXTENSION IS... (INTERRUPTED)

BLAIR EASTMAN- IF YOU'RE GETTING IN A FEW DAYS EARLY, THEN WHY NOT A FEW DAYS LATE?

KENNY JOHNSON- I THINK TO BALANCE IT OUT. WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO IS PROVIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND ABOUT THE SAME SUCCESS RATE. THAT'S MY UNDERSTANDING.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- IM JUST CURIOUS, WE'RE GETTING DOUBLE THE SUCCESS ON THAT?

KENNY JOHNSON- GETTING INTO NOVEMBER WAS PROBLEMATIC FOR US, BECAUSE IT DOUBLED THE SUCCESS RATE, BUT IT ALSO PROVIDED AN INCENTIVE TO TRY AND QUALIFY FOR SOMETHING ABOVE AND BEYOND. SO REALLY, WHAT MADE THE MOST SENSE WAS THAT THE LATE EXTENSION COINCIDED WITH THE YOUTH. SO THERE WILL BE SOME YOUTH THERE ON THAT LATE SEASON, SO ANYONE THAT HAS THE DISABILITY COR WE DECIDED THAT IT WOULDN'T BE ENOUGH OF AN IMPACT IF WE KEPT IT INSIDE OF THE BOUNDARY TOWARDS THE END OF OCTOBER.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO, WHY WAS THE... (INTERFERENCE WITH MICROPHONE?)

KENNY JOHNSON- RIGHT AROUND 60%. WE LOST SOME PEOPLE. THEY TAGGED OUT IN THE FIRST TWO SEASONS AND DIDN'T PARTICIPATE. WHO KNOWS WHAT THE PERCENT WOULD HAVE BEEN IF THEY WOULD HAVE ALL KNOWN ABOUT AND PARTICIPATED IN THE NOVEMBER HUNTS. YOU ARE RIGHT; WE WANTED TO MAKE IT EQUAL. THE BIG THING IS JUST HAVING SOME TIME WHERE YOU'RE NOT COMPETING WITH EVERYONE ELSE.

CHRIS MICOZ- SO, IF A DISABLED HUNTER HAS A COMPANION HUNTER WITH THEM, BESIDES HAVING THE HUNTER EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS, DOES THE COMPANION HAVE TO HAVE A SUB-SERVICE PERMIT OR TAG AS WELL?

KENNY JOHNSON- THAT'S A FAIR QUESTION. EACH OF THE CORS IS KIND OF MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. THE COMPANION HUNTER DOESN'T NECESSARILY MAKE SURE YOU GET THESE BECAUSE THE COMPANION HUNTER ITSELF KIND OF LEVELS THAT PLAYING FIELD. WE WILL STILL REVIEW IT CASE BY CASE. IT DOESN'T MEAN JUST BECAUSE YOU QUALIFY FOR ONE THAT YOU GET ALL THE ACCOMMODATIONS. THERE ARE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR EACH ONE.

DERRIS JONES –ON 12-6, WE'RE GOING TO KEEP THAT SO YOU CAN BE FLEXIBLE I ASSUME? NUMBER TWO ON THE SAME SECTION STATES THAT THE DIVISION SHALL NOT ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION FOR A PERMIT DATE EXTENSION. SHOULDN'T THOSE THIRTY DAYS BE TAKEN OUT AT THAT POINT TOO?

KENNY JOHNSON- I THINK THAT IT'S 30 DAYS, OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

KEVIN ALBRECHT- ON THE COMPANION HUNTER, WHEN THEY PUT IN FOR THEIR COR AND IT'S ACCEPTED, ARE THEY LIMITED TO THE COMPANION HUNTER THAT THEY REQUEST ON THAT LIST?

KENNY JOHNSON- THE WAY I UNDERSTAND IT, NOT JUST ANYONE CAN HUNT WITH THEM.

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY MORE QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC? QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE? COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? CLOSED TO THE AUDIENCE. QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM THE RAC?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters as presented.

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed unanimously

6) R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment (Action)

-Alan Clark, Assistant Director

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- THANK YOU ALAN. I NEED TO REMIND THE AUDIENCE THAT IF YOU WISH TO MAKE COMMENTS, THERE ARE COMMENT CARDS THAT YOU NEED TO FILL OUT IN THE BACK. ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC?

TRAVIS PEHRSON- I NOTICED THAT THERE IS NOTHING THAT SAYS THE CONVENTION NEEDS TO STAY IN UTAH.

ALAN CLARK- : IT DOES HAVE TO STAY IN UTAH, WHICH IS A REQUIREMENT. IT HAS TO BE A CONVENTION, ATTRACTING TEN THOUSAND PEOPLE THAT'S HELD IN UTAH. IT HAS TO BE A REGIONAL OR NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE ORGANIZATION INVOLVED.

TODD HUNTINGTON: I AM JUST CURIOUS. I HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS. WHY HAVEN'T YOU DONE THE AUDIT UNTIL THIS YEAR?

ALAN CLARK- : WE HAVE WORKED PRETTY CLOSELY WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS, SO WE WEREN'T CONCERNED THAT SOMETHING BAD WAS GOING ON. WE WORK VERY, VERY CLOSELY. KENNY WORKS CLOSELY WITH THEM. GREG DOES AND OTHERS ON OUR STAFF. WE DIDN'T FEEL IT WAS NEEDED, BUT WHEN THE PUBLIC FELT THERE WERE SOME CONCERNS, THAT TRIGGERED OUR INTEREST. WE DID AN AUDIT SO THAT WE CAN ADDRESS THOSE CONCERNS.

TODD HUNTINGTON- IS THIS GOING TO BE REVIEWED IN A FIVE YEAR PERIOD?

ALAN CLARK- IT WILL HAPPEN, IF THIS RULE IS APPROVED BY THE WILDLIFE BOARD. WE WILL HAVE A SERIES OF CONVENTIONS THROUGH 2016-2017. THEN IT SUNSETS, IF THE RULE IS NOT CHANGED. NOBODY CAN ISSUE ANOTHER AGREEMENT WITHOUT... (INTERRUPTED).

TODD HUNTINGTON- ANOTHER QUESTION I HAD IS THAT WE TALKED ABOUT TWO DEER PERMITS. IF SOMEONE DREW AN ELK PERMIT AND A DEER PERMIT, CAN THEY TAKE BOTH?

ALAN CLARK- THEY CAN HAVE BOTH OF THOSE, IF THEY WANT. THAT IS ONE OF THE SLIGHT DIFFERENCES TO MAKE THIS MORE ATTRACTIVE TO DIFFERENT PEOPLE.

TODD HUNTINGTON- ANOTHER QUESTION I HAD, WAS THE ONCE-IN-A-LIFE TIME PERMIT. I KNOW THERE IS NOT A WAITING PERIOD FOR DEER AND ELK. IF YOU GOT A ONCE-IN-A LIFE TIME AT THIS CONVENTION, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, YOU CAN ALSO DRAW A ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME IN THE GENERAL DRAW?

ALAN CLARK- NO. ONCE YOU DRAW ONE, YOU CAN NEVER APPLY AGAIN IN THE GENERAL DRAW. IF YOU DRAW ONE IN OUR GENERAL DRAW, THEN YOU CAN APPLY IN THIS DRAWING. THIS IS THE ONLY EXCEPTION TO THE ONCE-IN-A-LIFETIME CRITERIA.

TODD HUNTINGTON- SO YOU CAN DRAW ON THE GENERAL DRAW AND THEN PUT IN FOR CONVENTION, BUT NOT VICE VERSA?

ALAN CLARK- THAT IS CORRECT. THE IDEA WAS THAT THIS WAS A DRAWING THAT IS AVAILABLE TO EVERYBODY. THAT IS WHAT THE GROUP SOLD IT AS. THIS CONVENTION IS DRAWING WHAT IS AVAILABLE TO EVERYBODY. WE FELT AS A DIVISION THAT WE ALWAYS HAD A HISTORY THAT ONCE-IN-A -LIFE TIME IS A ONCE-IN-A-LIFE TIME NO MATTER HOW YOU GOT IT. IF YOU GO TO A CWMU AND YOU BUY A MOOSE PERMIT, THEN YOU CAN NO LONGER APPLY IN OUR DRAWING.

TODD HUNTINGTON- SO IF I DREW A SHEEP TAG, LET'S SAY IN THE CONVENTION DRAWING ONE YEAR, I CAN TURN AROUND AND APPLY FOR THE SHEEP DRAWING AGAIN?

ALAN CLARK- AT THE CONVENTION. YES YOU CAN.

TODD HUNTINGTON- IN THEORY, I CAN DRAW THAT SHEEP TAG FIVE YEARS IN A ROW?

ALAN CLARK- THAT IS CORRECT. IF YOU DID, YOU WOULD CERTAINLY MAKE OUR AUDIT.

DERRIS JONES- ON THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE 10,000 PEOPLE, I GUESS IT'S NOT REALLY A REQUIREMENT; IT'S DESIGNED TO DRAW TEN-THOUSAND PEOPLE. I NOTICED THAT THE NUMBER OF APPLICANTS IS DOWN BELOW TEN-THOUSAND NOW, SO ARE THERE PEOPLE THAT ATTEND A CONVENTION THAT DON'T... (INTERRUPTED).

ALAN CLARK- A LOT OF PEOPLE. THE GROUPS ACTUALLY HAVE THE NUMBERS. I THINK IF I REMEMBER RIGHT, IT WAS WELL OVER 20,000 PEOPLE THAT ATTENDED. WE PUT THAT LANGUAGE IN, SO THAT WE DIDN'T LET IT GET TO THE POINT THAT IT END'S UP BEING A REGIONAL BANQUET IN UTAH, AND WE END UP DEVOTING TWO-HUNDRED TO IT. WE DIDN'T WANT TO DO THAT, SO IT WAS SOLD TO THE WILDLIFE BOARD AND TO THE RAC AS BEING AN EVENT.

CHRIS MICOZ- OK! WHATEVER MONEY IS MADE FROM IT, IS IT A 90-10 SPLIT?

ALAN CLARK- NO. IT'S NOT LIKE A CONSERVATION PERMIT. THERE IS NO HIGH BID. THE APPLICATION FEE STAYS WITH THE GROUP THAT IS FOR PROCESSING THE PERMIT AND HOLDING THE DRAWING. EVERY INDIVIDUAL THAT DRAWS



ONE OF THOSE TAGS HAS TO BUY A LICENSE. THAT'S THE MONEY THE DIVISION GETS. THE GROUPS KEEP THE FIVE DOLLARS.

CHRIS MICOZ- DOES THE DIVISION DO AN AUDIT ON THE CONSERVATION PERMITS AS WELL?

ALAN CLARK- YES! WE DO IT EVERY THREE YEARS WHEN THEY'RE RENEWED. THOSE ARE PRESENTED TO THE WILDLIFE BOARD SO YOU HAVEN'T SEEN THEM, BUT THEY ARE AVAILABLE. WE DO THOSE EVERY YEAR. WE DO IT ALL AND THAT INCLUDES ALL THE MONEY, BECAUSE THE WAY THE CONSERVATION PERMIT RULE IS WRITTEN, IT'S MORE INCLUSIVE.

BLAIR EASTMAN- \$850,000 DOLLARS IS NOTHING TO SHY AWAY FROM. WHAT DID THEY USE THAT \$850, 000 DOLLARS FOR, AND IS THERE ANY LIMITATION BY THE DIVISION ON WHERE THAT MONEY CAN BE USED?

ALAN CLARK- THERE ISN'T ANY LIMITATION BY THE DIVISION, AND IF YOU WANT TO WAIT ON THAT, I WILL LET GREG COME UP AND ANSWER THAT QUESTION. HE HAS THAT INFORMATION. ONE OF THE LIMITATIONS IS THAT WHEN YOU APPLY, LET'S SAY THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THIS RULE AND GROUPS APPLY, LET'S SAY THAT THREE OR FOUR GROUPS APPLY AND ONE OF THE CRITERIA THAT WE LOOK AT IS THE BENEFIT THEY HAVE DONE FOR WILDLIFE IN UTAH, NOT WILDLIFE EVERYWHERE, WILDLIFE IN UTAH. THE MORE THEY CAN SHOW THAT THEY USE THAT MONEY IN UTAH, THE BETTER THEIR SCORE WILL GET, COMPETING WITH OTHER GROUPS.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO IT'S THE SAME 200 PERMITS EVERY YEAR FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS?

ALAN CLARK- NO. THAT VARIES EVERY YEAR. WE ADJUST THAT EACH HUNT AND IT'S DONE IN RELATION TO THE PERMITS THAT ARE GOING TO THE REGULAR DRAWING. IF WE HAVE A HUNT THAT'S CUT WAY BACK IN PERMITS, WE'LL CUT IT OUT OF THE CONVENTION. IF WE HAVE A HUNT, THAT THEY HAVE INCREASED PERMITS, WE MIGHT DO A COUPLE MORE OF THOSE PERMITS. SO, IT'S GEARED TO THAT, AND IT'S ALSO GEARED TO HUNTS THAT HAVE A NONRESIDENT PERMIT. LET'S SAY THERE ARE THREE TAGS, WE'LL TAKE ONE OF THOSE AND PUT IT IN THE CONVENTION.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- IS IT SPLIT UP IN A WAY WHERE, LET'S SAY THAT THERE ARE 20 TURKEY TAGS THAT ARE THERE, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO TAKE TEN OF THEM AND GIVE THEM TEN ELK TAGS THIS YEAR?

ALAN CLARK- NO. WE DID MAKE ONE FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT ADJUSTMENT WITH TURKEYS. WHEN IT WENT FROM LIMITED ENTRY TO GENERAL SEASON, WE DID CUT BACK ON SOME TURKEY TAGS, BUT IT DIDN'T REALLY CUT BACK ON THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE APPLYING FOR THE TURKEY TAGS OR THE ELK TAGS. THERE ARE JUST A COUPLE MORE TAGS IN THE EXISTING HUNTS THAT THEY HAD. SO IT'S NOT LIKE WE CREATED A BIG THING OF NEW HUNTS TO APPLY FOR, BUT WE DID HAVE TO MAKE SOME ADJUSTMENTS TO TURKEYS, BUT IT WASN'T DRIVEN BY WANTING MORE ELK. IT WAS DRIVEN BY NO LONGER HAVING A LIMITED ENTRY TURKEY HUNT, EXCEPT IN THE FIRST SEASON. THAT WAS A ONE TIME ADJUSTMENT AND I THINK THAT WAS THIS PAST YEAR WHEN WE MADE THAT

CHANGE. THE FIRST THREE YEARS FOLLOWED THE SAME FORMULA AND RATIO, BUT WHEN WE CHANGED TURKEY HUNTING THIS YEAR TO GENERAL SEASON HUNTING WE HAD TO MAKE A CHANGE. IT INCLUDES TURKEY, BEAR AND COUGAR: IT'S A CROSS SECTION OF WHAT WE HAVE IN LIMITED ENTRY HUNTS. I DIDN'T BRING THE NUMBERS ALONG.

GREG SHEEHAN- IN THE AUDIT IS AN ATTACHMENT WITH ALL THE PERMITS BY HUNT.

ALAN CLARK- GREG DID THAT PART OF THE AUDIT, SO IF YOU WANT TO LOOK AT THAT AND SEE WHAT THEY ARE, I ACTUALLY MAKE THAT CALL SINCE I HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THIS FROM THE BEGINNING. I DO IT ENTIRELY BASED ON WHAT WERE THE NUMBERS OF PERMITS THAT WERE DRAWN IN THE YEAR BEFORE. I LOOK FOR THE PERMITS THAT WILL BE IN THE 2011 CONVENTION. WE HAVEN'T SET THE NUMBER YET. BY THE TIME THOSE HAVE TO BE DONE. IT ALWAYS DELAYS BY A YEAR, BUT IF SOMETHING DROPS OUT, THEN I WILL CUT THOSE OUT.

DERRIS JONES- I SEE THE ORGANIZATIONS POST ALL REMAINING AND ALL SUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS. HOW DOES THAT FIT THE PRIVACY STUFF? HOW COME THEY DO THAT HERE, BUT THE DIVISION CAN'T POST NAMES OF APPLICANTS THAT DRAW LIMITED ENTRY TAGS?

ALAN CLARK- I AM GOING TO DEFER TO GREG ON THAT ONE.

GREG SHEEHAN- BECAUSE WE LIMIT THEM ON INFORMATION THAT THEY CAN ACTUALLY POST UP THERE, SO WE POST NAME, CITY, AND ADDRESS ALL THAT.

DERRIS JONES- SO THE DIVISION COULD PUT JUST THE NAME ON ALL... (INTERRUPTED).

GREG SHEEHAN- MARTY BUSHMEN SAID THAT IS A POSSIBILITY, BUT FOR NOW WE SHY AWAY FROM IT.

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY MORE QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC?

CHRIS MICOZ- I HAVE A QUICK QUESTION. THE GROSS REVENUE ON THESE TAGS IS PRETTY HIGH. WHAT ABOUT THE INTEREST ON THAT? DOES IT GO TO THE ORGANIZATION TO BE KEPT AND THEY COLLECT THE INTEREST ON THAT?

ALAN CLARK- ON THOSE, IT WOULD BE BECAUSE THAT'S NOT OUR MONEY. THAT'S NOT THE STATE'S MONEY. I WON'T ANSWER THAT QUESTION YET BUT ASK ME THAT SAME QUESTION WHEN WE GET TO THE CONSERVATION PERMIT AND I CAN EXPLAIN SOME OF THE DIFFERENCES. I TOLD THEM AT THE RAC MEETING LAST NIGHT. JUNE TOLD US TO CHANGE IT AND I'M TOO OLD TO CHANGE THE NAME OF SOMETHING. I WOULD NEVER GET IT RIGHT. I WOULD STILL CALL IT BY THE OLD NAME BUT IF WE HAD KNOWN THAT THE GROUPS WERE GOING TO CALL THIS THE HUNT EXPO THEN WE WOULD HAVE. CONVENTION SOUNDS REALLY CLOSE TO CONSERVATION AND SO PEOPLE INTERCHANGE THOSE ALL THE TIME AND WE DIDN'T LOOK AHEAD AND THINK IT THROUGH. WE ALSO DIDN'T HAVE THE COURAGE TO RENAME IT.

TERRY SANSLOW- QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC? QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE? I HAVE A COMMENT HERE FROM BYRON BATEMAN.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

BYRON BATEMAN- THANK YOU! I'M BYRON BATEMAN. I AM THE PRESIDENT OF SPORTSMEN FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE. I APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO COME AND SPEAK TO YOU TONIGHT, ESPECIALLY ABOUT THIS CONVENTION PERMIT RULE AND WHAT WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO THESE PAST 4 YEARS. YOU ALL ASKED A LOT OF GREAT QUESTIONS TONIGHT BECAUSE A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE THE SAME QUESTIONS. AS A MATTER OF FACT, WE HAVE THE SAME QUESTIONS AMONGST OURSELVES. HOW MANY, WITH A SHOW OF HANDS, HAVE GONE TO AN EXPO IN THE LAST 4 YEARS? WE RENTED THE SALT PALACE WHICH IS A VERY LARGE FACILITY. FIVE OF THOSE LARGE EXHIBIT HALLS PLUS THE GRAND BALL ROOM WHICH WILL HOLD 2,000 PEOPLE. WHEN THE GOVERNOR HAS HIS DINNER AND STUFF LIKE THAT, THE ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S BALL, THAT'S WHERE THEY HAVE THAT, IT'S IN THAT GRAND BALL ROOM. AS FAR AS EXPENSES, ALMOST PARALLEL AT NON-GROSS REVENUE BY THE TIME YOU ADD TV AND RADIO ADS, OUR PRINT AND MEDIA ADS THAT WE GO OUT AND DO, PLUS OUR DIRECT MAILERS AND STUFF LIKE THAT, AND ADVERTISERS AND EVERYTHING ELSE. THIS EXPO HAS BROUGHT PEOPLE FROM EVERY STATE IN THE UNITED STATES. WE HAVE 20,000 ATTENDEES. IN FACT, THIS LAST EXPO WE HAD 25,000 ATTENDEES. DERRIS, THAT WAS A GOOD QUESTION, BECAUSE WE DO EXCEED THAT TEN-THOUSAND BENCH MARK SINCE THE FIRST YEAR. WE KIND OF WENT WITH THE ECONOMY. OUR FIRST YEAR, WE DID REALLY GOOD, THEN THE NEXT YEAR WE CAME DOWN. WE HAVE JUST FOLLOWED THE ECONOMY BUT THIS PAST YEAR IN 2010 WE MATCHED 2009 AT GROSS REVENUE. HOPEFULLY, THE ECONOMY IS PICKING UP. THERE IS A LOT OF INTEREST IN THESE PERMITS AND A LOT OF OPPORTUNITY. YOUR QUESTION ABOUT ONCE-IN-A-LIFE TIME, IF YOU ARE THAT LUCKY, YOU COULD DRAW FIVE YEARS OF ONCE-IN-A-LIFE TIME PERMITS AT THE EXPO. AT NO OTHER PLACE CAN YOU DO THAT, BUT YOU STILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DRAW THE REGULAR HUNT PLUS THE HUNTER EXPO AND DRAW. WITH THE STATE DRAWING, IT COST 10 DOLLARS; WE'RE STILL GOING FIVE DOLLARS. IT'S A BARGAIN FOR THE PEOPLE TO COME AND DO THIS, SO WE TRY TO KEEP THINGS USER FRIENDLY. SOME OF THE MONEY THAT WE HAVE SPENT, WE HAVE DONE FOR HABITAT PROJECTS AND STUFF. I GOT A PHONE CALL TODAY FROM RICK LARSEN. I DON'T KNOW IF A LOT OF YOU KNOW RICK WITH THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES. BILL MENTIONED IN HIS PRESENTATION ABOUT THE BISON. RICK CALLED ME TODAY AND ASKED ME IF WE WOULD GIVE YOU WHATEVER IT COST TO HELICOPTER-CAPTURE THOSE BISON ON THE HENRY MOUNTAINS, WELL, I GOT THE CALL TODAY THAT IT WAS 37,500 DOLLARS. I TOLD RICK TO SEND ME AN INVOICE AND I WILL GET YOU A CHECK. WE ALSO HAVE THE ADVANTAGE TO SELL SOME OF THESE OTHER CONSERVATION PERMIT TAGS AT THE CONSERVATION CONVENTION. WE GOT TO KEEP THOSE SEPARATE BUT MULE DEER IS THE MOST SUCCESSFUL. IT HAS RECORD LEVELS FOR THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS. IT IS LARGE AMOUNTS OF MONEY TO DO THAT WITH THOSE CONSERVATION PERMIT TAGS, IT'S ALLOWED US TO DO WHAT WE DID TODAY. TO SPEND THAT 37,500 DOLLARS TO PUT MORE ANIMALS ON THE MOUNTAIN AND START A HERD SOMEWHERE ELSE. SO WE ARE ABLE TO BUILD OUR HERDS AND STUFF LIKE THAT THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND MAINTAIN QUALITY. UTAH HAS BECOME KNOWN FOR THAT. WE ARE THE

PLACE TO COME HUNTING IN THE WEST ANYMORE. SPORTSMEN FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, WE HAVE SPENT CLOSE TO 600,000 DOLLARS ON DIFFERENT PROJECTS OVER THE LAST THREE YEARS. WE STILL HAVE A LOT TO GO THIS YEAR. ONE OF THE MAJOR THINGS WE HAVE DONE WITH THAT IS PREDATOR CONTROL. WE SPENT 98,000 DOLLARS AND THAT'S WITH COUNTY BOUNTIES. WE MATCHED THE BOUNTY THAT IS PAID IN OTHER COUNTIES THROUGHOUT THE STATE. PLUS WE COORDINATE THE ARIL GUNNY. WE WERE ABLE TO GET WILDLIFE SERVICES TO FLY TWICE THIS WINTER ON THE HENRY MOUNTAINS, BECAUSE WE HAD SNOWY EVENTS, ONCE IN A 100 YEAR EVENTS. THE SNOW WE HAD ON THE HENRY MOUNTAINS AND WE WERE FORTUNATE ENOUGH TO COORDINATE THAT AND GET THAT DONE. WE GOT THE HELICOPTER DOWN THERE TWICE TO HELP PROTECT THE WORLD CLASS DEER HERD WE HAD DOWN THERE. PLUS THE BISON, PLUS ALL THE OTHER ANIMALS THAT LIVE ON THAT MOUNTAIN. WE JUST ASK YOU TO SUPPORT THE DIVISION'S RECOMMENDATION TO MAKE THESE CHANGES. WE ALSO WANT THE OTHER CONSERVATION GROUPS. IF SOMEONE ELSE WANTS TO COME IN AND MAKE A PROPOSAL FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, THEY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT. WE JUST ASK FOR YOUR SUPPORT TO CONTINUE TO DO THE GREAT THINGS WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO FOR THE LAST FOUR YEARS. THANK YOU.

MILES MORETTI- THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL. I AM MILES MORETTI, PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE MULE DEER FOUNDATION. I KIND OF WROTE THOUGHTS DOWN. WHEN YOU GET MY AGE YOU'VE GOT TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU DON'T LOSE WHERE YOU ARE. I AM GOING TO ECHO A LITTLE OF WHAT BYRON SAID AND I URGE YOU TO AUTHORIZE THIS CONVENTION RULE FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEAR PERIOD. THE WESTERN HUNTING CONSERVATION EXPO IS ONE OF THE PREMIER HUNTING EXPOS IN THE COUNTRY. A LOT OF PEOPLE WHEN WE STARTED SAID WE COULD NOT HAVE A WORLD CLASS HUNTING EXPO IN SALT LAKE CITY. MOST OF THE CONSERVATION GROUPS ARE IN RENO, LAS VEGAS, AND NASHVILLE. THOSE ARE THE PLACES THAT USUALLY HAVE A CONVENTION. WELL YOU KNOW WE PROVE A LOT OF THOSE PEOPLE WRONG, AND WE FOUND WITH THE PARTNERSHIPS THAT WE HAVE HERE WITH OUR DIFFERENT SPONSORS IN THE STATE OF UTAH THAT HAVE STEPPED UP AND REALLY BEEN A GREAT SUPPORTER. SALT LAKE WAS REALLY THE PLACE TO BE FOR THE WESTERN HUNTING EXPO AND OUR EXHIBITORS AND CORPORATE SPONSORS OR ATTENDEES ARE TELLING US THAT IT IS ONE OF THE FINEST SPORT SHOWS OUT THERE RIGHT NOW. AS WE SAID EARLIER THIS YEAR, WE BROKE OUR RECORD OF 25,000 ATTENDEES AND WE EXPECT A BIGGER AND BETTER SHOW NEXT YEAR. WE HAVE SOME SURPRISES COMING WITH SOME CELEBRITIES AND THINGS THAT WE ARE HOPING THAT WILL COME HERE IN THE NEXT WEEK OR TWO. THIS NATIONAL BUZZ THAT WE CREATED, I TRAVEL ALL OVER THE COUNTRY AND PEOPLE HAVE HEARD OF SALT LAKE CITY AND THE EXPO. THEY'RE SAYING IT'S REALLY UNIQUE. OUR CONSERVATION PERMITS ARE WHAT SOME STATES CALL THE GOVERNOR TAGS. UTAH MULE DEER TAGS SOLD FOR A RECORD \$280,000. ARIZONA'S MULE DEER TAGS FOR 177,000 DOLLARS AND COLORADO'S MULE DEER TAGS FOR 130,000 DOLLARS. WE NOT ONLY HAVE THE UTAH TAGS, BUT WE BRING HUNTS FROM OTHER STATES AND WE HAVE TAGS FROM MONTANA, WASHINGTON, OREGON, NEVADA, CALIFORNIA, THAT WE BRING TO THIS CONVENTION AND AUCTION, SO ITS NOT JUST UTAH TAGS. THIS IS A UNIQUE PARTNERSHIP; I DON'T THINK YOU COULD DO THIS IN ANY OTHER STATE WITH WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE. JUST WITH THE SYSTEM WILDLIFE AGENCIES HAVE. THE DIVISION OF WILDLIFE

RESOURCES REALLY SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR STEPPING UP AND HELPING US HOLD THIS WORLD CLASS SHOW IN SALT LAKE CITY. THIS NEXT FIVE YEARS WILL HELP US STAY IN SALT LAKE CITY FOR 5 MORE YEARS. FRANKLY IF WE DIDN'T HAVE THESE 200 TAGS AS PART OF THIS CONVENTION, MY BOARD WOULD PROBABLY MOVE OUR CONVENTION TO RENO. THIS IS REALLY ONE OF THE KEY THINGS THAT ARE KEEPING US HERE IN UTAH. THE ECONOMIC IMPACT IN THE STATE OF UTAH. THE ECONOMIC REPORTS THAT COME OUT OF OUR CONVENTION EACH YEAR. WE'RE BEING TOLD THAT 8 TO 10 MILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF VALUE IS COMING BACK INTO OUR ECONOMY THROUGH JOBS, TAXES, AND HOTEL ROOMS ALL THOSE THINGS THAT HAPPEN WHEN WE BRING A CONVENTION OF THIS SIZE TO THE STATE. AS BYRON SAID, JUST LOOK AT THE GROSS NUMBERS OF THE TAGS AND YOU THINK-WOW THAT'S A LOT OF MONEY BUT YOU HAVE TO REMEMBER TO PUT A SHOW ON OF THIS SIZE AND TO PUT A WORLD CLASS SHOW ON IT COSTS A LOT OF MONEY. MARK MY WORD, IF MDF WASN'T MAKING MONEY, WE WOULDN'T BE IN SALT LAKE CITY. WE ARE A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION BUT TO ACCOMPLISH OUR MISSION, WE HAVE TO BE PROFITABLE. THIS IS A MONEY MAKING THING FOR OUR ORGANIZATION. IN ADDITION, WE SELL ANYWHERE FROM \$800-900 THOUSAND WORTH OF GOVERNMENT TAGS FROM OTHER STATES. MOST OF THAT GOES BACK ON THE GROUND. THE OTHER THING THAT WE CONTRIBUTED HERE IN THE STATE OF UTAH, PEOPLE ASK WHAT WE'VE DONE AND WE HAVE DONE A LOT OF SIMILAR PROJECTS. GENERALLY, A LOT OF PROJECTS THAT SFW DOES. THERE ARE SOME UNIQUE PROJECTS THAT WE DO. BUFFALO ARE NOT IN OUR MISSION BUT THEY ARE IN SFW'S. THE HENRY MOUNTAINS ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO US IN THIS REGION. IT'S WHERE A \$205,000 DEER IS GOING TO BE SHOT THIS YEAR. IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO US, AND WE'RE HOPING TO FUND PROJECTS DOWN THERE. IN THE WINTER OF 2008, WE HAD A HEAVY WINTER IN NORTHERN UTAH. IT WAS RIGHT DURING THE EXPO. BOTH SFW AND MDF IMMOBILIZED OUR VOLUNTEERS. I KNOW THAT MDF SPENT OVER 3500 LABOR HOURS FROM OUR VOLUNTEERS AND MEMBERS ON FEEDING DEER. WE SPENT ABOUT \$28,000 HELPING DEER FEEDING AND MOBILIZING AND BUILDING TROUGHS. THOSE ARE THE KINDS OF THINGS WE DO AS A PARTNERSHIP HERE IN THE STATE. WE ARE PROUD OF OUR CONTRIBUTIONS AND PARTNERSHIP WITH THE STATE OF UTAH. WE ASK THAT YOU APPROVE THE DWR'S RECOMMENDATION TO RENEW THE CONVENTION PERMITS FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEARS. THANK YOU.

RAC Discussion

TERRY SANSLOW- THANK YOU MILES. ANY MORE COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? THAT'S ALL THE CARDS THAT I HAD, SO WE WILL CLOSE IT TO THE AUDIENCE.

DERRIS JONES- TERRY, IS THERE A POSSIBILITY THAT WE CAN ASK THESE REPRESENTATIVES QUESTIONS?

TERRY SANSLOW- SURE.

DERRIS JONES- MY QUESTION IS ON WHAT KIND OF THINGS THE MONEY IS SPENT ON, ON THE GROUND. BYRON MENTIONED THE \$35,000 ON THE BISON CAPTURE. ARE THERE SOME OTHER EXAMPLES YOU CAN THROW OUT THERE, MAYBE A PERCENTAGE OF MONEY BEING SPENT ADMINISTRATIVELY VERSES ON THE GROUND TO GIVE US AN IDEA OF WHERE THE MONEY IS GOING?

MILES MORETTI- WE'VE DONE A COMBINATION OF THINGS. A LOT OF THE PROJECTS THAT ARE FUNDED, WE ALSO BRING VOLUNTEERS ALONG. WE'VE DONE EVERYTHING FROM GUZZLERS TO SAGE BUSH REJUVENATION AND WINTER RANGE RESTORATION, PONDS, CONSERVATION EASEMENTS, AERIAL SEEDING, IT GOES ON AND ON. THOSE THINGS HAVE DIFFERENT VALUES ON THEM. IT COULD BE ANYWHERE FROM \$10-20 THOUSAND DOLLARS ON PROJECTS THAT WE'VE CONTRIBUTED TO. WE HAVE DONE COYOTE CONTROL AND A VARIETY OF PROJECTS. THIS IS MDF MONEY THAT GOES ON THE GROUND IN UTAH. IT'S NOT CONSERVATION PERMIT MONEY.

BYRON BATEMAN- THE SFW HAS DONE LAND PURCHASES. WE OWN LAND IN PARTS OF THE STATE FOR WINTER RANGE. WE HAVE DONE FINAL PAYMENTS ON SOME OF THOSE DEER, ELK AND TURKEY FEED LIKE MILES MENTIONED. IN THE WINTER OF '08, WE SPENT OVER \$43,276, THAT'S JUST OUR DOLLARS THAT WE'VE SPENT TO FEED DEER AND ELK. WE SENT SOME FEED DOWN HERE TO FEED THE TURKEYS ON THE SAN JUAN AND LASALS. WE HAVE WORKED WITH OTHER CONSERVATION PARTNERS WITH NWTf WITH TURKEY FEEDING. WE'VE DONE \$25,000 IN SCHOLARSHIPS AT UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY. THESE SCHOLARSHIPS ARE FOR PEOPLE THAT ARE COMING OUT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FROM COLLEGE. IT'S HELPING NEW WILDLIFE BIOLOGISTS TO COMPLETE THEIR EDUCATION. WITH THE COYOTE BOUNTY INITIATIVE, WE SPENT \$98,800 IN THE LAST THREE YEARS. WE DO A LOT OF YOUTH HUNTS AND PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED HUNTS, \$34,600 FOR THOSE INDIVIDUALS. IN ADDITION TO THAT WE DO COMMUNITY CARE AND DONATIONS TO PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY. WE HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE WITH A LOT OF HARDSHIPS. PEOPLE WITH ILLNESSES AND CHILDREN THAT WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO HELP OUT. WE'VE BEEN FORTUNATE. IT HAS BENEFITED US MORE TO DO THOSE KINDS OF THINGS I THINK THAN IT HAS THE PEOPLE RECEIVING THE MONEY. IT'S ALWAYS NICE TO DO THAT KIND OF STUFF. ANOTHER THING THAT WE DO IS HUNTS FOR HEROES PROGRAM, OUR WOUNDED WARRIOR PROGRAM. WE SPENT ANOTHER \$57,912 TO SEND SOME OF THESE INDIVIDUALS ON THE HUNT OF THEIR LIFE OR THE FISHING TRIP OF THEIR LIFE. WE HAVE GOT THREE YOUNG WARRIORS THAT WE'RE SENDING ON HUNTS THIS YEAR. AT OUR BANQUET IN OREM THIS PAST YEAR, WE HAD A YOUNG MAN WHO WAS IN THE HOSPITAL AND WE HAD HIM TALKING FROM HIS HOSPITAL BED. HE WAS WOUNDED IN NOVEMBER 2009 IN AFGHANISTAN, HE GOT SHOT JUST BELOW THE KNEECAP AND BETWEEN HIS KNEE AND HIS ANKLE, AND HE'S HAD 13 SURGERIES. WE HAVE RAISED A LOT OF MONEY FROM SOME OTHER PEOPLE. THOSE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS WE DO WITH THIS MONEY. WE HAVE DONE MISC. WATER AND HABITAT PROJECTS. WE HAD A LOT OF FISH. PEOPLE COME TO US AND SAID THAT ALL THE FISH IN STRAWBERRY ARE GETTING EATEN UP BECAUSE WE COULDN'T AFFORD TO KEEP THEM IN THE HATCHERIES LONGER. THE DIVISION DIDN'T HAVE THE MONEY TO KEEP THEM IN THE HATCHERY SO WE WROTE A CHECK FOR \$7500 TO KEEP THEM IN HATCHERY A LITTLE BIT LONGER SO THAT THEY AREN'T EATEN BY CUTTHROATS. ANOTHER MAJOR THING WE HAVE DONE THAT IS A MAJOR ISSUE THROUGHOUT THE WEST WAS THE DELISTING OF WOLVES. WE SPENT \$117,000+ SO FAR ON THAT WOLF LITIGATION. WE ARE INTERVENERS IN THE COURT IN MISSOULA MONTANA. WE WILL BE AT THE HEARING ON JUNE 15 WITH JUDGE MALORI, HOPING TO BACK UP THE WHOLE ARGUMENT. SFW WILL BE A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE COURTROOM. THAT IS JUST A FEW OF THE THINGS THAT WE DO. THERE ARE A LOT MORE THINGS AND A LOT MORE DETAILS THAN THAT. WE CAN PLAY WITH NUMBERS

ALL DAY LONG AS TO WHAT WE WANT TO SHOW AS EXPENSES TOWARDS THE REVENUE WE RAISE ON THE PERMITS OR WE CAN CHARGE THE EXPENSES ON SEVERAL OTHER THINGS. WE HAVE GOT REVENUE STRAINS AND LARGE EXPENSES LIKE MILES SAID. ONE THING WE WANT TO DO IS THE BUYER REPORT DONE BY THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH. THEY WENT IN AND ACTUALLY SURVEYED 377 PEOPLE AT THE EXPO. THIS IS TO SEE WHAT KIND OF MONEY THEY SPENT AND WHERE THEY CAME FROM AND STUFF LIKE THAT. LIKE I SAID BEFORE WE HAVE PEOPLE FROM ALL 50 STATES AND WE ALSO HAD PEOPLE FROM ALL 6 CANADIAN PROVINCES AND 29 FOREIGN COUNTRIES COME TO THIS EXPO. IT'S NOT JUST A REGIONAL SHOW; IT'S A LARGE SHOW THROUGHOUT THE WORLD. PEOPLE LOOK FORWARD TO COMING OUT EVERY YEAR. OTHER CONSERVATION PARTNERS DO THEIR EXPOS IN LAS VEGAS OR NASHVILLE OR SOME PLACE ELSE. WE WANT TO KEEP OURS RIGHT HERE IN UTAH AND KEEP THE MONEY HERE IN UTAH. THERE WAS OVER 10 MILLION IN MONEY RAISED, YOU MULTIPLY THAT BY 6 OR 7 AND IT GOES TO DIFFERENT PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE STATE PLUS THERE WAS OVER 1 MILLION DOLLARS IN SALES TAX THAT WAS GENERATED. IT BENEFITS EVERYONE INCLUDING THE STATE.

CHRIS MICOZ- I HAVE A QUESTION FOR YOU. THE PURCHASES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE, ARE THEY FOR HUNTING?

BYRON BATEMAN- CRITICAL WINTER RANGE. ONE OF THOSE WAS FOR THE DIVISION TO FIND A PIECE OF PROPERTY BY WILLOW HOLLOW. WE DONATED \$10,000 TOWARDS THAT PURCHASE. THERE WERE SOME WETLANDS TO THE NORTH OF SLC AIRPORT. THERE WERE 600 ACRES THERE. WE DONATED MONEY TO HELP THE FIRE IN THE WETLANDS. OTHER LANDS THAT WE HAVE ARE ALL WINTER RANGE THAT PEOPLE HAVE OPENED TO THE PUBLIC. WE CLOSE THEM JUST LIKE THE DIVISION DOES WITH WMAS WHEN IT'S THE TIME OF THE YEAR TO CLOSE THEM FOR THE DEER AND ELK TO COME DOWN.

TODD HUNTINGTON- YOU HAVE ABOUT 25,000 VISITORS TO THE EXPO AND ONLY 10,000 ARE APPLYING FOR THESE HUNTS. IT SEEMS LIKE WE'RE GETTING A LOT OF PEOPLE THERE THAT AREN'T APPLYING. ARE WE USING THE REVENUE FROM THE 200 TAGS TO PAY FOR THE EXPO? IS THAT RIGHT?

BYRON BATEMAN- LIKE I SAID, YOU CAN APPLY THE REVENUE TO ANY EXPENSE OR VISA VERSA. WE HAD ONE OF OUR EXPO MEETINGS YESTERDAY PRIOR TO GOING DOWN TO BEAVER TO DO THE SAME THING LAST NIGHT. THAT'S ONE QUESTION WE ASK OURSELVES. A LOT OF THEM ARE WIVES AND CHILDREN.

TODD HUNTINGTON- THAT WAS MY OTHER QUESTION. SO WHAT YOU ARE SAYING, WHY THE OTHER 15,000 PEOPLE ARE NOT APPLYING?

BYRON BATEMAN- WELL YOU HAVE TO BUY A LICENSE TOO, BUT IT HELPS THE DIVISION BY SELLING MORE LICENSES THERE AT THE EXPO.

MILES MORETTI- ONE THING ON THE TRAFFICKING, WHEN THE APPLICANTS DROPPED IN 2007 TO 2008, THAT WAS WHEN THE DIVISION REQUIRED YOU TO PURCHASE A HUNTING LICENSE BEFORE YOU COULD APPLY. THE SAME THING HAPPENED TO US IN 2007 WE DIDN'T NEED TO PURCHASE A LICENSE. EVERYBODY PUT IN THE NEXT YEAR. IT DROPPED, ESPECIALLY BECAUSE WE HAVE A LOT OF NON-RESIDENTS AT THE SHOW. THEY DON'T WANT TO PAY THAT

MONEY FOR A BIG GAME LICENSE FEE FOR A CHANCE TO DRAW. BUT AS YOU SEE, NON-RESIDENTS STILL COME BECAUSE THEY HAVE A LITTLE MORE SPENDABLE INCOME AND ARE WILLING TO DO THAT. THAT IS ACTUALLY LIKE BYRON SAID ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE SCRATCHED OUR HEAD AT. HOW MANY OF 25,000 PEOPLE ARE ELIGIBLE FOR THOSE 200 TAGS. ARE WE NOT DOING A GOOD ENOUGH JOB IN MARKETING? OR ARE THEY SAYING THEY'RE NOT GOING TO PLAY THAT GAME, BUT YOU WOULD THINK THAT FOR FIVE BUCKS YOU WOULD DO IT, SO FROM AN ORGANIZATION STANDPOINT WE ARE GOING TO TRY TO MARKET TO THAT SEGMENT A LITTLE BETTER AND MAKE SURE THAT PEOPLE ARE CLEAR ON WHAT THOSE 200 TAGS ARE. BASED ON THE STATISTICS, 80 TO 85 PERCENT OF ATTENDEES ARE UTAH RESIDENTS, SO THEY'RE PROBABLY APPLYING IN THE MAIN DRAW ANYWAY, SO MAYBE WE ARE NOT DOING THE MARKETING THAT WE SHOULD BE DOING.

#### VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed with one opposing vote cast by Todd Huntington

#### 7) Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment (Action)

-Alan Clark, Assistant Director

#### Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- I JUST HAVE ONE QUESTION? THE PRICE ON THESE, ARE THEY GOING TO BE PRICED LIKE PREMIUM OR LIMITED ENTRY?

ALAN CLARK- WHAT WE DO IS, ANTELOPE ISLAND HAS SERVED AS A NURSERY HERD FOR OUR CALIFORNIA BIG HORN. WE PUT THEM ON ANTELOPE ISLAND TO PROVIDE A SOURCE FOR TRANSPLANTS AND WHEN YOU TRANSPLANT BIG HORN SHEEP, YOU DON'T TRANSPLANT MATURE RAMS. THEY ARE TOO MUCH BOTHER, TOO MANY PROBLEMS, TOO DIFFICULT TO HANDLE. DERRIS PROBABLY KNOWS THIS BETTER THAN ANYBODY. SO WE HAVE NOT REMOVED ANY ADULT RAMS FROM THAT ISLAND SINCE WE ESTABLISHED TO HERD. THERE ARE SOME VERY LARGE AND OLD RAMS THAT ARE WAITING TO DIE. THEY WILL NEVER BE TRANSPLANTED, SO THOSE ARE WHAT ARE THERE. THERE IS ALSO A LOW POPULATION OF MULE DEER, BUT THEN AGAIN, SO DOES THE HENRY MOUNTAINS HAVE A LOW POPULATION OF MULE DEER THAT HAVE NOT BEEN HUNTED. ON ANTELOPE ISLAND, THERE ARE VERY LARGE BUCKS THERE. OUR ESTIMATE IS OUR TAGS WILL RAISE A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF MONEY. IT WOULDN'T SURPRISE ME IF TAGS COULD RAISE MORE THAN \$200,000 IN THE FIRST YEAR OR TWO.

TERRY SANSLOW- MY QUESTION WAS ABOUT PUBLIC PERMITS?

ALAN CLARK- THE PUBLIC PERMITS WILL BE JUST LIKE ANY OTHER PERMIT. IT IS UP TO THE BOARD WHETHER THEY CAN ESTABLISH THAT AS A PREMIUM UNIT. FOR SHEEP, IT'S THE SAME PRICE. IT WON'T MATTER. THEY CAN ESTABLISH IT AS A PREMIUM UNIT OR THEY CAN JUST ESTABLISH IT AS LIMITED ENTRY. THOSE



ARE PARTS OF PROBLEMS THAT WE WOULD BE NEGOTIATING WITH PARKS. WE JUST HAVEN'T GOT THAT FAR DOWN THE ROAD YET.

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC?

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO ON ANY OF THESE CONSERVATION PERMITS THAT ARE SOLD THROUGHOUT ANY OF THE ORGANIZATIONS, THEY USE THE TOP TEN PERCENT, THEN 30 PERCENT GOES TO THE DIVISION, AND THEN 60 PERCENT GOES TO WHOM OR WHERE?

ALAN CLARK- GOES BACK TO BENEFIT WILDLIFE IN UTAH, NOWHERE ELSE.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO IT WON'T GO TO ARIZONA OR ANY PLACE LIKE THAT?

ALAN CLARK-NO. ALL OF THE RECEIPTS AND ALL OF THE PROJECTS ARE AUDITED EVER YEAR. WE GOT 90 % THEY KEPT 10 %, BUT THIS HAS WORKED OUT REALLY WELL BECAUSE VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATION HAVE TWO ADVANTAGES: FIRST IT HARNESSSES A LOT OF EXCITEMENT, AND THEY CAN GO TO A CHAPTER AND SAY WE HAVE THIS MONEY, WHAT KIND OF HABITAT PROJECT WOULD WORK, OR WORK DIRECTLY WITH US. FOREST SERVICE OR BLM PEOPLE WOULD COME UP AND WORK ON PROJECTS SO IT MAKES IT MORE MEANINGFUL TO THE LOCAL SPORTSMAN. THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO DO, WE WANT TO MAKE SPORTSMAN IDENTIFY WITH HABITAT. THE SECOND BENEFIT IT HAS HAD IS: SINCE IT'S THEIR MONEY, THEY ARE NOT RESTRICTED BY ALL THE THINGS THAT WE ARE RESTRICTED BY. THEY CAN ACT FASTER. THE STATE PROCESS AND THE FEDERAL PROCESS ARE DESIGNED ON PURPOSE TO BE CUMBERSOME TO AVOID PROBLEMS. THIS GIVES THEM SOME MONEY TO ACT QUICKLY ON SOMETHING. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT THE GROUPS HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO FOR INSTANCE IS BUY SOME USED EQUIPMENT. IT'S VERY DIFFICULT FOR THE STATE TO BUY USED EQUIPMENT. THE GROUPS HAVE BEEN ABLE TO DO A LOT OF GOOD THINGS. WE WORK VERY CLOSELY WITH THEM ON HOW THEY SPEND THEIR 60 PERCENT. IN FACT THEY CAN'T SEND A CENT OF THAT 60 PERCENT UNTIL THE DIRECTORS OFFICE SIGNS OFF ON IT, SO EVEN THOUGH IT'S THEIR MONEY, IT'S NOT THEIRS WITHOUT STRINGS.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO THE DEER TAG THAT WAS SOLD FOR \$280,000. \$28,000 GOES TO THEM, 30 PERCENT GOES TO YOUR GUYS AND THEN THE REST HAS TO STAY IN UTAH?

ALAN CLARK- YES, AND ON PROJECTS THAT THE DIVISION APPROVES.

BLAIR EASTMAN- I HAVE A SCENARIO FOR YOU. IF I BUY A CONSERVATION TAG, AND USE IT AS A BONUS FOR AN EMPLOYEE OR A GIFT, BUT I CAN'T GIVE A NAME WITHIN THAT 10 TO 30 DAYS AS THE CASE MY BE. IS THERE A WAY TO WORK AROUND THAT?

ALAN CLARK- THERE IS AN EXCEPTION. IT DOES ALLOW A PERSON TO BE SUBSTITUTED. YOU STILL HAVE TO GET US A NAME. YOU CAN'T JUST LEAVE IT BLANK, BECAUSE IF YOU THINK ABOUT IT, IF IT'S BLANK YOU CAN GO RE-SELL IT FOR TWICE AS MUCH AS YOU BOUGHT IT FOR. YOU DO HAVE TO PROVIDE A NAME BUT THERE IS A PROVISION THAT YOU CAN SUBSTITUTE ANOTHER ONE FOR THAT, AS LONG AS YOU INVOLVE THE CONSERVATION GROUP. THERE IS A

SECOND PROVISION THAT ALLOWS YOU, BECAUSE SOME OF THESE EVENTS OCCUR BEFORE OUR DRAWING, AND THEN YOU DRAW A TAG. IT ALLOWS THE GROUP ALSO TO COME UP WITH ANOTHER NAME TO REPLACE THAT PERSON SO YOU CAN KEEP YOUR DRAWING TAG.

BLAIR EASTMAN- SO I COULD ACTUALLY BUY THE TAGS AND PUT MY NAME ON THEM FOR THE TIME BEING?

ALAN CLARK- YOU CAN'T HAVE YOUR NAME ON MORE THEN ONE. I WOULD DO IT UP FRONT, JUST SO EVERYONE WILL KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON. EVERYBODY IS WATCHING EACH OTHER AND I GET CALLS ALL WINTER LONG ASKING IF SOMETHING WAS DONE ILLEGALLY BY ANOTHER GROUP. THERE'S A FAIR AMOUNT OF WATCHING. IT'S KIND OF LIKE CELL PHONES FOR OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT GUYS. IT'S ONE OF THE BEST TOOLS INVENTED.

TRAVIS PEHRSON- SO THEY ACTUALLY ANTICIPATE AT LEAST \$200,000.

ALAN CLARK-IF THINGS GO THE WAY WE ANTICIPATE AND THERE'S NO HUGE CONTROVERSY GOING ON, I THINK THAT THE 200,000 IS A VERY SAFE BET. ANTELOPE ISLAND IS 28,000 ACRES. PEOPLE DON'T REALIZE THE SIZE OF IT. IT'S A CHUNK OF REAL ESTATE.

DERRIS JONES- I AM ASSUMING THAT IT IS GOING TO BE CONSIDERED A FAIR CHASE?

ALAN CLARK- IT WOULD. THAT'S A BIG ISLAND. IT'S NOT LIKE GETTING OUT OF YOUR VEHICLES, LOOKING AND SEEING THE WHOLE ISLAND. IT'S A MOUNTAIN. WE HAVE A HECK OF A TIME EVEN FINDING THE SHEEP TO COUNT THEM. THEY HAVE A LOT OF PLACES TO HIDE THERE.

WAYNE HOSKISSON- R657-41-2 DEFINITIONS, IT SAYS THE SPORTSMAN PERMIT MEANS THAT A PERMITTEE IS ALLOWED TO HUNT DURING SEASON DATES SPECIFIED IN SUB-SECTION I. I THINK THAT MUST HAVE SLIPPED TO K. I'M NOT SURE IF I AM INTERPRETING THAT RIGHT?

ALAN CLARK- PROBABLY. I WILL CIRCLE THAT AND CHECK THAT. DON'T WORRY ABOUT THAT IN A MOTION.

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY MORE QUESTIONS? ANY QUESTION'S FROM THE AUDIENCE? COMMENTS FROM BYRON BATEMAN.

#### Questions from the Public

#### Comments from the Public

BYRON BATEMAN- THANKS AGAIN FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO LET ME SPEAK AGAIN TONIGHT. THIS PICTURE HERE IS A PICTURE OF THE CALIFORNIA BIG HORNS COMING FROM NEVADA BEING RELEASED ON THE ISLAND. CONSERVATION DOLLARS WERE USED TO HELP FACILITATE THAT CAPTURE OF THOSE BIG HORNS. AS ALAN MENTIONED, USING ANTELOPE ISLAND AS A NURSERY. WE STARTED A HERD IN THE STANSBURY MOUNTAINS. WE ARE GOING

TO HAVE OUR FIRST HUNT THIS YEAR OUT ON THE STANSBURY. IT REALLY HELPS TO INCREASE OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE TO VIEW BIG HORN SHEEP, MULE DEER, BISON ON THE ISLAND AND STUFF LIKE THAT. IT'S THE SPORTSMAN DOLLARS THAT IS MAKING THIS HAPPEN. WHEN THE STATE ACQUIRED ANTELOPE ISLAND IT WAS A WORKING CATTLE RANCH. THEY HAD DEER HUNTING ON THAT RANCH AT THAT TIME. PART OF THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT WHEN THE STATE ACQUIRED IT WAS TO KEEP THE HISTORIC VALUES OF THE RANCH. WHICH INCLUDE THE HUNTING? WE HUNT THE BISON OUT THERE RIGHT NOW. WE GIVE OUT 6 TAGS EACH YEAR TO CONTINUE THE HUNTING TRADITION LIKE THAT. HUNTING IS A REAL MANAGEMENT TOOL TO USE. WE DON'T TAKE BIG RAMS OFF FOR TRANSPLANT. IT'S A GREAT OPPORTUNITY. THIS IS A UNIQUE WAY TO LOOK AT A RENEWABLE RESOURCE. IT COULD HELP PAY FOR ITSELF, HELP SUSTAIN ITSELF. IT'S A HISTORIC RANCH; HUNTING IS PART OF THE TRADITION. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT HAPPEN. THANK YOU!

MILES MORETTI-THANK YOU! I WANT TO ECHO WHAT BYRON SAID AND SUPPORT THE DIVISION RECOMMENDATION ON WHERE THEY'RE GOING WITH ANTELOPE ISLAND. I USED TO SIT AT THIS TABLE AND SCRATCH MY HEAD ABOUT HOW TO RAISE REVENUE AND NOW I AM ON THE NONPROFIT SIDE. SO IF I DON'T RAISE THE REVENUE THEN I DON'T KEEP MY DOORS OPEN ANYMORE. THIS IS A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY FOR A PART THAT IS STRUGGLING AS THE LEGISLATURE STRUGGLES FOR FUNDS. ALSO DERRIS, I'M A PROFESSIONAL MEMBER OF BOONE AND CROCKET, BUT I AM THE ONLY ONE IN UTAH AND I AM GOING TO WRITE THEM AND ASK THEM IF THEY WOULD CONSIDER DOING A RULING FOR BOONE AND CROCKET RECORD BOOKS FOR THE FAIR CHASE BECAUSE SOMETIMES ISLANDS ARE A LITTLE BIT IFFY, WHETHER THEY ALLOW THEM OR NOT. THE RULE CHANGE ON THE CONSERVATION PERMITS IS AGAIN 10 TO 30 DAYS. THIS WOULD HELP US OUT A LOT, DEPENDING ON THE VOLUNTEERS AND BANQUETS WE PUT ON. THE CONSERVATION PERMIT PROGRAM IS A GREAT PROGRAM IN THIS STATE. NO OTHER STATE HAS ONE QUITE LIKE IT. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE NOTICED THIS YEAR WAS THE WATERSHED INITIATIVE WHICH HAS BEEN SO SUCCESSFUL AT PUTTING 10- 12 MILLION DOLLARS ON THE GROUND. THE CONSERVATION GROUPS, ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELK, SFW, MDF, WILD TURKEY FEDERATION, WE WERE ALL ABLE TO STEP IN WITH THOSE CONSERVATION DOLLARS. WE WERE ABLE TO FUND SOME PROJECTS THAT OTHERWISE WOULDN'T HAVE. IT A GREAT PROGRAM AND IT'S REALLY ALLOWING US TO CONTINUE HABITAT WORK. THERE IS NO OTHER PARTNERSHIP LIKE THIS ONE ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE COUNTRY. I WILL LET THE RAC KNOW ABOUT THE BOONE AND CROCKET ANSWER.

#### RAC Discussion

#### VOTING

Motion was made by Todd Huntington to accept the Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed with one opposing vote cast by Laura Kamala

- 8) R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment (Action)

-Judy Tutorow, Administrative Services Staff

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY QUESTION FROM THE AUDIENCE? I DON'T HAVE ANY COMMENT CARDS FROM THE AUDIENCE. ANY QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM THE RAC?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Todd Huntington to accept R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Chris Micoz

Motion passed unanimously

9) R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment (Action)

-Judy Tutorow, Administrative Services Staff

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY QUESTION FROM THE RAC?

TODD HUNTINGTON- AS IT IS NOW, SAY SOMEONE DRAWS A TAG, AND THEY ELECTED TO TURN IT BACK, THEY DON'T GET A REFUND? IS THAT CORRECT?

JODI TUTOROW-THERE ARE PROVISIONS THAT WE ALREADY HAVE IN PLACE, BUT NO, THEY DO NOT GET A REFUND.

TERRY SANSLOW- THE PROVISION IS THE 30 DAYS BEFORE THE HUNT STARTS, RIGHT?

JODI TUTOROW- THAT'S RIGHT.

KEVIN ALBRECHT- RIGHT NOW, HOW MANY PERMITS ARE TURNED BACK SO CLOSE TO THE START DATE THAT YOU ARE UNABLE TO REISSUE THOSE?

JODI TUTOROW-I CAN TELL YOU THAT LAST YEAR WE HAD 392 LIMITED ENTRY AND LIFETIME PERMITS SURRENDERED. AND REALLOCATED OUT 172 OF THOSE. THEY CAN STILL TURN IN THE PERMIT UP UNTIL THE HUNT STARTS AND GET THE BONUS POINTS REINSTATED.

BILL BATES- DO YOU KNOW WHEN THIS WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE?

JODI TUTOROW- AT THE BOARD MEETING IN JUNE. WE HAD A LOT OF CALLS WITH HUNTERS WANTING TO KNOW IF THEY TURNED IN THEIR PERMIT NOW AND IT GOES INTO LAW AT THE BOARD MEETING (I THINK IT WILL GO INTO EFFECT AROUND AUGUST 9<sup>TH</sup>) WOULD THEY QUALIFY FOR THAT REFUND. I HAD TO ASK MARTIN BUSHMEN HOW HE WOULD MAKE A RULING ON THAT, AND HE DID SAY THAT WE WOULD BE ABLE TO HONOR THAT, JUST AS LONG AS WE HAD THAT PERMIT IN. EVEN IF THAT LAW DIDN'T GO INTO EFFECT IN AUGUST WE COULD GO BACK AND REFUND BASED ON THAT.

KEVIN ALBRECHT- ONE QUESTION I DIDN'T QUITE UNDERSTAND, IS IF THEY TURN A TAG BACK AND THEIR POINTS ARE REINSTATED, ARE THEY REINSTATED FOR THE YEAR THEY DREW THE TAG OR JUST FOR THE POINTS THEY HAD BEFORE?

JODI TUTOROW- THEY ARE GOING TO SAVE ALL THE POINTS THEY HAD ON FILE BEFORE, PLUS THE ONE FOR THE CURRENT YEAR.

TERRY SANSLOW- ANYMORE QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC? QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE? COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? COMMENTS FROM THE RAC?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

10) R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment (Action)

-Justin Hart, Assistant Regional Aquatics Program Manager

Questions from the RAC

TERRY SANSLOW- ANY QUESTIONS FROM THE RAC? QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE? COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE? DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS FROM THE RAC?

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Blair Eastman  
Motion passed unanimously

- 11) Aquatic Informational Presentation (Informational)  
-Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Manager

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.  
4 public in attendance

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on June 10 at 9 a.m. at the DNR Board Room at 1594 W. North Temple, SLC

The next southeast regional RAC meeting will take place on July 28 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

**NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED  
UBATC, Vernal/May 13, 2010**

5. R657 HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR DISABLED HUNTERS

**MOTION: to accept as presented.**

Motion passed unanimously

6. R657-55 WILDLIFE CONVENTION PERMIT RULE AMENDMENT

**MOTION: to go along with wildlife convention permit rule amendment as presented by the Division**

Passed unanimously

7. R657-41 CONSERVATION AND SPORTSMAN PERMITS RULE AMENDMENT

**MOTION: to go with Conservation and Sportsman Permit Amendment Rule as presented by the Division.**

Passed unanimously

8. R657-17 LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE RULE AMENDMENT

**MOTION: to accept**

Passed unanimously

9. R657-42 REFUND RULE AMENDMENT

**MOTION: to accept the rule as presented**

Passed unanimously

10. R657-60 AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES INTERDICTION RULE AMENDMENT

**MOTION: to approve the aquatic invasive species amendment**

Passed unanimously

**NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY**  
**Uintah Basin Applied Technology College (UBATC), Vernal**  
**May 13, 2010**  
**Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 8:30 pm**

**RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mitch Hacking-Agriculture  
Floyd Briggs-At Large  
Amy Torres-At Large  
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor  
Bob Christensen-RAC Chair  
Brandon McDonald-BLM  
Beth Hamann-Non Consumptive  
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen

**EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Loran Hills-Non Consumptive  
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture  
Ron Winterton-Elected Official

**UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:**

Carlos Reed-Ute Tribe  
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen

**UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:**

Natalie Boren-NER Invasive Species Bio  
Ben Wolford-NER Conservation Officer  
Roger Schneidervin-NER Aquatics Manager  
Marcia Keddy-NER Support Services  
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach  
Gayle Allred-NER Administrative Aide  
Drew Cushing-SLO Aquatics Bio II  
Judi Tutorow-SLO Licensing Coordinator  
Staci Coons-SLO RAC Coordinator  
Roger Wilson-SLO Wildlife Pgm Coord  
Greg Sheehan-SLO Admin Svcs. Sect. Chief

**WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:**

Del Brady

**1. WELCOME, RAC INSTRUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURE: Bob Christensen**

**2a. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES: Bob Christensen**

**MOTION by Amy Torres to approve the agenda and add scheduling a RAC Social date at the end of the meeting.**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**

**2b. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Bob Christensen**

**MOTION by Floyd Bartlett to approve the minutes**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**



### **3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE: Bob Christensen**

Antlerless permit numbers motion from the Northeastern Region RAC was to go with the Division's permit recommendations with two changes, 1) cut the Anthro elk permits from 500 to 250; and cut the Diamond Mountain January late hunt from 100 to 50 permits and add the remaining 50 permits to the two earlier hunts at 25 permits each. The Wildlife Board discussed both issues at length. There was no motion by the Board on the Anthro unit singling it out, but there was a motion made to accept the Diamond Mountain change. So part of NER's motion passed, part did not. The Board felt with the population being over-objective and the amount of elk on Anthro, going by the management plan, that we needed to reduce that herd size. The rest of the decisions the Board made were consistent with our RAC recommendations.

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

The field season is going. The preliminary report shows fawn survival looks good.

We have been doing gill netting and will be doing gill netting on Flaming Gorge this week.

The Bison release happened. 41 Bison were released on the Book Cliffs Tuesday. They looked healthy and happy. Ron Stewart has taken video which we may show in the next RAC.

We've dedicated the Mallard Springs WMA as the Kevin Conway WMA. We are trying to work with Kevin's wife Karla and her family to come out and see it and have an official dedication but so far we have not had much luck.

This is Amy Torres' last RAC meeting. She will be moving with her husband to California. We appreciate all the work she has done, especially the work she did as RAC chair last term.

### **5. R657-12 HUNTING AND FISHING ACCOMMODATIONS FOR DISABLED HUNTERS – Greg Sheehan (ACTION)**

See handout

#### **Questions from RAC:**

Mitch Hacking: What do you consider disabled?

Greg Sheehan: I will read the definition.

1(a) is blind, quadriplegic, upper extremity disabled, paraplegic, or otherwise permanently disabled so as to be permanently confined to a wheelchair or the use of crutches, or who has lost either or both lower extremities...”

We have a variety of CORS that address this: blind, companion hunters, shooting from vehicles, season extensions, etc.

Mitch Hacking: Do you get totally blind hunters?

Greg Sheehan: They're not allowed to shoot. They have a companion.

Rod Morrison: How do you go about applying for one of these permits?

Greg Sheehan: We don't issue any unique permits. If you draw a permit through the general season or once-in-a-lifetime or limited entry, you can apply for these CORs. There are CWMUs and landowner associations who have been good about taking permits they've received and donate them to handicapped.

Rod Morrison: Is there a way of bidding on them?

Greg Sheehan: No.

Rod Morrison: Do they have any better odds of drawing than the normal person?

Greg Sheehan: A wheelchair-bound hunters group came and wanted a percentage of permits but it was not received real well, carving out unique permits. They receive bonus points like anyone else would. The success odds are high.

Rod Morrison: I would like to make the handicap have better odds of drawing a permit since some of these limited entry permits take a long time.

Greg Sheehan: It would be a pretty big process and it would require a bigger rule than we have to present here today. You could have it considered through the RAC in the future. Those groups already did a presentation to the Board but they weren't quite ready to approve it. We have had a lot of groups all around the state with CWMU and landowner permits. If a CWMU permit holder has permits they have not used, they can be carried over, and those have been donated to handicapped people. The only way we have to give handicapped people a better opportunity is to offer them more bonus points. I'm terrified to offer that to them because they could open a can of worms.

Rod Morrison: Can we look at setting aside some permits for the disabled?

Greg Sheehan: That's been brought up before. If your RAC wanted to bring that up for consideration you could do that tonight.

**Questions from Public:**

Jay Brewer: How do you guard against fraud?

Greg Sheehan: Because we don't issue special permits, we don't have the problem. The biggest issue with fraud is people saying they have a disability, but they have to fill out a form, signed by a physician and a letter from the physician to demonstrate they have a permanent disability. We call a lot of doctors every year and talk with them about it.

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

Amy Torres: I was glad to see that you took into account the weekends for the wheelchair-bound. Secondly, in the copy of the regulations and 12-6, there's a line that talks about 30-day extension that hasn't been taken out. I like Rod's idea but I don't think it could go into the motion because this meeting talks about permits already established. It would be better served in November when we're talking about numbers.

Greg Sheehan: If you did want to mention that to the Board, you could, so it will be considered in November.

Kevin Christopherson: The Board did consider a similar proposal last year and elected not to approve it because it reduced the odds of hunter success. They chose to go with CORs after permits have been drawn.

**MOTION by Amy Torres: to accept as presented.**

Second by Floyd Briggs

**Motion passed unanimously**

**6. R657-55 WILDLIFE CONVENTION PERMIT RULE AMENDMENT - Greg Sheehan (ACTION)**

See handout

**Questions from RAC:**

Mitch Hacking: On the Conservation organization, you issue this to one organization?

Greg Sheehan: It was issued to FNAWS, in partnership with Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife and the Mule Deer Foundation. FNAWS elected to move their national convention to Reno, so other organizations elected to run it.

Mitch Hacking: Do you do it just with one?

Greg Sheehan: The contract exists with just one. Whoever applies, it's open to any conservation organizations, but they'll look at groups and if they're paired up, the Board may look on it more favorably.

Mitch Hacking: Are there any pre-requisites for fledgling groups?

Greg Sheehan: They need to show a demonstrated track record of value to wildlife and convince the Wildlife Board. It would probably be better if they were paired with one or two of the larger groups.

Floyd Briggs: Did the Board take into consideration the mountain sheep problem in Daggett?

Greg Sheehan: Yes. Hunts that are doing well and have growing permits can maybe absorb some of the increase. Units like Daggett that have had problems would not have any. They are reviewed and are sensitive to that.

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

Miles Moretti (CEO Mule Deer Foundation): As a clarification regarding the Western Hunting Expo, the Division wanted one single group to be responsible. If the groups got in a fight, they might have problems, so the Division does the main contract with one group but does contract with each group.

I urge you to support this presentation. In four years, we proved people wrong. Most groups hold their conventions in Reno and Nashville. Here, we found a partnership with the Division of Wildlife Resources and found SLC is really the place to be. Exhibitors and sportsmen like coming here. Over 25,000 attended the expo this year. We have set a record. We have people from all over the west, the country, and foreign countries. We've set records in amounts paid for permits also. \$250,000 was paid for mule deer tag sold; we sold a Colorado tag for all-time record; Arizona tag for an all-time record. This partnership has helped contribute to the success of this. 200 tags are a tremendous draw. There are close to 10,000 applicants. It helps bring people to SLC. Renewal of the contract will ensure we can keep this here for the next five years. The Economic Bureau in SLC does a report, and figures it brings somewhere between 8 and 10 million dollars to the economy. Money raised from tags helps offset the cost of putting on the expo. The Mule Deer Foundation makes money too. We sell conservation tags from other states, outfitters from Alaska, and all over the world. No other expo has the number of tags we have. Also, a lot of the sale of both conservation permits and convention tags goes on the ground for wildlife.

Byron Bateman (Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): In order to book the Salt Palace you have to do multiple year contracts to make it less expensive. That's why it's important to know you've got them. A University of Utah etc. report shows close to \$10 million was

generated last year. If you multiply that by sales tax, etc. it helps the general public throughout the state. Sportsmen come from all six Canadian provinces, China, Africa, South America, etc. This is getting to be the expo people come to internationally. We want to let other state agencies come and see what Utah is doing for wildlife, to try and figure out how they can do what we have done.

Convention permits are like a regular draw, just \$5 to apply. This gives the opportunity to everybody in the state to celebrate the wildlife we have in the state over a four-day period. It takes a lot of money to put on a show. Our costs keep going up and we ask for your support. We have to qualify every year. Hopefully we show people we meet and surpass the criteria.

**Comments from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: Greg, the five-year contract was on this plan, right?

Greg Sheehan: Yeah it goes from 2012 to 2016 for the next one.

Kevin Christopherson: Beyond the money, last year they took the Legislature there and they were very impressed with the convention. We made a lot of friends in the Legislature when they saw how big a deal that was.

Mitch Hacking: I'm a member of Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and the Mule Deer Foundation, and a livestock producer. My experience has been that there have been a lot of positive articles in working with livestock and my hat is off to you. Livestock people and sportsmen haven't always gotten along, but your magazine has articles regarding both.

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to go along with the Wildlife Convention Permit rule amendment as presented by the division**

Second by Brandon McDonald

Motion passed unanimously

**7. R657-CONSERVATION AND SPORTSMAN PERMITS RULE AMENDMENT  
- Greg Sheehan (ACTION)  
(Antelope Island State Park Conservation Permits for Bighorn Sheep and Mule Deer)**

**Questions from RAC:**

Beth Hamann: Four permits, two for public and two for conservation?

Greg Sheehan: Yes

Mitch Hacking: Regarding conservation permits, we have an issue with sage chickens. Do you ever specify projects for one certain wildlife and would sage chickens qualify?

Greg Sheehan: Typically the species the permits are sold for are retained and dedicated to those species. Because of the problem with sage grouse, the only way conservation permits might benefit are sage steppe projects or watershed projects that might benefit multiple species. Deer projects and sometimes quasi-sage grouse projects, but we don't say we sold a moose permit and will use the money for sage grouse. We've done well with money. The Legislature gave us two million dollars, two years ago. There has been a lot of support from the livestock industry and the oil industry. You're probably aware that Fish and Wildlife had us up for review for listing. It ended up being listed as "pending," so we didn't have a listing right then but we're still trying to piece together money.

Mitch Hacking: So they just indirectly get benefitted, but you can't take conservation money to go to a sage chicken project?

Greg Sheehan: We're not necessarily held by law on how to manage them, but we've generally going with, if we're raising money for sheep, then we use it for sheep. When we look at watershed initiatives, and long-range projects, things that have sage grouse components are higher.

Mitch Hacking: Sage grouse are permits, aren't they...? Can they be sold as conservation permits?

Byron Bateman: We'd sell them. Working with BYU, Randy Larsen and Rick Baxter, we sent them money for sage grouse, to make sure they had a study in place. We continue to do that study and fund that with their Masters and Doctors programs. It's going to affect grazing big game and hunters big time if sage grouse are listed. We've funded another study on the Cage Mountains to find out what they're eating. We've worked closely with Wildlife Services on Strawberry to find out what's affecting populations, and transplanting sage grouse, and finding out how that's working. It's doing great. There is a new study to see about the impacts of predators. We've been doing it for several years because we knew it was coming down the road.

Greg Sheehan: Maybe we ought to get some on the conservation permits.

### **Questions from Public:**

None

### **Comments from Public:**

Byron Bateman ( Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): There is a lot of information. The questions you ask are good questions and we're more than happy to answer those questions. The Antelope Island animals transplanted on the slide on the screen were done by conservation permit dollars. If this passes and then goes to State Parks, we'll have the

opportunity that a couple of sportsmen will be able to hunt on State land. It's historically been hunted for mule deer. Bison, bighorn, and pronghorn were brought in. A lot of the deer have left; they come and go depending on the level of the lake. Bison do qualify for Boone and Crocket, as do mule deer. It's exciting that with all the money raised throughout the state to raise money for parks, we can go back into the habitat and do improvement projects. A lot of cheat grass out there now after fires. It needs some habitat work. We could have a lot more wildlife if we could do habitat work. We can help the Legislature and have a hunt. We ask for your support to help that go through and Parks can do what they want with the money. They have been in the red and we'll help raise the money for them.

As for the housekeeping rules: going from the 10 days to go to a 30-day time frame to get our paperwork in makes our paperwork simpler. Since we have multiple banquets, it's pretty hard to get the information rounded up and submitted.

Miles Moretti (Mule Deer Foundation): We also want to endorse the Antelope Island Conservation permit. There will be value added that can bring much needed money to the area. Hunting has been a heritage. Wonder if animals qualify for Boone and Crockett. I'll write a letter regarding sheep if they qualify. We endorse the 30-day turn around.

**Comments from RAC:**

Amy Torres: Greg, what are the other comments for *not* doing this?

Greg Sheehan: Locally in the Salt Lake, Davis County area, Park proponents saying we want to leave this a park and don't want more hunting. Bison hunting has always occurred there the whole time Parks has owned the island.

Amy Torres: What does State Parks think about it?

Greg Sheehan: It will come down to the State Parks Board move in that direction. That's one of the challenges they get to make.

Bob Christensen: I read some people are concerned about wildlife viewing with a hunt going on.

**MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with the Conservation and Sportsmen Permit Amendment Rule as presented by the Division.**

Second by Amy Torres

**Passed unanimously**

**8. R657-17 LIFETIME HUNTING AND FISHING LICENSE RULE  
AMENDMENT - Judi Tutorow SLO Licensing Coordinator (ACTION)**

See handout

**Questions from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: Was there just one year you had a chance to buy the lifetime license?

Judi Tutorow: Lifetime licenses were on sale from 1984 to 1994. When we had the deer herd loss, we stopped the sales. We only sold 1,000 in the first few years. Then, in the last year, when it was capped, we sold over 3000.

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

**MOTION by Amy Torres: to accept**

Second by Beth Hamann

**Passed unanimously**

**9. REFUND RULE AMENDMENT - Judi Tutorow Licensing Coordinator  
(ACTION)**

Refund for anyone who obtains a limited entry and OIOAL if the date of surrender is more than 30 days prior to the opening of the hunt, minus a \$25.00 fee.

**General season**

If a hunter gets a reallocated permit, the hunter could get reimbursed for their general season permit.

When a permit remains unissued or unpaid, the Division may:

Reissue it to an alternate;

Offer it over the counter;

Add it to the following year quota (only general season permits;

Elect not to issue it.

**Questions from RAC:**

Rod Morrison: So if you turn back a permit is it issued to an alternate?



Judi Tutorow: Limited Entry and Once-In-A-Lifetime is issued back to an alternate. In the past, when they were turned back, you did not get refunded. That's why we wanted to provide a refund.

Rod Morrison: How do you do the alternate?

Judi Tutorow: Once the drawing is all completed, the contractor gives us the next guy in line that would have drawn out.

Rod Morrison: Can I get my name on the list?

Kevin Christopherson: It's on it, you just don't know how far down the list.

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

**MOTION by Beth Hamann: to accept the rule as presented**

Second by Amy Torres

**Passed unanimously**

**10. R657-60 AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES INTERDICTION RULE  
AMENDMENT - Natalie Boren AIS Biologist (ACTION)  
See handout**

**Questions from RAC:**

None

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

Mitch Hacking: How's it going?

Natalie Boren: It's going well for us. Other states are getting on board. We haven't had any more infected lakes come about. Red Fleet came up positive two years ago. Every test done last year came back negative. The rest of the state's looking pretty good too. We have lot of seasonal employees working on decontaminating boats and educating boaters, and the funding looks good.

Mitch Hacking: Does it come in any other way other than boats?

Natalie Boren: It can be transported on diving suits and feathers, but the feather veliger would be microscopic. There is only one study that says a duck could transport it from one pond to a nearby close pond. Boats and other equipment like pumps submerged in the water are the only way. We're still looking into the water truck issue coming from Oklahoma to our State. It could be another vector.

Floyd Briggs: Over in our area on the Gorge, our officers are getting beat up over the Wyoming-Utah issue. Was there any communications made between the Wyoming Fish and Game and Utah DWR or was the \$30 fee strictly done by Wyoming?

Kevin Christopherson: They passed their own law and we don't have much influence on it.

Floyd Bartlett: How did Utah justify it where the State picked up the equipment used?

Natalie Boren: When the Legislature passed funding for the program, they said it is a Utah problem, farmers, irrigators, we all play a role in using water, and we're all going to fund the problem. Wyoming says boaters are the ones spreading it; boaters are the ones who will pay for it.

Utah boaters are being forced to buy a \$30 Wyoming sticker and not getting anything back from it. Their coordinators are working with us as much as we can to try to help boaters from both sides know what they need for each state and doing enforcement. It has been a rough start and probably will be all summer.

Kevin Christopherson: We ought to get with the county, and see if Wyoming wants to do a reciprocal rule. Wyoming would have to create a new law on Flaming Gorge.

**Comments from RAC:**

**MOTION by Floyd Bartlett to approve the aquatic invasive species amendment**  
Second by Brandon McDonald

**Passed unanimously**

**11. AQUATIC INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION - Roger Wilson  
(INFORMATIONAL)**

**See handout**

Northeastern Region:

-West Fork Duchesne River (Duchesne and Wasatch Counties): Remove special regulations from lower reach (North Fork confluence upstream to the Forest Service boundary)

-Wolf Creek (Duchesne and Wasatch Counties): Remove special regulations from lower reach (West Fork confluence upstream to the Rhodes diversion)

-Lake Canyon Lake (Duchesne County): CLOSED near the inlet stream, as posted during the spring spawning operations.

**Questions from RAC:**

None

**Questions from Public:**

None

**Comments from Public:**

None

**Comments from RAC:**

Brandon McDonald: How does that work if you were to do a take on a problem bird, do you have to go through fish and wildlife agency for a permit?

Roger Schneidervin: They're migratory so fish and wildlife is contacted. And APHIS.

Bob Christensen: For your information, the hunt structure changes presentation has been changed back to the November 18th RAC. If they left it on the September agenda, it may force people to choose between coming to the RAC and the September hunts, so it's back to November. Our November RAC date is November 18.

The Board meeting in January moved to the 4<sup>th</sup> instead of the 6<sup>th</sup>.

**RAC Social will be held the second Wednesday of June. June 9<sup>th</sup>, at Del Brady's home.**

**Meeting Adjourned 8:30 pm.**

**Next meeting: July 29, 2010**

Central Region Advisory Council  
Central Region Conference Center  
50 S Main St, Springville  
May 18, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

## **Motion Summary**

### **Approval of Agenda**

MOTION: To accept agenda as written  
Passed unanimously

### **Approval of Minutes**

MOTION: To accept minutes as transcribed  
Passed unanimously

### **R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters**

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented  
Passed unanimously

### **R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment**

MOTION: To approve the rule as presented  
Passed 7 to 1 with 1 abstention

### **R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment**

MOTION: To accept the amendments and house keeping items to the rule  
Passed 8 to 1

### **R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment**

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented  
Passed unanimously

### **R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment**

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented  
Passed unanimously

### **R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment**

MOTION: To accept the rule amendments as presented  
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council  
Central Region Conference Center  
50 S Main St, Springville  
May 18, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

**Members Present**

Micki Bailey, BLM  
John Bair, Sportsmen  
Matt Clark, Sportsmen  
Byron Gunderson, At Large  
Richard Hansen, At Large  
Doug Jones, Forest Service (for Larry Velarde)  
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair  
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair  
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive  
Allan Stevens, At Large

**Members Absent**

Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture  
George Holmes, Agriculture  
Jay Price, Elected  
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

**Others Present**

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board

---

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

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Micki Bailey to accept the agenda as written**

**Seconded by Richard Hansen**

**Motion passed unanimously**

2) **Approval of the April 27, 2010 Minutes (Action)**

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the minutes as transcribed**

**Seconded by John Bair**

**Motion passed unanimously**

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

**Wildlife**

- Range rides - very little winter loss and as usual, the losses that we do have are mostly fawns. Deer look to be in good condition and have for the most part moved off of the winter range. For the most part, the habitat looks good. East of Fountain Green where we usually have hundreds of deer wintering, the sagebrush is in such poor condition that those deer migrated further than normal into the Wales area. We have two rides scheduled for this week and one next week which will finish up this project.
- 
- Turkey hunts - We are hearing a lot of success stories from the turkey hunters that we have talked to. We haven't had any complaints from turkey hunters being too crowded. Turkey hunter seem to be happy just getting out after being cooped up all winter.

**Habitat**

- Livestock grazing starts on 10 WMA's this week and next totaling nearly 800 AUMs
- South Sanpete WMA plan update

- Noxious weed spray crews busy

#### Aquatics

- Community Fishing Ponds getting stocked weekly
- Identified stream sections for possible inclusion in the Walk-In-Access Program
- Gillnetting at Deer Creek and Jordanelle this week, we have good trout numbers and good fishing should continue through the year
- Many opportunities to fish streams and lakes throughout Utah despite HB 141

#### Conservation Outreach

- Salem Fishing Event May 11 (1000 disabled kids and 1000 volunteers)
- Expect to see numerous articles pitching fishing opportunities in response to the legislation limiting stream access. The angling public has the false impression that the legislation greatly reduces fishing opportunities in the state.
- June 5 Free Fishing Day, Utah Lake Festival, Wasatch Mtn. State Park Pond, Community Reservoir in Ephraim Canyon

#### Law Enforcement

- Still working on Cedar Mountain poaching case
- Big Hollow Shooting Range project

#### **4) R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters (Action) - Administrative Services Staff**

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

Allan Stevens – If they get one permit for having a disability does that allow them to get the season extension?

Kenny Johnson – If you qualify for one you may not qualify for all. Mobility is the main factor in the season extension.

Matt Clark – You said you issued 310 CORs. Typically how many applicants are there?

Kenny Johnson – We issued 310 in 2009. The applicant numbers have almost doubled the last couple of years. On average we are denying three or four hundred.

Duane Smith – How do we treat nonresidents with disabilities?

Kenny Johnson – They are treated the same as a resident. They can fill out the application and have a doctor verify the impairment.

Duane Smith – Do they still count as a nonresident?

Kenny Johnson – They have to obtain a permit like everyone else first and then apply the COR.

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

Tim Ruffin – I am and advocate and organizer for men and women for hunting and fishing accommodations within Utah. I work with MTM hunting organization and the public at large. I have been working with Kenny. He has been really responsive taking our comments. First and foremost I want to thank the RAC for getting these rules in place in 2005. These hunts give people with disabilities an opportunity to harvest animals that otherwise we would not hunt. I do agree with what Kenny has recommended and all the dates he recommended. I agree that the experimental hunt in November should be disregarded. I am a hunter and am for getting a nice buck but also I am a conservationist and I think that hunt during the rut really could affect deer herds. By moving it after the rifle hunt still allows us to harvest but not harvest too many bucks. On July 31<sup>st</sup> the disability loss center and I put in public comment stating our concern about the definition in subsection two. At the RAC in May of '09 the rule was revised to exclude for instance a cane or a single device. I walk with just a cane and I know several people that do that

still can't walk very far. Having that removed may get rid of some of the hunters. We also recognize there is fraud out there that needs to be looked into. If the DWR decides to keep the definition that specifically talks about the person's assistive device it actually goes against the federal ADA guidelines. We recommend that the rule be change to allow people to apply based on their disability and how it affects them while they are hunting not just saying this hunt is for someone with a walker or wheelchair. It needs to be looked at how Wyoming, Idaho and Colorado do. They say we comply with ADA guidelines and a severe impediment is reviewed. That would be my only change. I really appreciate what DNR is doing as far as making these hunts available for us. It is a really great thing.

Kenny Johnson – We did meet several times with Tim's group and the disability law center in Salt Lake. The definitions themselves are a little bit archaic from when the rule started but the purpose of adding subsection ten is that if somebody gets denied the opportunity to participate they still have recourse if they want to appeal that decision. We did take what they proposed to heart and that was the start of section ten.

Fred Oswald – But it is at the back end rather than the front.

Kenny Johnson – Correct, it was designed as a catch all and this is more in line with what ADA requires.

Fred Oswald – But not necessarily in line with what other states are doing according to Tim?

Kenny Johnson – It is pretty close. They may not be weeding them out on the front end of things. They say tell us how your disability impacts your ability to hunt and they review them case by case. We have some rules that are in place already that help filter that in the front end but if somebody doesn't agree we feel like this covers us and gives us a way to give them more due process.

Fred Oswald – You would disagree if I said you are not in compliance with ADA?

Kenny Johnson – Absolutely. We feel like we are right in line with ADA. Anything mission related for any agency is left up to the agency to decide whether it impacts their bottom line mission or not. We think we are going above and beyond with what we are offering and certainly we think the new subsection 10 addresses all those issues. If someone has something totally unrelated to a crutch or cane or wheelchair or whatever the device is we can still review it and if the impact is great enough we will grant them the COR.

### **RAC Discussion**

Richard Hansen – If a person is able to function with just a cane are they automatically disqualified?

Kenny Johnson – What the rule says is if you have lost the use of one or both lower extremities the device doesn't matter. That is the case with Tim and the reason for the concern.

Richard Hansen – Do you normally deny them a COR if they just have a cane?

Kenny Johnson – It depends on the reason for the cane. The nature of the disability has to be permanent and severely impede their mobility. That is the guy we are trying to help.

### **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Richard Hansen to accept the rule as presented**

**Seconded by Byron Gunderson**

**In Favor: All**

**Motion passed unanimously**

**5) R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment (Action)**

**- Alan Clark, Assistant Director**

### **Questions from the RAC**

Gary Nielson – The waiting period is not included at all?

Alan Clark – No, the idea behind this was not to have the same kind of drawing we conduct. There is no waiting period and no bonus points.

Richard Hansen – How was the five dollar application fee set?

Alan Clark – At that time that was the application fee we had. The idea was to make it affordable for people to be able to participate. Generally people approach this with the idea they are going to spend a certain amount of money to apply.

Richard Hansen – Do they use a random computer process like Fallon?

Alan Clark – It is random but Fallon's is more complicated because of points. This is one chance for one permit.

Richard Hansen – And you pay Fallon over three million dollars.

Alan Clark – We do pay them a lot of money. There are other services they provide.

Matt Clark – Under the definition of wildlife convention it says that you have to have in attendance more than 10,000 individuals. Can that be over a two or three day period?

Alan Clark – Yes. The numbers I showed you were just the people who applied. There are a lot of people who come to the convention who don't apply. The groups are here and you could ask them about attendance numbers.

Byron Gunderson – The sponsoring group gets 10 percent of the permit fee?

Alan Clark – No that would be a conservation permit. The Division gets all of the permit fees. The groups get the application fees but they have to cover all of the expenses related to running the drawing.

Allan Stevens – Basically if they make a million dollars that is their money? Why doesn't the Division want a piece of that money?

Alan Clark – We felt that the benefits of the convention are very positive. First of all we get the permit fees. There is a section at the top of the rule that talks about what we hope to do and there are lots of other benefits that come. The visibility of wildlife in Utah, providing wildlife has changed a lot in the four years the convention has been here. A lot of nonresidents come and see what we have to offer, that is a positive for the state of Utah. We get a lot of intangibles and we didn't feel we need a percentage of the five dollars.

Fred Oswald – As I recall there was some discussion about whether there ought to be some requirement that all of the money the organizations earn ought to stay in Utah on conservation efforts and ultimately that was found that that wouldn't be the case. But I think it can be shown that a considerable amount of the money that is taken in goes back into Utah conservation projects.

Alan Clark – Again that would be a good question to ask the groups when they come up.

Fred Oswald – Under the original rule there were three organizations and the rule required that in order for them to continue through the five years at least one of those three organizations had to be involved. With the new rule is it the same except that it begins with two organizations and at least one of those organizations has to continue to be a sponsor in order for it to continue?

Alan Clark – We don't know how many there would be at this point. There are a lot of conservation groups in Utah and we could have more applicants.

Fred Oswald – I thought one of those three original groups had to participate.

Alan Clark – One of the three that were selected by the board. There will be a new application process and a new selection will be made.

Richard Hansen – So you will determine who will be awarded the convention permits?

Alan Clark – Right. If the board approves the rule we will accept applications in August.

Richard Hansen – What are the criteria that you base your decision on?



Alan Clark – The basic idea is 501c3 conservation groups that make a contribution to Utah. If a conservation groups came in from another part of the country that does not have a tie in Utah would not be selected. It has to be a conservation group that has a history of making a contribution to wildlife in Utah.

Richard Hansen – Do you have any requirement that they use a percentage of the money from the convention toward wildlife conservation?

Alan Clark – In this rule there is not except that part of the application is that they have to show how they have used money to benefit wildlife in Utah. We are saying if you want to get this you have to have been using money in Utah.

Richard Hansen – Do you look at that every year?

Alan Clark – No, just once every five year period when a new group is selected.

Allan Stevens – Are there other states that basically give away permits like this?

Alan Clark – Not that I am aware of.

Allan Stevens – With conservation and convention permits how many permits do we give to conservation organizations and what percentage is that of the total available permits.

Alan Clark – I believe it is a little less than six percent. There are about 343 conservation permits and there are 200 convention permits.

Allan Stevens – But for some of the once-in-a-lifetime hunts, for example sheep hunts, isn't it much higher?

Alan Clark – It is a little high because the guideline we use on conservation permits for big horn sheep is ten percent. Everything else it can't be over five but it also can't be over eight total permits.

Allan Stevens – What is the percentage of OIAL permits that are given to conservation organizations?

Alan Clark – I am not sure I have that information here. I could get that to you. In my mind I see the convention permits, the drawing, different than the high bid conservation permits. For the convention permits anyone who wants to drive to Salt Lake can apply for. You don't have to pay admission for the convention. You can apply in the lobby and leave. We didn't want to make people have to go in to apply. The guideline we use on conservation permits for OIAL is ten percent.

John Bair – To clarify, I had to pay 508 dollars for my sheep tag. The state is not giving these permits away. I won the permit in the draw but you still have to pay for it. I think there is still some confusion with the conservation permits and convention permit. Conservation permits are sold at auction, convention permits are done in a draw. It is very different.

### **Questions from the Public**

Dave Rogers – Are out of state organizations allowed to partner with an in state organization?

Alan Clark – They can partner but the strength of their application is going to be judged by what they have contributed in Utah. For example Whitetails Unlimited has not contributed much to Utah so that group wouldn't add much to their application. The lead group does need to be a group that is contributing in Utah.

### **Comments from the Public**

Eric Tycksen – Thank you for allowing me to come speak to the RAC. I am the chief operating officer for the mule deer foundation. I am here tonight as a partner of the Western Hunting Conservation Expo, an outdoorsman and a fellow hunter. You are being asked to authorize the convention tags for another five year time period. I urge you to approve the Division's recommendation. MDF and SFW as current partners and our former partner, the wild sheep foundation have made the WHC one of the premier hunting shows in the west. In our four short years of holding the Western Hunting Conservation Expo we have proven a lot of doubters

wrong. We were told in the beginning we would not be successful holding the national convention here in Salt Lake City. Most wildlife conservation groups hold their conventions in Reno or Las Vegas. We have found that the partnership we have developed with our sponsors in the State of Utah all agree that Salt Lake City is the place for our exhibitors, corporate sponsors and our attendees. In 2010 the WHCE attracted over 25,000 people to the show over the course of a four day period. We have created a national buzz with the sale of the state tags from Arizona, Nevada, Colorado and Utah. The statewide deer tag was sold for 260,000 dollars. There is a unique partnership that exists between the WCHE and the Division of Wildlife Resources. The 200 tag drawing is a tremendous value. No other state has stepped up like the State of Utah and the Division of Wildlife Resources to help bring this world class show to Salt Lake City. The renewal of these 200 tags will help ensure that the Western Hunting show stays in Salt Lake City for the next five years. The economic impact to the state is tremendous. We bring hundreds of nonresidents to the state. Most of our exhibitors are from out of state. According to the State of Utah and the Berber report the expo has generated eight to ten million dollars impact to the state. The money raised from the 200 tags helps offset the cost of holding the expo. As Alan mentioned we have to pay for the show, the administration of the drawing and all of the set up, design, all the equipment, computers and everything it takes to put the show on. The partnership that exists between MDF and SFW and the Division of Wildlife is a good one. MDF sales 800 to 900,000 dollars in Utah conservation permits, not convention permits, of which 90 percent of that is returned to the State of Utah on projects in the Utah. MDF spends thousands of dollars each year in MDF money raised from other areas of the country on projects that are not funded by or through the watershed initiative here in the State of Utah. Another was MDF contributes to habitat and saves the Division money is through the use of our member volunteers helping on habitat projects and deer feeding. MDF members mobilized in the winter of 2008 to help feed deer in northern Utah. We did not use conservation money for that. We have many example of how MDF partners and contributes to help mule deer and all wildlife in the state. We are proud of the contribution and partnership with the State of Utah and the Division of Wildlife and ask that you approve the DWR's recommendation to renew the convention permits for another five years. Thanks.

Don Peay – SFW – A lot of the other western states and seeing a decrease for hunting licenses. Utah is seeing an increase. There are a couple of reasons for that. Number one; there is no other state that has a stronger partnership between the private sportsman groups and the state agency. We have addressed a lot of problems that other states haven't. We do have a great product in this state. The convention is unique and a lot of other states wish they had it. 20 years ago people didn't think of coming to Utah and now if you go out of state to hunt they say they want to come to Utah to hunt. It is s marketing thing nationwide. The expo gets marketed internationally. The number of applications for Utah's tags is up significantly. This creates a lot of jobs and economic activity for the state. I believe 2,000 big horn sheep died this year in the western United States. That is a lot. In Utah we had one small die off. John could tell you what we do to make sure that doesn't happen in Utah. Other states don't have a strong partnership and money to solve problems. Other places have seen reduction in moose populations and Utah's moose seem to be on the increase. I don't think there is any other state that has seen the growth of mountain goats Utah has. Fred thanks for bringing up the bison transplant. A lot of hours went in to that to make it happen. The expo is good for wildlife, for the economy and the state. There have been no negative public comments at the RAC meetings. The sportsmen look forward to it every year. It is family oriented and has brought money, national prestige and the spotlight to Utah. Thank you.

### **RAC Discussion**

John Bair – I have had a lot to do with the convention. To the see the way it has progressed every year is amazing. I remember the first year we got the director up on stage and presented him with a big check. We actually pledged the money back to the state before they even had it counted. I

can speak from experience, the thing that is neat about the expo and these permits is that in Utah once you have drawn a OIAL permit you are done. I drew a goat permit years ago and now I can put in for goat. I have been putting in for big horn sheep and have four points. I never thought I would hunt rockies and this year I drew a rocky tag. I have drawn two tags and know people who have drawn. It is a good opportunity to put in for stuff that normally you wouldn't be able to put in for. It is a neat thing. It is neat to see all the people who come there excited to draw. It is completely random. No one that has been putting in for longer than you has any more advantage. That is the exciting thing. We have had Wayne Laufier from the NRA there. We have had the governor and the mayor of Salt Lake and all kinds of international spokespeople and conservation activists there. The group of people it has drawn to the state is amazing. I stood in a ring with the governor, the head of the NRA, Rod Tech from National Wild Turkey Federation and a bunch of guys you never thought you could meet and they were all here. Larry Potterfield from Midway USA was here. It is an amazing group of people and they are all excited about what is going on. This state is doing some things right with the permits and getting everyone involved in the state.

## **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Duane Smith to approve the rule as presented**

**Seconded by Matt Clark**

Allan Stevens – I have a problem with the OIAL convention permits. Wildlife is owned by the citizens of the State of Utah. On some sheep hunts the public loses about 25 percent of their opportunity to draw a sheep tag due to the convention and conservation permits. Large percentages of the OIAL tags the public doesn't really have opportunity to draw unless they can drive to Salt Lake and spend extra money. I really strongly oppose the convention permits.

Doug Jones – A lot of the money does come back to the state. As District Ranger in Spanish Fork my district has received over 700,000 dollars to do projects on the ground that we would have the money or funding to do. There is a benefit. I am most appreciative of that. That has been from many different conservation groups.

Allan Stevens – I am not saying that I am opposed to conservation groups and them spending money in Utah. The question I always have is how much is enough? Is it 25, 50 or 75 percent? If we are going to do this I think it should be based on a percentage. Maybe that means that no sheep tags are available at the convention. It should be on a percentage rather than a set number of tags. With a turkey or bear or and elk tag there is a lot more opportunity for the public out there. This takes away the average person's opportunity to draw a OIAL tag. Over 25 percent of the tags are gone. I am not saying anything bad about the conservation groups. I have a problem with a set number of tags being offered.

Richard Hansen – I can see what you are saying but if you look at the money that is put back on the ground because of all this and the tags that are offered. I think we have more animals and more opportunity for those OIAL than we ever would if we didn't have these permits. To my I feel like it is worth that price. I think we actually have more opportunity because of it and not less.

**In Favor: Micki Bailey, Matt Clark, Duane Smith, Byron Gunderson, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson, Doug Jones**

**Opposed: Allan Stevens**

**Abstention: John Bair – because of involvement with conservation groups**

**Motion passed 7 to 1 with 1 abstention**

**6) R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment (Action)**

- Alan Clark, Assistant Director

### **Questions from the RAC**

Richard Hansen – So both the Wildlife Board and parks have to approve this?

Alan Clark – Yes, actually the Wildlife Board twice.

Richard Hansen – What if they approve the conservation permit but not a public permit?

Alan Clark – They could say that. If you remember that the intent language said it would include both. The parks board is a policy board and they can rule in the same way the Wildlife Board is a policy board and they can do that but it might be perilous for them based on what the intent language says.

Richard Hansen – Would the public permit be in the regular drawing and bonus points are used?

Alan Clark – Yes.

Fred Oswald – Since this is just a one year deal there would be no points involved.

Alan Clark – There would. You would use your points for that species, deer or bison.

Byron Gunderson – Is the intent of the legislature to supplement the state park by raising money.

Alan Clark – Yes that is clearly the intent.

Byron Gunderson – Let's say Yellowstone closes one week early and opens hunting for bison, elk and deer. You could easily supply the financial needs for Yellowstone Park. Why don't we do that? Because people think there should be some sanctuary places where animals are safe and people can go and look at animals. I realize that the remaining deer and sheep would not be traumatized and life would go the same after the hunt is over. I have talked to a lot of 'at large' people and I think over 90 percent are outraged at the idea of having a hunt on antelope island. I think if we marketed a tax increase as would you rather have a quarter added to your taxes or have deer and sheep killed on antelope island you would probably have no problem getting a tax increase.

### **Comments from the Public**

Don Peay – I wanted to clarify that SFW nor I played any role in seeing this through. I watched the legislature cut a billion dollars out of state funds this year and I just saw a headline that said they are looking to cut 100 million more. If people want to raise a couple hundred thousand dollars there are other ways to do it but they need to do it.

Dave Rogers – Mr. Gunderson, I think you would be surprised how many people would rather see deer and a bison hunted than have a tax increase. There will be some that will be opposed but you will also see a significant portion of the population that would rather keep their money and let people pay for that privilege.

Byron Gunderson – I think it would depend how you market the tax more than anything.

### **RAC Discussion**

Richard Hansen – How do they manage the animals now?

Alan Clark – We use sheep from antelope island for transplants but we do not take mature rams. That is why they were put there initially. There are a lot of older rams there now that will just die of old age. There is nothing wrong with that. The mule deer occur in low numbers and there is no hunting unless they wander off the island.

Richard Hansen – Are they are overpopulated?

Alan Clark – No. If it were overpopulated you wouldn't just hunt bucks you would hunt does. They are not overpopulated.

Richard Hansen – Is that because of predators?

Alan Clark – Probably because of the low numbers that are there. Even lower density than on the Henry Mountains.

John Bair – Years ago we had meetings about this and people who oppose hunting came out and the parks board opted out of it and I think capitalism are kicking in. It doesn't do any good to transplant the rams. It is a shame to see that resource that could offer so much money and help to the park go unused. Hunting has traditionally been done on island before it was a state park. This makes good business sense. It is foolish not to do it. It doesn't hurt the herd, why not let someone fund the park and let someone draw one permit. If we want to get into the ethics of this that and the other we might as well sit here and talk religion all day. No one is ever going to agree on it. I think business wise it is a no brainer.

Duane Smith – I agree with the economics and business. I would like to see it done different. I don't think points and waiting periods should apply. This would be a special hunt and everyone should have an equal opportunity to apply.

John Bair – If we wanted to address that would we do that now or when it comes back to the RAC?

Alan Clark – That would be the next round. Right now you are voting on how the permits that are offered would be done. That is all that is in the round in November because we don't know seasons or any of those things. That will be handled later assuming both boards move ahead.

Duane Smith – I just wanted to bring it up and get the idea out there.

Richard Hansen – If you did that then it is just like the sportsman permit. Essentially you would have two sportsman permits for deer and sheep.

Alan Clark – And if we did it that we would probably draw it with the sportsman permit. I do know that you don't want to let people build points for something and then take the hunt away. We saw that with the muzzleloader elk hunt.

## **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the amendments and house keeping items  
Seconded by John Bair**

Fred Oswald – Speaking as a non-consumptive rep on the RAC I can see both sides to the question. It makes some economic sense but if I were on the parks board and had responsibility for antelope island I am not sure it made economic sense because the legislature would start to see my budget every year as that deer permit or permits and I am not sure that is a good way to do business in terms of the budgetary process. I would be concerned about the foot in the door. This is one permit that could turn into two then three and where does it stop? I would have to disagree with my friend and college John. I don't see anything wrong with a wildlife sanctuary in the state where wildlife is actually allowed to die of old age.

**In Favor: Allan Stevens, Micki Bailey, Matt Clark, John Bair, Duane Smith,  
Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson, Doug Jones**

**Opposed: Byron Gunderson**

**Motion passed 8 to 1**

- 7) **R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment (Action)**  
- **Judi Tutorow, Licensing Coordinator**

## **Questions from the RAC**

John Bair – Can we have a draw for more lifetime licenses because I was young and I feel I was discriminated against because of my age and I don't think that is fair.

## **VOTING**

**Motion was made by Micki Bailey to accept the rule as presented**  
**Seconded by John Bair**  
**In Favor: All**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

- 8) **R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment (Action)**  
- **Judi Tutorow, Licensing Coordinator**

**Questions from the RAC**

John Bair – If someone decides they don't have time to hunt can they turn the permit in and get their points back?

Judi Tutorow – Right now you can turn in a permit before the hunt starts and get points back unless you are in group. If you are in a group the whole group has to surrender. The refund would only be given if you surrender the permit 30 days prior to the hunt, for any reason.

**RAC Discussion**

John Bair – I think that is the right thing to do.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by John Bair to accept the rule as presented**  
**Seconded by Gary Nielson**  
**In Favor: All**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

- 9) **R567-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment (Action)**  
- **Evan Freeman, Central Region AIS Program Manager**

**Questions from the RAC**

Fred Oswald – Can you tell us if we are winning or losing?

Evan Freeman – In Utah we are winning. In other states they are losing.

Richard Hansen – Is there any way to treat and get rid of them?

Evan Freeman – Officially yes but the cost would be astronomical. They are working on some bacteria and other chemicals but they are three to four years out.

**VOTING**

**Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the rule amendments as presented**  
**Seconded by Gary Nielson**  
**In Favor: All**  
**Motion passed unanimously**

- 10) **Aquatic Information Presentation (Information)**  
- **Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Manager**

John Bair – I was slightly offended by the kid wearing a Jeff Gordon hat in one of the pictures in your presentation.

- 11) **Other Business**  
- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

Fred Oswald – This is Micki Bailey's last meeting. She will be moving out of state. We will miss you Micki and thank you for your good work on the RAC. We wish you well in your new position.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.**

**30 in attendance**

**Next board meeting June 10 at the DNR Boardroom, Salt Lake**

**Next RAC meeting August 3 at Springville Civic Center 110 S Main St, Springville**

**Northern Regional Advisory Council**

**May 19, 2010,**

**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  
Ann Neville- Noncon.  
Brad Slater- Chair  
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman  
John Wall- At Large

**DWR Present**

Jodie Anderson  
Ron Hodson  
Randy Wood  
Greg Sheehan  
Kenny Johnson  
Darren Johnson  
Mitch Lane  
Paul Thompson  
Candace Hutchinson  
Ben Nadolski  
Drew Cushing  
Walt Donaldson

**Wildlife Board**

Ernie Perkins

**RAC Excused Absence**

Shawn Groll- At Large

**RAC Absent**

Michael Gates-BLM  
Bret Selman- Agric

**Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.**

**Number of Pages: 15**

**Introduction:** Brad Slater-chair

**Agenda:**

Review of Agenda

Review of March April 27, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Wildlife Board Meeting Update

Regional Update

R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters

R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment

R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment

R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment

R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment

R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment

Aquatic Informational Presentation

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

**Motion-**

**Second-**

**Motion Carries:**

**Item 2. Review and Acceptance of April 27, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

**Motion:** Gaskill- Make a correction to the minutes regarding email received. Statement should say "he was not here". Approve the minutes as corrected.

Byrnes- Antlerless 6 CWMU permit recommendations. Should say recused and not recued.

**Second:** Neville

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

**Item 3. Wildlife Board Update**

Information sent in an email.

**Item 4. Regional Update**

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Personnel Changes:

New C.O. in Rich County. Jade Sumsion.

Clint Brunson- Has chosen to go back to the walk in access position. Held interviews for summit county biologist position.

Craig Schaugaard is on career mobility to Salt Lake. Paul Thompson is on career mobility as Regional Aquatic manager.

Goose banding project in June. June 7-13 will be trapping Urban Geese.



## **Item 5. R657-12 Hunting and Fishing Accommodations for Disabled Hunters**

Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Gaskill- For what reason would someone be denied?

Johnson- In the rule, there are requirements for each different type of certificate. They get an application specific to the accommodation they are looking for and with the help of their doctor, they determine on their own whether or not they qualify. It is based on that application and the expertise of the doctor. It has to be permanent disability not temporary.

Gaskill- Who would make the denial?

Johnson- Based on the application information; our counters would break the bad news to them if they did not qualify. There is also an appeals process for review.

Van Tassell- General rifle deer hunt has been reduced in the north to a 5 day hunt; will there be no extension for disability?

Johnson- Correct, on those specific shortened units.

Gaskill- Your initial slide said that it was not designed to give them superior opportunity but they seem to be doing quite a bit better than the average hunter.

Johnson- The superior opportunity came in more because of those late dates in November. They were 60% success; the other two were kind of on par so we were ok giving them that extra opportunity. The closer you get to the rut, the more of a concern there is that those success rates are not fair.

Gaskill- I am not terribly concerned, I just wanted clarification.

Johnson- We think that will level the playing field a little bit.

### **Motion**

**Motion-** Cowley- Move to accept as presented.

**Second-** Gaskill

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

## **Item 6. R657-55 Wildlife Convention Permit Rule Amendment**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services

See Handout

Byron Bateman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Economic impact of 4 day expo is close to 10 million dollars. This show is recognized as the premier event in the sporting and hunting industry in the U.S. Appreciate the opportunity to represent and show what Utah can offer.

Eric Tycksen- Mule Deer Foundation- Urge you to approve Divisions recommendations to renew convention permits for another 5 years. Convention has been a success in Utah. Bring non-residents to the state and exhibitors from out-of-state or out of the country.

## **RAC Question**

Gaskill- Could you explain R657-55 number 8?

Sheehan- This rule had a couple of modifications that were emailed out to you. The original packet that was mailed out has changed. The rule we are presenting is not what you just referred to.

Gaskill- Can you explain how that is not a lottery?

Sheehan- This is not talking about the way the permits are issued. This is addressing supplemental items that might go along with applying for the draw. It is saying that these permits must be issued in a legal way that meets local jurisdiction requirement.

Gaskill- How is it not a lottery?

Sheehan- These permits are issued similar to the way we issue our permits here in the state. If you view the other 5,000 permits that we issue through our draw a lottery then you could consider all 5,200 permits as part of a lottery.

Gaskill- I am not saying I consider them a lottery, I am just wondering the rationale? How would you defend that if there were a lawsuit for example?

Sheehan- Because our position for these permits is that these people are winning opportunity to purchase a license and a license is not considered real property in the State of Utah. Real property has got to be something that is tangible and transferrable. Our permits are not transferrable to other individuals. We are licensing someone to participate in an activity.

Gaskill- Thank you.

Neville- How is the money transferred and used?

Sheehan- Which part are you looking at?

Neville- Last page, last line. Where in this particular rule does it say how the money will be allocated and used?

Sheehan- It does not say that anywhere in the rule.

Neville- Is there another reference to that anywhere?

Sheehan- No. The groups, as part of their application, need to come in and demonstrate their commitment and past experience with spending dollars that they earn on wildlife in Utah.

Neville- Would that be part of the contract?

Sheehan- It would be part of their presentation that the wildlife board would adopt when they accepted that. Whoever applies has to convince the board that they are doing good things for wildlife. Both groups could give you a detailed listing of how they use some of that money.

Tycksen- The money we raise at conventions like this are good for the organization and helps fund projects as well as attract and maintain volunteers. Over 6,000 hours of volunteers working on habitat projects in Utah.

Neville- Do you have any success criteria for any of your projects?

Tycksen- Success criteria?

Neville- Do you do monitoring?

Tycksen- Neither of our groups do projects unless we have the cooperation from the Division of Wildlife.

Neville- I don't even know if the division has success criteria for those particular projects.

Tycksen- I don't know the answer to that question.

Neville- You have a lot of ways you are spending money and have some great projects. Do we know how successful they are?

Tycksen- I cannot give you a quantitative. Our success cannot be quantitative but our success rate is high as far as what we set out to do.

Neville- Do you have any plans of doing that?

Tycksen- You tell me how to do it or help me figure out how to do it and we can.

Neville- I'm sure the division has many methods.

Sheehan- Maybe Randy or Ron can respond to that.

Neville- Whenever I do a project for my job, I have to have success criteria.

Hodson- We do monitoring on many of these habitat projects with our range crew. They do pre-treatment and post-treatment monitoring.

Neville- You do some?

Hodson- It is mostly vegetative monitoring to find out how the vegetative community is responding to the projects. We also do some monitoring to see how big game and sensitive species will respond to the project. We do not do that with every project. So, there is monitoring going on.

Cavitt- How much does it cost to put on this convention vs. revenue?

Tycksen- It costs a little over 4 million to put the show on in Salt Lake City. Revenue from the tags is \$800,000-\$850,000. We hold other events during the show to offset that. It is just a great show to bring to Salt Lake. Both groups sell conservation tags at the convention.

Cowley- Why the change in audit requirements?

Sheehan- We had some comments from the public saying they want to see this audit every year. It provided some good information and insight to how this happens.

Leonard- Paragraph 8 under 55-5 had been revised and eliminated. How many other changes are there?

Sheehan- That is the only change in this rule.

## **RAC Comment**

Gaskill- Under 57-7 paragraph 7, the first word should be "if" not "in". Under paragraph 3, will they also send an email?

Sheehan- Sometimes we do not have that information.

Gaskill- I am not mandating it, I am just saying it is an option.

Slater- By adding and/or email?

Gaskill- Yes.

Slater- Is that a motion?

Gaskill- No, just a suggestion.

Sheehan- We will take a look and that and get that fixed. There is also one in the disabled rule that we are making a change to.

Gaskill- Will the RAC have any input in choosing a successful applicant.

Sheehan- That will not go through the RAC process.

Gaskill- I would be very interested in the results.

Neville- Would the applications be public?

Sheehan- I think they probably would be after the conclusion.

## **Motion**

**Motion-** Leonard- Accept the proposal as presented by the Division including typo correction R657-55-7 line 7 “if” and notification by email.

**Second-** Van Tassell

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

## **Item 7. R657-41 Conservation and Sportsman Permits Rule Amendment**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services

See Handout

## **RAC Questions**

Cavitt- What kind of specifics would be associated with the hunt. My concern is that there may be situations where the public will not want to see a hunt going on. How could that be managed so that it is not a visible thing?

Sheehan- Those are some of the season issues that would be presented. We would recommend that the hunt time frame happen late in the calendar year, in December.

Cavitt- Would they generally close an area of the island for that?

Sheehan- I don't think they would necessarily close the island but park rangers would work closely with the hunters to try and avoid any conflict situations.

Byrnes- The intent language does not say that they have to expend the funds on wildlife but you said that it would be expended on wildlife programs. Is that correct?

Sheehan- If I said that, I probably said it wrong. Those funds go to the state park to use as they needed.

Byrnes- The intent language also says up to the amount of \$200,000 dollars would be transferred. Why would you transfer 90% of the funds raised?

Sheehan- It says up to the amount to be used at Antelope Island State Park. It gives them a higher authority to spend money at the state park but we could transfer them as much money as those permits generated and that is what we are proposing in the rule.

Byrnes- I am curious why you would transfer more than they had said you would transfer.

Sheehan- This has been a pretty sensitive subject. This language is heavily debated by the house and the senate on the last day of the legislative session. Ultimately, this is what they came up with.

Byrnes- Clarify the issue with the bison. The bison on the island are livestock, correct?

Sheehan- They are privately owned by parks and recreation.

Gaskill- Why not keep some for the division? The division has the mandate for managing wildlife so I don't understand why we do not use that excess money to manage.

Sheehan- One thing that I will say is that parks have been very cooperative. They have allowed us to transplant those sheep a number of years ago onto the island. I think this was largely so the legislature has a way to use a renewable resource and help parks and recreation out of a difficult financial situation.

Gaskill- Are we going to get a request from UDOT next year and a request from social services the next year to sell some of our deer and elk and give them money? I am just concerned about the whole precedence of it.

Sheehan- It is a partnership that we are trying to work closely with and I think there is benefit for wildlife of the state if this happens and there are benefits for the parks. There are a lot of habitat projects they could do to help deer population.

Gaskill- Should some language to that effect be in this agreement that perhaps mandates at least a portion of this money towards habitat?

Sheehan- I think that would be a valid discussion item as we enter into an agreement with them. I think that is probably a direction that they are already comfortable with. I cannot speak for them.

Cowley- Do all of the funds raised stay on the island?

Sheehan- It says to be used on Antelope Island State Park. I think they would be used at the park.

Cowley- I read it as up to \$200,000 dollars, almost as if anything could be shifted somewhere else.

Sheehan- Yes, possibly. They did not really involve us when they did this.

Slater- If I understand correctly, for instance, you said up to \$200,000 but if the permit process gathered \$225,000 in revenue the maximum that could be spent in that appropriation would be \$200,000. Does the other \$25,000 go to a restricted account?

Sheehan- The parks have some restricted accounts just like wildlife does.

Slater- So it becomes like a non-lapsing fund?

Sheehan- It is an account that they can draw from. They may need to ask for permission. They earn interest on those accounts.

Neville- Do you have any idea what the Antelope Island annual budget is?

Sheehan- I don't.

Neville- Does anyone? I am just trying to figure out if \$200,000 dollars is a drop in the bucket.

Mary Tullius- Director Utah State Parks- The budget this year is about \$800,000 dollars but that is not just for the island. That is for all of the off park responsibilities including boating and other programs we do off the park. In response to the \$200,000, we feel strongly that should remain on the island to go for habitat development. We don't want that to go into salaries or park operations. There are so many things that need to be done on the island for habitat development.

Ferry- How many bison tags are issued?

Sheehan- I think we are doing six per year.

Ferry- If this program is successful with the sheep, is the intent to expand it as well?

Sheehan- That is really the parks decision to make because they own those.

Ferry- Are the sheep and deer considered livestock like the bison?

Sheehan- No.

Leonard- Can those funds be used to obtain matching federal dollars?

Tullius- That is true.

Leonard- Do you foresee that hunting could be used as a management tool out there to control wildlife numbers in the future?

Tullius- At their meeting in February, the board adopted a wildlife management plan for the bighorn sheep and that was sort of their effort to come to a decision about what to do with the wildlife on the island. In the past, the board has taken the position that hunting would be used as a last resort. The board made the decision that hunting would be a tool along with other tools.

Leonard- Could you address the issue of separating the public or keeping the hunting to a minimal public observation.

Tullius- We feel that the island could be open during a slower time of year. It would depend on what kind of media interest is out there.

Leonard- Do you anticipate any interference from anti-hunting groups.

Tullius- Very possibly. We are going to look at all of those scenarios so that we are prepared.

Neville- How many deer are on the island?

Tullius- I think there is about 300-350. There is about 100 bighorn sheep.

Leonard- We ought to get some wild turkeys for watchable wildlife.

Tullius- One step at a time.

### **Public Comment**

Barbara Riddle- President/CEO Davis County Area Convention and Visitors Bureau- Feel an experimental hunt on Antelope Island is devastating. Public has come out against hunting. Legislature and removal of intent language on bill.

Byron Bateman- President of Sportsman for Wildlife, Representing Mule Deer Foundation- Antelope Island was a working ranch before the state acquired it. Hunting has always been part of the heritage and history. We are going to make the park a better place. There is a lot of habitat that can be done. Follow the legislature's intent to conduct this hunt as it has been presented tonight.

### **RAC Comment**

Neville- The precedent of hunting in areas that have been closed, they are state lands. Would that start a precedent and would it be a good or bad one?

Cavitt- I don't necessarily view this as an anti-hunting issue. There is a reason why the Weber and Davis county Chamber of Commerce are opposed to it and I think it is a business issue. There are many people who are in favor of hunting in this state but it is a business aspect that people are opposed to on Antelope Island.

Byrnes- I think this is the third time this has come up and it has been defeated every time previously. This time, we have it in an appropriations bill. I know my legislator and many from Davis County got it removed and it was put back in. It sets a very bad precedent to allow the money derived from tags to be used in another department's budget even if it is for wildlife. Hunting four animals a year on the island is not a management tool. We are not even following our established procedures as far as having conservation groups bid on a tag to get the most money we can. The intent language does not say there has to be a hunt. Our role is to take public input and weight social issues. I am opposed.

Lawrence- I look at it from a habitat perspective and I think it is a win/win for habitat. It has been brought up that the island is full of weeds and the biologists out there have plans to do quite a bit of work to improve that. If the money is spent on habitat projects, all wildlife habitat will improve. If wildlife populations increase and improve in diversity, that will attract more visitors to the island. There will be incentive for the island to take better care of the habitat and for conservations groups to bid on the projects.

Ferry- I look at this from a business perspective as well and the opportunity to increase the park's budget by 25% with minimal impact. I do not want to see open season but I think minimal impact with maximum benefit would be good for the park.

Neville- Money made by the Mule Deer Foundation and Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. Are they excluded from doing a project on Antelope Island or have they just not done one?

Sheehan- The money that the groups raise from the conservation permits that the groups auction off has to be spent in accordance with the division's approval on any project. I do not think we are precluded from doing projects on Antelope Island. It is certainly a possibility.

Neville- So we don't necessarily have to have the hunt to get any habitat improvement done on it from other tags that are sold?

Sheehan- I won't say that.

Byrnes- Is it correct that conservation permit funds were used for transplanting sheep?

Sheehan- Yes.

Byrnes- So you did use funds from conservation permits to transplant sheep off of the island.

Sheehan- Right. That was probably more along the lines of introducing or supplementing a herd rather than a habitat project.

Gaskill- The conservation group can keep 10% of the funds from these proposed bighorn and deer.

Sheehan- That is correct.

Gaskill- They are free to use that 10% however they want correct?

Sheehan- Yes.

Gaskill- That does not come under the other rule that says 90% goes to wildlife and 10% goes to them. We are talking different procedure but the same numbers. Do the same rules apply? In other words, they can use the 10% from a conservation tag for their administration of their organization.

Sheehan- They can with this money as well.

Gaskill- But they would not be required to do anything else with it. It is their money to do with it as they will correct?

Sheehan- Yes, it is their fee for finding someone who will pay \$260,000 for a deer tag because I do not think we could do it on our own.

Gaskill- If you were to get \$200,000 dollars total, they would get \$20,000 which they could do with whatever they want. They are not obligated to do anything habitat wise.

Sheehan- No.

Gaskill- Thank you.

Cavitt- I grew up in Illinois and one of the things the state legislature did was sold us, a number of years ago, on a state lottery. They claim that all the revenue from the state lottery was going to education. Of course what happens after the first year or so, they see the money going there and they start cutting the state funding to education. I see this as a step in that same direction.

If we want to do habitat restoration, we should step up and do habitat restoration on the island.

Cowley- What is the consequence to the division should the RAC's recommend against this?

Sheehan- We are probably in a little different situation with this entire rule you are considering tonight. If this passes, all we are doing is creating a rule that provides a mechanism to issue and sell those permits that are for the island. If this rule did not pass this RAC and did not pass the wildlife board, we would not have a mechanism in place to do that. The legislature put this on State Parks and Recreation to decide if a hunt is appropriate.

Gaskill- I think it is an unfair question to ask him to predict the Utah State legislature.

Slater- Whether this rule passes or not, there will still be issues and discussions on hunting or not hunting as a management tool. If the rule passes, it will still require authorization by the parks board and the wildlife board to allow hunting, is that correct?

Sheehan- Yes. If this rule is adopted that we are presenting, the parks board needs to approve a hunt on the island. We would then need to come up with a cooperative agreement and then worry about season dates later.

Tullius- You are correct, the parks board still needs to make the decision about allowing hunting or not allowing hunting. At the last board meeting a couple of weeks ago, they listened to information about intent language. They did not take any action on it and want to consider this a little bit more. It is a difficult decision for the State Parks Board.

Slater- If this rule passes and let's say that the board is now faced with that, you do recognize that hunting could be an option although a last resort. The primary mission of a park is to provide a habitat, nursery stock or brood stock.

Tullius- We realize that.

Slater- There are maybe other methods or other means of managing the wildlife on Antelope Island.

Leonard- I spend a lot of time in Jackson, WY and witnessing the hunts that take place, it does not seem to be hurting tourism or business in those communities. In fact, it is a draw during slow times and helps habitat.

Lawrence- I do agree with Dr. Cavitt that we should be spending money on habitat on Antelope Island. To get projects funded, it takes partner dollars. Parks and recreation does not have the money to put into habitat work. State money that comes from the legislature can be applied to all projects across the board but state lands get the bottom of the bucket.

Conservation groups help put money into those projects. The habitat on Antelope Island is in poor condition and something needs to be done.

Ferry- It seems the biggest concern is the impact this will have on tourism. I am wondering if there has been a negative impact from the bison hunt?

Tullius- That is a hard question to answer because we have nothing to compare that with. We have had that hunt for 20 years.

Ferry- Do you get a lot of negative comments on that hunt?

Tullius- I would say we get a fair amount of comments.

Ferry- Do people say they are not coming to the park because they hunt bison?

Tullius- No, because we try and warn people. We put out a news release that there will be hunting on the island at certain times.

Ferry- I am wondering if the impact outweighs.

Tullius- I don't know that we really have any data to go on.

## **Motion**

**Motion-Byrnes-** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-41 as presented excluding all language referencing the Antelope Island Conservation Permit provision.

**Second-Neville**



## **Discussion on the Motion**

Leonard- Was this just going to be an attempt to partition that and come back to the Antelope Island or to pass.

Byrnes- I would just like to get done with the rule completely. My intent would be to complete our business on the rule by accepting everything except the Antelope Island wording.

Slater- Then we could come back and visit that as a separate motion?

Byrnes- I would rather just be done with it.

Slater- I understand.

**Motion-** Leonard- Make a substitute motion to approve R657-41 to consider Antelope Island Conservation Permit provisions separately.

Cowley- He wants to partition this so that both issues can be voted and addressed if needed.

Leonard- Correct.

Byrnes- Your substitute motion that you want to make is that you would act on these special Antelope Island conservation provisions separately from the previous motion.

Leonard- Right.

**Second-** Lawrence

Gaskill- I think it is a redundant motion.

Byrnes- He wants to have a vote though.

Slater- The chair will rule that the substitute motion is on the floor right now and then we will come back to the original motion.

Cowley- I am struggling with what you are saying. My understanding is that it leaves both topics to be voted on. It does not necessarily vote on one or the other.

Lawrence- We vote on the entire rule minus 41-12 and then come back and vote on 41-12.

Neville- It might just be easier to vote on the first motion, strike the second motion and then possibly go for another motion.

Slater- We have to handle Jon's motion.

**Motion Passes-** For: 6 Against: 4

Restate Motion - Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-41 as presented excluding all language referencing the Antelope Island Conservation Permit provision.

**Motion Fails-** For: 4 Against: 6

Ferry- I think we need to discuss the rule without the exclusion. The only thing that has passed is the Antelope Island; the rest of the rule has not passed.

Slater- No. We are back to trying to sort through a recommendation.

**Motion**

**Motion-** Gaskill- Accept the portion of the proposal that does not deal with Antelope Island.

**Second-** Neville

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

**Motion-** Ferry- Accept the Antelope Special Antelope Island Conservation Permit Provisions

**Second-** Wall

**Motion Passes-** For: 6 Against: 5

**Item 8. R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing License Rule Amendment**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services

See Handout

**RAC Questions**

Gaskill- How will the lifetime license holders, particularly the ones out of state, be notified of these changes?

Sheehan- If you are a lifetime license holder, you get mailed the same thing every year. Right now, they get it automatically unless they tell us otherwise.

Gaskill- So this is all done by mail not online?

Sheehan- They do. The mailing is only a postcard reminder that says it is time to go do this.

Van Tassell- How do you know if the person is alive or not?

Sheehan- We have that problem with the lifetime license holders. A lot of times family will call and tell us to quit mailing things. Also, we get return mail and terminate that.

Wall- How many lifetime licenses were sold?

Sheehan- I believe around 4,700 and we still have about 4,300-4,400 active. Last year we issued about 3,900 deer permits.

**Motion**

**Motion-** Byrnes- Recommend approval R657-17 Lifetime Hunting and Fishing Rule Amendment.

**Second-** Cowley

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

**Item 9. R657-42 Refund Rule Amendment**

Greg Sheehan, Administrative Services

See Handout

**RAC Questions**

Gaskill- Who makes that decision on which of those options and what are the guidelines for those?

Sheehan- The first thing we always try and do is re-issue something to an alternate. On general season permits, if something is surrendered we add that to next year's quota.

Gaskill- I wouldn't think you would want to be in the business of offering one region a deer tag over the counter either.

Sheehan- No. General season we would just add to the next year's quota.

Gaskill- So that is just an administrative decision.

Sheehan- Well, in that order. We kind of do that now. All it does is give us a couple more options. Normally, we always have alternates on our permits. We finally ran into a case where we did not and we did not know what to do.

Van Tassell- If somebody surrenders a limited entry or once in a lifetime, what happens to their points?

Sheehan- They get their points back. Any hunter can come in an surrender that permit up to the beginning of the hunt. You will not get your money back but you will get your points back. If they give us at least 30 days or longer so we know we can get it resold in that last month or so, we will give them their money back.

Byrnes- When you talk about a general season tag and putting into the following year's quota and that is in the accepted payment of fees section right?

Sheehan- It is under that rule, yes. Where are you looking exactly?

Byrnes- On R657-42-8, accepted payment of fees, line 12.

Sheehan- Section 8, line 12?

Byrnes- Yes, are you only talking about tags that have been returned?

Sheehan- Yes. When it talks about reissuing those for nonpayment.

Byrnes- Then it says "or remains unissued or unpaid". Could that not apply to a tag that simply was not issued to anyone?

Sheehan- That is correct.

Byrnes- So, if you had leftover general season tags and we did not sell them, that would allow you to add them to next year's quota right?

Sheehan- On the general season?

Byrnes- Yes.

Sheehan- We have not ever done that before. We have not had an unsold deer permit for a while.

Byrnes- The way I read it, it allows you to take leftover tags that were unsold and add it to next year's quota.

Sheehan- I think you are correct on that.

Byrnes- Would you change that before it goes to the Wildlife Board?

Sheehan- What you would like it to say is that if they are unsold, that is it for the year?

Byrnes- On general season tags.

Sheehan- I would be glad to. I understand what you are saying and I think we would agree with what you are proposing.

## **Motion**

**Motion-** Gaskill- Accept the proposal with the change to line 12c and delete that option of adding the wildlife document to the following year's quota.

**Second-** Cowley.

## **Discussion on the Motion**

Sheehan- You are just talking if there are some never sold but we still like the language that we have sold it and it was surrendered, to add it to the following year's quota?

Gaskill- That was not my motion.

Byrnes- As you stated it, it would not allow them to add any to the quota the next year. My concern was general season tags that could be entered into the next year's quota.

Gaskill- I would accept an amendment to my motion.

Cowley- My concern with that is if we are managing the wildlife, as far as big game, and then we are adding additional tag numbers on top of that. I don't think that you would have that many returned.

Sheehan- On general season deer permits statewide, we have about 300 permits per year that are surrendered and then we add that to the next year. Because we add 300 every year, it basically does not change the numbers at all.

Gaskill- Do you want to amend my motion?

Byrnes- If you would consider a friendly amendment. I would just take out the reference to the line and say you would accept recommending the rule as presented excluding adding general season tags into next year's quota.

### **Friendly Amendment**

**Motion-** Gaskill- Recommend acceptance of the rule as presented, excluding adding general season permits to the following years quota.

**Second-** Byrnes

**Motion Carries:** Unanimous

### **10. R657-60 Aquatic Invasive Species Interdiction Rule Amendment**

Candace Hutchinson, AIS Biologist

See Handout

### **RAC Questions**

Byrnes- The wording "other waters established by the wildlife board", I don't quite understand the use of established there. Would it be something that is identified by the wildlife board?

Hutchinson- I'm not sure why they chose exactly that other than I think to approve a water it has to go to the wildlife board to be considered contaminated, affected or detected.

Gaskill- Would it not be the case that if we didn't have that, we could not do any in Utah.

Otherwise, we would exclude Utah waters.

Hutchinson- Probably.

Gaskill- That is my reading. Is that right Walt?

Walt Donaldson- Right now it is not only in rule, it is in law. When we determine that a water is infected with quagga mussel or have the presence, we have to go to the Wildlife Board and get their approval to put it on the affected list for the state of Utah. That is the reason we have to have that sentence in there. We want to do it by geographic region so that it is simple for the boaters and biologists. In rule, that is what we have to do.

Gaskill- That was my assumption.

Byrnes- Ernie, do you know the reason why the word "established" is used.

Ernie Perkins- Only because it is state code. Could we get an update on the status of all suspect waters in the state over the last year?

Hutchinson- By suspect waters, do you mean Electric Lake? Our test came back negative on that. It is a two year cycle. On the third year that they are found not contaminated, then they will be removed from the list. This is the first year it was not detected.

Neville- Do you think that your campaign has been working?

Hutchinson- I think it has been working and we have revamped it this year to have a new face. I think that will help stimulate it again.

### **Motion**

**Motion-** Cowley -Accept it as presented.

**Second-** Gaskill

**Motion Carries-** Unanimous

### **11. Aquatic Informational Presentation**

Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Manager

See Handout

### **RAC Comment**

Gaskill- I would like to commend the Division. The fishing has vastly improved.

Ferry- How is the Utah carp eradication going?

Donaldson- The endangered species mitigation fund put forth quite a bit of money this year to help fund an experimental contract to help remove those carp and this year they removed either 1.75 million pounds or close to 2 million. The biggest issue on carp removal is where do you put those fish when you get them out. We have been trying to work with markets. We have had requests from China. No one wants to invest to get them over there.

Ferry- Is it only a wintertime removal?

Donaldson- Our contractor would like to expand that more into the spring and fall if he could.

Gaskill- Aren't they building a processing plant on Lincoln Beach?

Donaldson- There is a lot of discussion of getting some property there where they could build a facility. That has not occurred as of yet but that is being considered.

### **Public Comment**

Dale Searcy- Limit change on community ponds. People are adapting and fish are lasting from stocking to stocking with exception of the cormorant. That reduced limit has worked well.

Need support on helping with the situation with the cormorants. Need some kind of support in writing from the Division showing that we have authorization to give to the police department so that they know this is something that is sanctioned by the DWR.

**Meeting Ends: 9:20 p.m.**