

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
165 S. 700 E., Springville
September 14, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as presented
Passed unanimously (quorum not present)

Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13

MOTION: To accept the guidebook and rule as presented
Passed unanimously (quorum not present)

Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58

MOTION: To accept the rule as presented
Passed unanimously (quorum not present)

Proposed Fee Schedule FY2012

MOTION: To accept the fee schedule as proposed
Passed unanimously (quorum not present)

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
165 S. 700 E., Springville
September 14, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Richard Hansen, At Large
Doug Jones, Forest Service
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Members Absent

John Bair, Sportsmen, excused
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Mike Gates, BLM, excused
Byron Gunderson, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Jay Price, Elected
Allan Stevens, At Large, excused

Others Present

Rick Woodard

1) **Approval of the Agenda and the August 3, 2010 Minutes (Action)**

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the agenda and minutes as presented

Seconded by Richard Hansen

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Three more otters released in Middle Provo this week
- Draft bear management plan completed, under review

Habitat

- Habitat restoration biologist position interviews this week

Aquatics

- Kokanee spawning and egg collection underway at Strawberry
- Utah Lake trap netting operations this week
- More June sucker stocked in Utah Lake
- 15,000 sterile rainbow fingerlings stocked in 6th Water (Diamond Fork Drainage)
- Granite Creek treatment scheduled for this month (treatment followed by reintroduction of Bonneville cutthroat trout later this fall)

Conservation Outreach

- Kokanee Festival this Friday and Saturday at Strawberry Fish Trap

Law Enforcement

- Strawberry checkpoint conducted August 29th

3) **Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (Action)**

- **Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Coordinator**

Questions from the Public

? - Has the cormorant problem actually been documented in a study?

Drew Cushing – We have had predation problems with cormorants at our community fisheries for the past ten years. Cormorant population in the west has increased. The Division of Wildlife has actually used rotenone and killed their prey base along the Great Salt Lake fringe and has created some mid level reservoir feeding places for them at our community fisheries and our larger reservoirs. What we are trying to do is to haze them back where they came from. We are working with our waterfowl people to re-provide that food source in some of our ponds and WMAs. We have documented well the population and the predation. Our stocked rainbow trout in our community fisheries are depleted in about two days because of the cormorants. On a four-acre fishery we have documented 40 cormorants each day and they eat three pounds of fish a day.

Comments from the Public

Dan Potts - Salt Lake County Fish and Game Association – We want to formally support the proposal for the standardization and simplification of the bass regulations for the state of Utah. We want to recommend one exception. We felt that there has been a significant change of management and direction on Utah Lake. We think the RAC has three options for Utah Lake. They can adopt the proposal. The problem is that we have spent years producing a trophy large mouth bass fishery on Utah Lake. It is difficult to catch large mouth bass 12 inches and under. We have fish that range from 12 inches up to eight pounds. Cal Robertson at Robertson Marine showed me a picture of an eight pound large mouth bass. There are very very few large mouth bass on Utah Lake but they are very very nice. They are very susceptible to over harvest during a few periods of time during the year, the spawn being one of those. They could be wiped out with a catch and kill regulation. Once the meat fisherman find out, not only are they going to take the fish, everybody will take the fish. Those trophy fish will be lost. We feel that the catch and kill regulation is not appropriate for Utah Lake. Our second recommendation would be to simply put the regulation off because so many entities have not discussed this issue for Utah Lake. We have to remember there is a June sucker recovery implementation program going on there and we haven't really discussed this issue very well in the program. There are other groups like ourselves that haven't heard about this. A presentation was made to the Utah Anglers Coalition but we didn't have time to have another meeting before this meeting. Utah Anglers Coalition took a position years ago to adopt the current management for Utah Lake and so we have decided to take a status quo approach which is to maintain the current regulation. Salt Lake County Fish and Game Association's solution is to support a compromise between the catch and kill and everything over 12 inches goes back. Our compromise is to simply shift Utah Lake from the slot that it is in to the other trophy waters where it belongs. The catch and kill regulation is primarily for those waters where we have too many fish and we need harvest. We do not have enough bass at Utah Lake and they are all really big. We are recommending a simple tweak to the proposal. We know you don't have a quorum but at least you might carry that back to the board if you so decide. Thank you.

Roger Wilson – We are not proposing a catch and kill regulation at Utah Lake. This is a standard six fish limit.

Drew Cushing – What it takes to drive a restricted regulation is harvest. The reason a restricted regulation works on a water like Strawberry is you have enough harvest that the fish are removed at a size to allow fish to get bigger. In 2006 we did a creel survey at Utah Lake and in the year long creel there was only one bass that was checked. The reality is that Utah Lake along with the majority of our other bass waters does not have enough harvest to drive a restricted regulation. If there is a situation where we have over harvest you can have a trophy fishery. If you don't have any harvest our management hands are tied.

Michael Mills – Coordinator for the June sucker recovery implementation program – My main purpose on commenting tonight is just to clarify the programs position on the proposed regulation changes being presented tonight. As background, the June sucker recovery program is a group of several federal, state and local agencies that includes an outdoor interest representative who is actually Danny Potts. Our goal is to recover the June sucker so that is no longer requires protection under the endangered species act and also to allow for the continued development and use of water resources in the state. Over the years we have spent considerable time and effort studying non-native fish on Utah Lake. The creel survey was mentioned. We have done studies looking at every species out there trying to pin point where our biggest problems are related to June sucker recovery. Our number one issue is common carp which has been a subject of an extensive mechanical removal effort. Recently Utah State University completed a food web model for Utah Lake that was funded by the June sucker recovery program. That model focused on the following sport fish species; white bass, bullhead, crappie, channel catfish and perch. It did not make specific recommendations in regards to black bass management. Bottom line is that June sucker recovery should not be used as a means to achieve a trophy bass fishery on Utah Lake. Drew presented the proposed change the June sucker technical committee and due to the low harvest rates, the low overall population of large mouth bass and the lack of research implicating black bass as a factor in June sucker recovery the technical committee decided not to take a position on the regulation or to promote the issue to the June sucker administrative committee. The program is supportive of the Division's efforts to manage the Utah Lake fish community and also to promote fishing and harvest on Utah Lake. I simply ask that as you consider the recommendation before you that you don't use June sucker recovery as a means for accepting or rejecting that proposal. Thanks.

Ed Stott – I am an avid Utah Lake fisherman. Large mouth bass is a pride of mine. It is wonderful to catch them because there are so few of them there. I don't think you should allow open take. If you allow that to be an open regulation people will start taking them home and not releasing them because if we don't someone will and there won't be any left next year or the year after that. We need them to kill the white bass; there are millions of white bass in there. I catch a large mouth once or twice a month and I let it go. I don't think you should change the regs on Utah Lake.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – read emails received

Robert Dibblee – Utah Anglers Coalition - Because we never brought the subject of fish regulations on Utah Lake to a vote at the last UAC meeting, we must take a neutral position on the subject.

George Sommer – I am unable to attend the meeting tonight. I have been involved in the discussions surrounding the proposed changes and wish to go on record as being in support of the Division's recommendations.

Gary Nielsen – How many bass were found in the creel survey?

Roger Wilson – There was one that was actually seen in the actual creel survey. That wasn't the total harvest estimate.

Richard Hansen – Are black bass predatory? Will they eat the white bass?

Drew Cushing – While white bass are a huge problem for the June sucker recovery program we didn't find fish remains in the stomachs of large mouth bass. I don't have the background to say if they are eating white bass or other fish species out there.

Gary Nielsen – Are we changing stuff that is already working well or is it insignificant?
Drew Cushing – For example at Pineview Reservoir our manager up there was convinced that his regulation, which was a pretty restrictive regulation, was working. He completed a creel survey there and 52 large mouth bass were harvested in a 12 month period. The plain truth is that it is not anglers that have an impact on bass populations. It is the environment overall. It is the water levels; it is all the things we can't control. It is the same with Utah Lake. The reason we have made this effort to standardize and simplify was really because if there are barriers to people going out and fishing for bass, such as a restricted regulations that are too confusing, that is keeping us from selling those licenses and being able to manage those fisheries at a high level.

VOTING

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

Seconded by Gary Nielsen

In Favor: Duane Smith, Doug Jones, Larry Fitzgerald, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielsen

Motion passed unanimously (quorum not present)

- 4) **Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58 (Action)**
- **Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Doug Jones – Do you just need to have one decontamination certificate in the boat even if more than one person is operating the boat?

Roger Wilson – It is not required to have one on the boat. It must be on the dash of the launch vehicle. The contact is made at the boat ramp.

VOTING

Motion was made by Gar Nielsen to accept the rule as presented

Seconded by Duane Smith

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously (quorum not present)

- 5) **Proposed Fee Schedule FY2012 (Action)**
- **Ron Nielsen, Central Region Administrative Services Section Manager**

Questions from the RAC

Gary Nielson – Are they looking at a one year dedicated hunter program?

Ron Nielsen – The board has asked us to look at unit by unit management and other management strategies. If some of those changes are made the dedicated hunter program may have to change and if so this fee would be in place if needed.

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to accept the fee schedule as proposed

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously (quorum not present)

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

24 in attendance

Next board meeting September 22 and 23 at the DNR boardroom, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting November 10th at TBA

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/September 9, 2010

5. FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13

MOTION to accept the proposal as presented by the Division

Passed unanimously

6. FISHING CONTESTS AND CLINICS RULE R657-58

MOTION to approve UDWR's proposal

Passed unanimously

7. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY2012

MOTION to go with the Division's proposal as presented

Passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Western Park, Vernal

September 9, 2010

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 7:50 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bob Christensen-RAC Chair
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Beth Hamann-Non Consumptive
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture
Ron Winterton-Elected Official
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Trina Hedrick-NER Aquatics Mgr.
Jack Lytle-NER Conservation Officer
Drew Cushing-SLO Aquatics Bio II
Roger Wilson-SLO Wildlife Pgm Coord
Gayle Allred-NER Administrative Aide
Ron Stewart-NER Conservation Outreach

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Floyd Briggs-At Large
Brandon McDonald-BLM
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture
Carlos Reed-Ute Tribe

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

UNEXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Loran Hills-Non Consumptive

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES: Bob Christensen

MOTION by Rod Morrison to approve the agenda and minutes

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE: Bob Christensen

This meeting covered the cougar guidebook and rule, compensation for bear damage, furbearer guidebook, otter management plan, and waterfowl guidebook. The Wildlife Board was in accordance with what NER passed in our Regional Advisory Council meeting. On the cougar guidebook we had a change in our motion to change Three-Corners and West Daggett cougar units from a split unit to a harvest objective. The Division took that and changed their proposal and presented that to the Board, and that passed, so those units are changed back from a split unit to a harvest objective.

Another thing changed; it was also suggested that the cougar opener start on Monday instead of Wednesday to give lion hunters an opportunity, if they harvested a lion, since the Division is closed on Fridays now, to have an opportunity to get a lion checked in. Manti last year went over last year because Division offices weren't open.

Clay Hamann: How many bobcat tags are they offering this year?

Bob Christensen: Three

4. REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson

Wildlife Issues

The Division has had a long time issue with deer on the airport runway. It has heated up recently. The way the laws are written, when wildlife becomes a health or safety issue, then Wildlife Services is supposed to remove those deer. We haven't used them a lot in the past because the airport has a fence. In the past he'll call and when we get arrive, there are no deer, but there are holes in the fence so the deer are coming and going. This year, we're calling Wildlife Services. We're trying to hunt in the basin but it's hard to take deer in town with so much private land.

The airport has a proposal for a new fence which should fix the problem for now. If a plane hits the deer, we would get the blame. We're responding when we can but hopefully they can get the new fence built.

New Personnel

We have some new people in our aquatic section. Trina Hedrick is our Aquatics Manager who replaced Roger Schneidervin. Trina came to us from Duke University. She worked for Arizona for several years, for SLO for a couple of years, and here for four years.

We also have Matt McKell at Flaming Gorge. He comes to us from the Northern Region. He has worked for us for five or six years and has a strong statistical background. He moved in about a month ago.

Stream access bill

History: Several years ago, there was a lawsuit where fishermen had been arrested for trespassing and the Utah Supreme Court ruled that waters are a public resource in Utah and you can't keep people from accessing it if you want to walk or float down the stream. In the last session a bill was passed that essentially reversed that. For now, we're back to the old law that you cannot access it without landowner permission.

The task force will be coming out to look at the walk-in access program, refocus on purchasing access from landowners for fishing. They will visit different areas of the state and take public comments. No one has contacted us yet. I don't know whether we will host that or not. That's their effort to find a happy medium. Fisherman access is way more expensive than big game access. That's where people build homes, is by streams, as opposed to the back 40.

AIS

We had a positive hit on Red Fleet for quagga mussels. It was a weak lab positive and we wanted to go through another full year. The lab results are back and this is the second year in a row that we're clean. The downside for us is that we've had to have crews up there all season long washing the bats, which costs a lot of money.

Walleye illegally introduced in Red Fleet

We'll probably be coming back to you with suggestions. Walleye will eat everything and they will stunt out and we'll have nothing. Do you let people fish and let the system crash or do you anticipate the crash and convince the public that killing the fish in advance is a good move. Being a state park that's a big deal because if the fishery crashed they would lose a lot of money.

Flaming George

A pier is scheduled to be constructed this fall if they can get in there. It's a project that's been on the books for several years at Dam Point, right next to the Flaming Gorge Visitor's Center. There's a courtesy dock there now but people can't access it very easily. This is a joint project between Outreach and Aquatics. Right now the water's high. We had a meeting last weeks with the guides. Western Area Power wants to do double peaking. When they used to do that in the 80s it really affected the fishery. If the water is too high, we won't be able to put a dock in there. We've decided to get more heavily involved rather than just comment and take a stronger hand in the research there.

Cart Creek pond

The pond is a body of water that you pass just after the switchbacks. We've put catchables in there. The culvert is rusting out and we're seeing what the Forest Service has to say. We're hoping to get that pond back where it was or enlarge it with parking, but that will take some time and money.

Kirk Woodward: Why don't walleye do well here?

Kevin Christopherson: If you have a large variety of fish or a bigger body of water you can manage it. Typically in the West you see a five to seven-year cycle where they start to come on, there's a lot of prey, they hit the coyote/rabbit phase and eat out their base and the fishery crashes. They go through these same cycles in the Midwest but there are so many waters, the fishermen know which waters are down in the cycle and go to other waters. Another problem is rainbow trout cost \$1.00 a pound which is expensive walleye food. If we stop stocking, the fishery will crash sooner. We could let the thing run its course and people will beg us to treat it because the walleye will only be four inches long or you go on your experience and say we're better off treating it now so the crash won't come.

Mitch Hacking: Can you kill the walleye without killing the other fish?

Kevin Christopherson: I wish. Different species have different sensitivities; there's just not the profit there for the chemical companies to create differences in the rotenone.

Mitch Hacking: Should you let it run its course and then kill it?

Kevin Christopherson: If they get used to walleye, the people who put the illegal fish could wait till it's been treated and put more in again.

Clay Hamann: What's the possibility they will go downstream?

Kevin Christopherson: We see walleye in the river occasionally. Most of that water is diverted. We don't see a lot of walleye in the Duchesne River below Starvation.

Trina Hedrick: From the studies they did out of Colorado State, they showed that the walleye we see in the Green are coming from Starvation Reservoir but you don't see them in the rivers.

Kevin Christopherson: There are some getting in the Green already. They're not establishing in big numbers so Red Fleet fish might not be a problem. With smallmouth bass, they were at low levels for years and then suddenly exploded, so you never know.

Drew Cushing: We're not the only state in the West who has walleye issues. Reservoir states fluctuate and have a lack of diversity. Walleye overpopulate and eat themselves out of house and home and deplete themselves. This is not a unique situation.

Kevin Christopherson: We're our own worst enemy; we try to manage around them. Like Deer Creek Reservoir, we try to put large enough trout in to be too big for the walleye to eat on. We tell people it's not going to work and then we do our best to make it work.

Roger Wilson: It's getting increasingly more difficult to get public buyoff, but when it crashes, it might be crashed for a year or two before it comes back.

Kevin Christopherson: It's expensive, but you don't treat it you'll end up with a fishery; two years out of ten.

Kevin Christopherson: We will probably hold some public meetings in addition to RAC meetings to explain the situation to the public.

5. FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13: Roger Wilson

See handout

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: On federal birds how does that work?

Roger Wilson: They're migratory and they're regional feeders. There are indications that they'll fly 200 miles for a forage flight and fly back. Nongame Migratory Committee on

the Pacific Flyway Council. Idaho's having a lot of troubles. It is a federal issue. APHIS has a permit to haze them and to take birds. They've already gone through a NEPA process. They have a successful record back East with cormorants. The idea is, to use lethal control is a last ditch effort. Nobody wants to kill birds, but it would be simply a few birds to control birds.

Mitch Hacking: What can the State of Utah do to get control over these birds?

Roger Wilson: We are proposing to work with APHIS. Idaho has had complete runs of Yellowstone cutthroats shut off. They're working with us and we're having some success working with the Federal government.

Drew Cushing: We drafted a cormorant management plan this spring and APHIS was our partner in this (Department of Agriculture). They helped us draft the plan and implement the plan. This spring we were able to haze hundreds of cormorants and take two. Before, we were losing 90% of our stocked trout in our community waters.

Mitch Hacking: Can you go beyond hazing?

Drew Cushing: That's what we're doing but it's a progressive approach. Idaho got torn down by the public by being too aggressive. APHIS took some birds in a public setting in the city. They're willing to work with us and we're lucky to have them.

Mitch Hacking: In Randlett the cranes are multiplying and the only word we get is they're federal birds and there's not much we can do.

Drew Cushing: If you need contacts, they work with private citizens too.

Mitch Hacking: So you do feel pretty good about what they are doing?

Beth Hamann: Are you guys watching the Diamond Mountain lakes. Last year we saw two pelicans; this year we saw over 30.

Roger Wilson: They are a problem with deep water fisheries. They hurt fish; they try to catch them in shallow water. When they feed in Strawberry on other fish, we're not concerned, but when they get the bigger spawners, they feed in groups and are cooperative. At Matt Warner, are they a problem?

Beth Hamann: We're just a big increase. They're eating something.

Roger Wilson: It's a numbers issue. We've had hundreds and hundreds of pelicans sitting on streams. That's a pretty good block on fish.

Drew Cushing: Cormorants eat three pounds of fish per day on small ponds and remove any stocked fish in community waters in a day and a half.

Roger Wilson: Pelicans are still on the sensitive species list in Utah. We'd just as soon not take them but when they escalate that's the only way to get rid of problem birds that won't haze anymore. We're going to rely on the experts and write a management plan because it is sensitive.

Bob Christensen: On the West Fork of the Duchesne, what was the issue there?

Roger Wilson: This was brought to the committee this spring. The region felt it was more of a brown trout fishery; the regulations are one over 22 inches and the region felt it wasn't necessary. Subsequent to that, we were approached by a landowner and anglers who hadn't heard of the proposal. Because it is an issue that doesn't have to be dealt with right now, we felt we could table the issue.

Trina Hedrick: Is there a closure issue?

Roger Wilson: It's either a two-fish limit or one over 22 inches, and closed during the spring spawning run.

Clay Hamann: Isn't it flies and lures only?

Roger Wilson: We're not going to make any changes. It will be the same as it has been. We felt like it was good business to work with these people who have some concerns so we're going to table it for now.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

Discussion and Motion:

MOTION by Beth Hamann to accept the proposal as presented by the Division

Second by Mitch Hacking

Motion passed unanimously

6. FISHING CONTESTS AND CLINICS RULE R657-58: Roger Wilson

See handout

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

Ron Stewart: I was talking to Ross Catron from the Forest Service and he would rather not have the tagged fish in the moose Ponds because it's getting enough pressure as it is and he doesn't want to single that out, whereas Long's Park could use a little more pressure.

Roger Wilson: If the Division has concerns, we wouldn't approve it.

Ron Stewart: I was wondering if Long's Park could be added at this point.

Bob Christensen: That's interesting. Ross didn't say anything to me about it.

Jack Lytle: What does the ranger in that district think?

Ron Stewart: I don't know, I didn't ask her. That was personal information on Ross' part.

Trina Hedrick: It was an effort to have something for Daggett County. Is it too late to change it to Long's Park?

Roger Wilson: That would be up to this RAC.

Ron Stewart: Moose Pond was spotlighted as part of the Scenic Byway but not intended to be over a long period of time.

Jack Lytle: I think there's room for discussion. You could have a short period of time.

Roger Wilson: Our process would be to go through the COR process with the option of denying it. I'd recommend we don't do it every year. If we're going to make changes every year we might as well open it up statewide. The rule requires that people proposing contests approach us with a COR before the end of December. This is why we did it that way. My proposal is that we vote on this one and if we want to bring additional waters or statewide, we do that next year.

Kevin Christopherson: We could make it "Waters as Approved by the Division."

Drew Cushing: That's what it is now.

Roger Wilson: It doesn't seem to be a problem.

Kevin Christopherson: We can turn them down.

Roger Wilson: Yeah, we can.

MOTION by Beth Hamann to approve UDWR's proposal

Second by Kirk Woodward

Motion passed unanimously

7. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY2012: Kevin Christopherson

See handout

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with the Division's proposal as presented

Second by Ron Winterton

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 pm

Clay Hamann: The Northeastern Region has done well. The fish at Calder are big and robust. There is a problem with illegal take though. I don't think anglers are paying attention. When I talked to one guy who had a whole bunch of fish, the guy thought he was sure they were over 22".

Beth Hamann: But there was one guy we saw and when we went toward them, they ran and jumped in their vehicle and took off.

The next RAC meeting will be held November 18 at the Western Park again.

Northern Regional Advisory Council

September 15, 2010

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

Robert Bynes –At Large
John Cavitt- Noncon.
Paul Cowley-Forest Service
James Gaskill- At Large
Shawn Groll- At Large
Russ Lawrence- At Large
Jon Leonard- Sportsman
Brad Slater- Chair
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Ron Hodson
Randy Wood
Roger Wilson
Masako Wright
Drew Cushing
Paul Thompson
Ben Nadolski
Masako Wright
Chris Penne
Kevin Bunnell
Justin Dolling

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins

RAC Excused Absence

Joel Ferry- Agric
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bret Selman-Agric

RAC Absent

Michael Gates- BLM

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 8

Introduction: Brad Slater-chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda and Aug 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13
Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58
Proposed Fee Schedule FY2012
DL&L Black Footed Ferret Reintroduction Plan

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Introduction of RAC Members

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Aug 4, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Gaskill- Approve the Agenda.

Second: Cowley

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

No questions on Wildlife Board update.

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Issues that occurred this summer regarding wolves in the Northern part of the state. DWR has requested to have the wolves delisted in the state so they can manage them.

Item 5. Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13

-Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- You are not suggesting that bait fish are transporting the quaggas; you are suggesting that the water they are in are doing it? What are you suggesting there?

Wilson- The water is the big issue. There may be a film of water on the fish that could be transporting. We are talking about primarily the amateur stages not the adults. There is even a slight chance that they could be moving these in their stomach as well. There has been no clarification or studies done on the risks involved.

Gaskill- Regarding the Boulder Mountain, you are allowed to take only 2 trout over 14 inches. Does that include brook trout over 14 inches?

Wilson- Are you looking at the Boulder Mountain regulation?

Gaskill- Yes. You can take 4 trout unless 4 of them are brook trout. But only 2 of them can be over 14 inches. I was a little unclear as to whether that over 14 inches includes brook trout or not. Can you have only 2 brook trout over 14 inches?

Wilson- That is a good question. Do you know that Drew? Drew is looking that up. It is a bonus limit so you can have up to 8 brook trout.

Gaskill- Yes, that was my point. Could we get 8 over 14 inches or only 2?

Wilson- It is probably only 2 but Drew is looking at that right now.

Cushing- Two over 14 and a bonus limit of four.

Gaskill- That is the way I thought it read but I just wanted to make sure. My other question is why did we close the Boulder Mountains and the Mirror?

Wilson- I think they have had some issues in the past and anglers have requested that. I'm not sure there is a strong biological overriding concern there but there is public concern with public fishing there in the winter.

Gaskill- Likely, they are worried about over fishing the smaller lakes.

Wilson- Yes.

Gaskill- I am wondering if there should be something in here about the closure not applying to streams. It is in there but the closure does not apply to streams right?

Wilson- That whole stipulation does not apply to streams.

Gaskill- Right.

Wilson- That is just lakes a reservoirs. That bonus limit does not apply to streams either, it is just the lakes. That is a change from the previous time. The region felt like it really was not an issue on the streams. That particular regulation does not apply to streams.

Gaskill- I was just thinking that was a little confusing. You might want to consider rewording that so it is clear to everyone. I had to read it a few times.

Wilson- So you would suggest something like this does not apply to streams?

Gaskill- Yes, just something simple like that.

Cowley- I am wondering what coordination is being done on the white pelican issue? I believe that is a state sensitive species also.

Wilson- It is and it is part of the management plan. Non-game bird committee has looked at this issue. It is increasing in severity and we are coordinating with others to make sure everyone is involved.

Cavitt- Would you expand on the hazing operations and success of cormorant problems in the community fisheries that you have had this summer.

Wilson- I am going to ask Chris to talk about that. He could give you a better report on that.

Chris Penne- Started a program at 3 community fisheries in the northern region that had been significantly impacted by cormorants. The management plan we followed was an elevated response plan where we started out with fairly non-invasive techniques for the birds. With more persistent birds, we ended up elevating the response each time. We started out with a radio controlled boat on the water to chase the birds of and in many instances worked. In some instances, they ended up returning. If that did not work, we moved on to pyrotechnics under

the trade name of “bird bombs” shot out of a small pistol up in the air and that generally worked. Only one instance did we have to terminate a bird. Before that termination, we did use paintball guns as well.

Hodson- Chris has been the coordinator for the community fisheries program statewide and recently we’ve decentralized that program and put it out into the regions. Chris has come to the region as our community fisheries biologist. He is now heading this program in the northern region.

Cavitt- As a follow up, how do you know you are dealing with the same bird? Are they marked?

Penne- In the one instance where we had to really elevate control and actually terminate a bird, it was the same bird showing up at the same time every day. In this case, it was just one alone bird.

Gaskill- Was that program going to be expanded? I know it is not just community fisheries. When you terminated that bird, it did not show up again so you were pretty sure it was the right one right?

Penne- Correct, in fact we did not have any more visits to that particular pond by cormorants for the rest of the season. It did make a large difference.

Wilson- Birds that won’t haze will decoy a lot of other birds. If you can’t get them to move, you get a whole bunch of birds that won’t move. In some circumstances, it is necessary to have lethal measures taken to solve the problem.

Gaskill- Do you plan to extend the program?

Wilson- It is really a personnel problem. We can let Paul weight in on Little Creek if he would like.

Paul Thompson- Not aware that we had a significant problem.

RAC Comment

Lawrence- Commend the aquatic section for doing a fine job. There is a lot going on and it is nice to see the regulations getting simplified.

Gaskill- Would like to echo that and be invited to go with you sometime.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Approve Rule R657-13 as presented.

Second: Van Tassell

Discussion on the Motion

Gaskill- Is table the appropriate word for that or delete?

Wilson- Tabling might not be the perfect word for that but we want to bring this up again after further discussion with those anglers and parties that had concerns. We are going to extend some outreach and have some discussion with those groups and see if they can support us in this.

Gaskill- I am ok with the word, I just want to get something like that in minutes so that we knew what we were doing here.

Cowley- Where we have to approve these every year, you might as well call it delete for this year.

Gaskill- Whatever you want to do.

Slater- Is Tom Clark here? Mr. Clark was going to try and come tonight but I did tell him that I would give you his input. Basically, it was to prohibit fishing at Locomotive Springs during the months of December and January when waterfowl season is in place. He points out the conflicts that can sometimes come into play with those that are wanting to waterfowl and those there fishing. Has that ever come up in your meetings?

Wilson- I did see that email. There was another individual that approached me with a comment that we ought to open a lot of our waterfowl management areas up to more fishing.

We do have it from both sides. There are conflicts and something we have to discuss.

Hodson- We actually had some of our folks meet with this gentleman.

Paul Thompson- Tom did get a hold of our office and Randy Berger who manages that area along with myself met with him. The water levels are getting quite low and for a public shooter at Locomotive Springs, it is hard to find a place to hunt when it gets really frozen up in December and January. Tom felt that there were too many folks camping and fishing that it was kind of detracting from the waterfowl. We stock 3 springs out there and we have backed off of one of the springs to give some hunting opportunity and leave the other two for angling opportunities.

Cowley- My proposal would not change given the information provided.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58

- Roger Wilson, Aquatic Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Comment

Jennifer Schmalz- We fill out a form when we go boating but did not know there was an online form. How are you going to let people know that they can go online and do this? My family would be interested in doing that.

Wilson- It is up on our website and we are attempting to get the word out. It is very popular and the people like it.

Cowley- Did they send something out with the boat registration?

Wilson- I believe they did. Is that right Drew?

Cushing- Yes.

Wilson- It is on our website and we had some press releases on this.

Leonard- Is that required of float tubes and kick boats?

Wilson- It is. Anything that launches should have those. It takes about 40 minutes to complete that course and it is pretty comprehensive.

Motion

Motion: Lawrence- Move to accept the changes as presented.

Second: Cavitt

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. Proposed Fee Schedule FY2012

- Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

See Handout

RAC Questions

Lawrence- With dedicated hunter, the \$60 dollar fee is within that \$180 dollars that is already paid.

Hodson- They won't be paying the \$180.

Lawrence- It would be \$60 on a yearly basis.

Hodson- If we use this, it will be because we go to just a one year at a time program instead of a three year program. Then, they would be paying \$60 dollars each year.

Lawrence- That is good to hear because I thought this was \$60 in addition to that. With the license, that is \$150 dollars per year to hunt deer.

Hodson- No, if we implement this, the \$180 will go away. It will be because we now have a one year program instead of a three year program.

Van Tassell- On that dedicated hunter, isn't it like 2 bucks in a three year period?

Hodson- It is.

Van Tassell- So, how would you implement a one year? How would that work?

Hodson- If that ever comes to pass, there will be lots of changes to the dedicated hunter program. We are trying to think ahead and see the potential problems.

Van Tassell- Can the legislature up the fees without going through this process of going through the RAC and the board?

Hodson- They certainly can. They set the fees but this is kind of the public process to give input.

Cowley- What kind of disabilities are we looking at for this reduced fee?

Hodson- I don't know the whole list. Post-traumatic stress counts as a disability for veterans and that would not fall under the normal disabled fishing license. I don't know the list of disabilities that qualifies someone as a disabled veteran.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Approve the proposed adjustments and presented.

Second: Leonard

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 8. DL&L Black Footed Ferret Reintroduction Plan

- Masako Wright, Sensitive Species Biologist

See Handout

Public Questions

Jennifer Schmalz- What is the status for the white tail prairie dogs?

Bunnell- White tail prairie dogs have been petitioned to be listed on the endangered species but the petition came back negative. So they currently don't have any federal status but they are listed as a state sensitive species.

Jennifer Schmalz- What will happen when you release them?

Wright- We release them into burrows.

Jennifer Schmalz- Is there any concern about releasing them in the winter or late fall?

Bunnell- That is actually the time they are most successful and the easiest time for them to obtain food.

Gina Nielsen- Because they are reintroduced and got down to 18 species, is the possibility of them being susceptible to a plague higher than other diseases because they might have limited genetic diversity? Is that something we want to encourage?

Bunnell- They have several genetic problems but the captive breeding program tries to maximize the diversity that they have but the material they have to work with is pretty limited just because of the founding population. They do have some genetic issues that are primarily expressed through the males.

Gina Nielsen- When they do the reintroduction, do they try to take species that have been introduced in Canada and been there for a while and then in the southern areas so that they get more diversity that way?

Bunnell- Very recently, they brought a few animals back in from the wild to the captive breeding program to see if they can bring any new or refined genetic material. There is a whole organization built on trying to maintain genetic diversity with ferrets.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- What is the cost of this program?

Bunnell- It is actually pretty minimal. From our standpoint, it will be some surveys in the fall and spring. Mostly in personnel time.

Cavitt- Are there any stipulations or requirements that prohibit any kind of exploitation of coming out to the reintroduction site for profit?

Wright- No.

Bunnell- That is being done some up in Windcave National Park as a park program. It has been a good education tool. We would actually encourage that if there is not too much disturbance.

Slater- You mentioned that Rich County has to be involved. Are you talking the county commission? Have they had the presentation?

Bunnell- Several.

Groll- What was the response from the commissioners?

Bunnell- Purposely, we have gone very slow with this process. They had some concerns which we addressed most of them. They have reached a comfort level that they are ok with it. They do see some risk involved but we have been able to reduce that risk that they will tolerate it.

Hodson- This still also has to go through the RDCC process.

Bunnell- It is in that process now.

Hodson- As part of that process, Rich County will have the official chance to comment there. We have kept them informed. If they have concerns, we will address those before moving forward.

Bunnell- In addition to the RDCC process, we sent a specific letter with the plan directly to the county commissioners in Rich County stating what I just said. We have not heard anything at this point.

Cowley- Is this viewed as an experimental population?

Wright- This population would be endangered.

Bunnell- They actually referred to it as an experimental essential instead of an experimental nonessential. When we get into this in a couple of years and everyone is comfortable, we will have to go to something more permanent.

Groll- If during that five year commitment the county or Deseret says this is not working then what is the procedure to get out of it?

Wright- You would just catch the ferrets and it's over.

Bunnell- The permit specifically says that if anyone wants to back out, the fish and wildlife service comes in and captures the ferrets they can and they walk away.

Motion

Motion: Byrnes- Recommend the Wildlife Board approve the Desert Land and Live Stock Black Footed Ferret Reintroduction Plan.

Second: Cavitt

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Meeting Ends: 7:55 p.m.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
September 8, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

**MOTION: To accept the agenda as amended
Passed unanimously**

Approval of July 28, 2010 minutes

**MOTION: To accept the minutes of July 28, 2010 as written
Passed unanimously**

Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13

**MOTION: To accept R657-13 Fishing Guidebook and Rule as presented
Passed unanimously**

Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58

**MOTION: To accept the Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule as presented
Passed unanimously**

Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2012

**MOTION: To accept the Proposed Fee Schedule for FY 2012 as presented
Passed unanimously**

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
September 8, 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.
Darrel Mecham, sportsmen**

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

2) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow –Bill Bates indicated that he will be taking the place of Greg Sheehan in the presentation of fee changes.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Pam Riddle to approve the agenda as amended.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to approve the minutes of the July 28 meeting as written.

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed unanimously

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Informational)

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow - The Wildlife Board passed everything pretty much the way we did, except they added a few permits and moved some around in the southern region. There had been a number of sightings of cougars in the Marysville area, so the board chose to increase permits. Terry asked Kevin Albrecht for an update on the mule deer committee, but Kevin answered that they had not met yet.

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

4) Regional Update (Informational)

-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Aquatics:

Carbon County Fair and kids fishing day on 8/13

Scofield and Electric Lake sampling in September

Huntington Creek and Straight Canyon sampling in September

Ferron Res. structure repair needed

Mud Creek Restoration on-going

Tiger muskies released last year at Joes Valley are now up to 20 inches.

Conservation Outreach:

Utah State Fair is on-going

Tusher Mountains Rocky Mountain Goat Watch occurred in August

Displays at Carbon and Emery County fairs provided

Youth and scout programs presented during summer months

Habitat:

**Pinyon-juniper treatments continue into October on LaSal and Manti units
Price River improvements continue
Guzzlers in Book Cliffs will be monitored by trail cams for wildlife use**

Law Enforcement:

**Checkpoint near Scofield Res. held on 8/28
Trophy deer poaching investigation from Elk Ridge on-going
Archery season law enforcement is on-going**

Wildlife:

**Youth chukar hunt took place on September 4
Pronghorn classification is on-going
Elk classifications is now over
Upland game hunts are beginning
An open house is scheduled in Blanding on 9/22.**

Questions from the RAC

**Wayne Hoskisson: What is involved in big game classifications?
Bill Bates: It involves counting the number of does and fawns or cows and calves.
Derris Jones: What were the results of the classifications?
Justin Shannon: The cow: calf ratio for elk is better than average. It's too early to tell for pronghorn antelope.**

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 5) R657-13 Fishing Guidebook and Rule (Action)
-Roger Wilson, Aquatics Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

**Derris Jones: Are pelicans a problem anywhere except at Strawberry Reservoir?
Roger Wilson: Yes. We've had a few problems at Bear Lake, but there is only one tributary there and we can put up pickets and string to deter pelicans. It's very difficult to implement something like that in the hundreds of miles of tributaries in Strawberry Valley. We have done a little in Trout and Indian creeks but it has only worked in localized areas. We've hazed with propane cannons and chased them with boats. We'd like to implement other controls to help us stop the depredation along spawning runs.**

Kevin Albrecht: At Flaming Gorge and Lake Powell, you mentioned possible changes in regulations for the next year.

Roger Wilson: Wyoming is becoming increasingly concerned about smallmouth bass and we are too. Lake Powell and Flaming Gorge are different waters and may

require different limits, so we'll have to work with the neighboring states to consider special provisions.

Derris Jones: Could burbot end up in Lake Powell?

Roger Wilson: Yes, and they are currently impacting smallmouth bass in Flaming Gorge.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept R657-13 Fishing Guidebook and Rule as presented.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed unanimously

- 6) R657-58 Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule (Action)
-Roger Wilson, Aquatics Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to accept R657-58 Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule as presented.

Seconded by Chris Micoz

Motion passed unanimously

- 7) Proposed Fee Schedule FY 2012 (Action)
-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Questions from the RAC

Todd Huntington: Regarding the Dedicated Hunter Rule, will the three year program be phased out?

Bill Bates: Whether the program will change from a three year to a two year or one year program, I'm not sure. They are waiting to see if the board chooses to go with a

unit by unit deer hunting strategy. Kevin, are you familiar with the committee that is looking into potential changes for the dedicated hunter program?

Kevin Bunnell: We don't know what changes will be taking place.

Bill Bates: A week ago, we talked about some ideas. One thing that we've been looking at is how to deal with residents and non-residents. If we have 20-30 units statewide, we need to divide resident and non-resident permits among those units. As far as the dedicated hunter program, we've talked about having a percentage of dedicated hunters allocated for each unit. Dedicated hunters would be offered first, second and third choices. As Kevin said, all these ideas are still in their formative stages, and we can't say what will happen.

Todd Huntington: Would a dedicated hunter have to complete his service hours in the unit for which he drew?

Bill Bates: That has to be ironed out.

Chris Micoz: Do we have very many non-resident dedicated hunters?

Walt Maldonado: There aren't very many.

Chris Micoz: As a non-resident, it would seem very difficult to do your service work.

Todd Huntington: Most of them end up buying out their service hours. Residents can buy out two of their three years service, but non-residents can buy out all service hours.

Bill Bates: There are a lot of questions, including whether or not the dedicated hunter program will even survive a change like this. This is something the Wildlife Board will have to grapple with. We don't have the answers yet. This proposed change in the fee structure is an attempt to make way for any change that may come.

Derris Jones: Is the current price of a COR three times the figures shown on the slide? Is there an increase or decrease in fee?

Walt Maldonado: It's a third of the current fee, so there's no change. If the program went to one year, there would be eight hours of service. One of the problems we face is what to do with the guys who are presently in the three year program, if the unit by unit management strategy passes.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the Proposed Fee Schedule for FY 2012 as presented.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

8) Predator/Prey Relationships (Informational)

-Justin Shannon, Regional Wildlife Program Manager

Both audio and visual portions of this presentation are available upon request. The audio portion has been recorded as an MP3 file. The visual portion is a PowerPoint presentation.

For a copy of both, contact Brent Stettler at brentstettler@utah.gov or 435-613-3707.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

No public in attendance

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on September 22-23 at 9 a.m. in the DNR Board Room at 1594 W. North Temple, SLC

The next southeast regional RAC meeting will take place on November 17 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell Museum in Green River

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Richfield High School
Richfield, UT
September 7, 2010
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. FISHING GUIDEBOOK AND RULE R657-13

MOTION: To accept the Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. FISHING CONTESTS AND CLINICS RULE R657-58

MOTION: To accept the Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58

VOTE: Unanimous

4. PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FY2012

MOTION: To accept the proposed fee schedule for FY2012 as presented.

VOTE: unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 September 8, 2009
 7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Steve Flinders Dell LeFevre Mack Morrell Cordell Pearson Rex Stanworth Dale Bagley Steve Dalton Clair Woodbury Layne Torgerson	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Mike Ottenbacher Mike Hadley Richard Hepworth Drew Cushing Roger Wilson Lynn Chamberlain Angela Van Scoyk Teresa Bonzo Paul Washburn Gabe Patterson Walt Donaldson	Jake Albrecht	Sam Carpenter Paul Briggs

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There was approximately 1 interested party 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 explained RAC meeting procedures.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Are we ready? Lynn said it's time to get started so let's go. Welcome everybody out tonight. I see Jake Albrecht in the audience, representing the Wildlife Board. I'm Steve Flinders, the RAC Chair; represent the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest. We'll start on my right and introduce the RAC.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell, Bicknell, agriculture.

Rex Stanworth: Rex Stanworth from Delta. I'm representing at-large.

Douglas Messerly: I'm Doug Messerly with the Division of Wildlife Resources. Myself and my staff act as executive secretary to this committee.

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

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

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

Steve Flinders: We'd like to excuse Sam and Paul. We're going to have to give Layne a little grief. We come to his neighborhood and . . . Um, turning to the agenda; any discussion about the agenda and minutes? Otherwise I'll accept a motion to approve.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I'll make the motion that we accept the minutes as given to us and accept the meeting agenda as outlined.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rex. Seconded by Mack. All those in favor of the motion? Any against? It looks unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as written. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

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

Steve Flinders: I want to update you on the Wildlife Board from the last RAC meeting and I thought it probably the most simple to read you; the pertinent motions were fairly complex, as you recall we recommended several changes.

- In terms of cougar recommendations a motion by Tom Hatch that was seconded by Jake and passed three to two, is the following: I move that we accept the Division's recommendations on the cougar guidebook and rule with the exception of the Southern Region: Increasing permits on Mt. Dutton by three, and on Monroe by four, leaving the Paunsagaunt permit numbers the same as last year. The Division will have the flexibility to remove four permits from the eco-region.
- Another motion by Tom that affects us is a motion to direct the Division to go to a Monday opener on the split units rather than a weekend.
- Everything else looks like it was as we passed it here for other rules and management plans; they were also ratified by the Wildlife Board.

Steve Flinders: So those were the two motions that are different than what we had. It's fairly similar; it looks like a compromise to what we talked about here. If you can't tell I wasn't at the Board meeting. Doug was in attendance. Do you have anything to add to that Doug?

Douglas Messerly: Nope. A lot of discussion.

Steve Flinders: Lots of discussion. Anything in the way of regional update?

Douglas Messerly: Just a couple of items.

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

- I just want to update the RAC and the public that are here, we have about 2,000 spike bull tags and about 2,400 any-bull tags remaining. Last year those tags sold out so if someone's interested in obtaining general season elk permits they better get busy because they're going pretty fast.
- In addition to that we've got a big project coming up in early October on the Virgin River. It's actually an operation aimed at establishing a barrier to migration to some of the invasive fish species that we've been trying to eradicate from the Virgin River. But in order to do that we need to treat a portion of the river first with Rotenone. And that treatment's coming up in early October. There will be efforts made to salvage the endangered fish that are down there and then we'll go forward with the treatment and then those fish will be restocked into those waters after they're not toxic any more. But it's a pretty big project for us that's coming up in early October.
- Many of the hunts are going at this point. The weather's been fairly warm and I think that's kind of kept success down in many quarters, although I am hearing of some harvest that's going on. So I think folks are out there having a good time and I think that as the fall goes on that will just continue.

Douglas Messerly: That's my regional update, unless there are any questions about any activities with the Division? Okay, thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. I'd be remiss if I didn't add a little information given a major fire in the Southern Region. This is on the north end of the Tusher Mountains of the Beaver Ranger District. It's the Twitchell Canyon fire. I've got a map up here. It changes every 12 hours as you might guess. This shows the acreage at 9,100. It's now, the perimeter itself, not all of it's black, but about 10,600 now. It stretches from Indian Creek, wraps around north and east around the Peaks over towards Kimberly now, and the head of Fish Creek. Should be a good fire in terms of stimulating aspen and turning some of that beetle-killed conifer over. We are initiating a BAER team; that stands for Burned Area Emergency Rehab. We'll look to seed some areas and try to take full advantage. We uh, you got to be careful what you wish for sometimes you get it. It is bumping private property and so we do have a type 2 incident management team here now; they're stationed in Elsinore. That's why you see the heavy helicopters, they're trying to shut that fire down around private and contain it there, but it still remains unchecked as it moves north towards Shingle Creek and in the back country and in the head of Fish Creek. If there are not any questions let's move into the agenda. We're few on public. Sure Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Is there any structures in that?

Steve Flinders: Oh yeah. Not lost yet other than it sounds like one old mining cabin, perhaps it's on Forest Service land. We're trying to get with our archeologist and see what he knew about that. There

have been a lot of engines and a lot of fuss over the structures in the Kimberly mining area on private property. And a lot of clearing out around those areas has been done in the way of prep work. There's some sprinklers set up around those and that's really why this is ramped up now to try to protect that. Those landowners aren't interested in fire on their private property and especially not around any of the structures. And so that's the priority for that fire right now. Anything else?

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman I was just going to make mention that Doug and his office had sent us that information from the Board meeting and I thought that was very helpful. I was grateful for that. So thanks Doug and you can continue that as far as I'm concerned.

Steve Flinders: Yeah we should forward Staci Coons' messages. We'll continue that to let her know to put the RAC on that mailing list. Let me briefly talk about meeting order for the few public that are here. We're going to with the Division of Wildlife presentation and then we ask you to hold your questions until after that presentation. And then we'll take public comment and ask you to fill out a comment card and get that to us. If there's nothing else let's move into agenda item number 5, Fishing Guidebook and Rule, Roger.

Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (action) 10:17 to 25:28 of 1:04:41
-Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator
(see attachment 1)

(Cordell Pearson arrived just as presentation was beginning.)
(Layne Torgerson arrived during presentation.)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Roger I'm confused on that, the net, where they throw the nets out taking the non-game fish. Are there waters where there's literally no impact to game fish as they throw their nets out?

Roger Wilson: Well they're required in rule to release game fish once they pull their nets in. They're not able to take game fish in that manner. So hopefully they can tell the difference. And we uh, you know this is again a non-commercial use. If they commercialize we issue a, or we work through a COR process to approve that.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Rex, good question. Any questions from the audience?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Jake.

Jake Albrecht: Jake Albrecht. Doug, can you comment on Kolob Reservoir, what's happened down

there the last year on that new regulation for us?

Douglas Messerly: My understanding, and I'll invite Clair Woodbury to comment on this also, he was a major player in the development of the plan and lives in that community, but my understanding is that we're getting harvest to the fish and use is up and generally people are happy with it. I haven't heard anything negative about it at this point. Clair do you have any comments on that?

Clair Woodbury: Yeah I would just echo, that's the comments that I've received from the public also, is they're ecstatic to have that open again to family use. And in talking to Richard on the gillnetting, he says it's showing no impact on loss of those trophy-sized fish that we've protected in the slot limit. So hopefully we'll uh, it will be able to sustain and keep this up.

Steve Flinders: I have a similar question for Panguitch Lake. Richard can you tell us if that, what that change has been like?

Richard Hepworth: What I'll tell you is that this year in our gillnetting this spring was some of the best fish we've ever seen in the nets up there; and our nets go back 30-40 years. And we had some fantastic looking fish; numbers were way up, size was good. Panguitch looked really good. Just really quick on Kolob, you know it's really kind of early to tell how the fishery's going to respond but the public perception, the public have been really happy with it so far. We have had a few concerns with having to let fish go inside the slot that are most likely going to die but that's part of having these kinds of regulations as well.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any other questions?

Rex Stanworth: I got one more for you Roger. Going out and camping there around Strawberry, this would have been about a month ago, so it would have been the second week of August, we went up the canyon that would be just a little bit west and south of Comanche. And that entire tributary said that there was no fishing allowed, which I was surprised because it didn't look like there was a whole lot of water. But during that time in August is there uh, or is that just a protected place all together?

Roger Wilson: Now did you say Indian Creek, is that uh?

Rex Stanworth: Well I'm not sure. It may have been Indian Creek. We were just a little bit west of Comanche marina.

Roger Wilson: Oh you mean Renegade marina.

Rex Stanworth: Renegade, yeah. Same thing. Um, and south.

Roger Wilson: I was trying to figure out where Comanche was. It was close.

Rex Stanworth: Well it is close. Okay, but all of that just had no angling allowed.

Roger Wilson: Yeah, Indian Creek is, you know this was part of a negotiated work with the Forest Service years ago when we first opened those streams. There were concerns expressed about opening at that time. And Indian Creek has always been closed. It's been kind of a spawning nursery and kind of a

refuge for spawning. You know I think it would be very appropriate to bring this up again and talk about it because the other streams are catch and release and artificials. And you could make the point what harm is there in letting a few fisherman fish with flies up there. So it's something that I actually brought up with the management personnel this year to look at that. You know they had some questions on some other streams; but we maybe ought to look at that again and see if that's an appropriate move and maybe we can bring it forward in the informational next year.

Rex Stanworth: That would be great. Okay, awesome.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I know I asked you this last year and I'll probably ask you again next year; mainly because I get a lot of feedback from my friends in Central Utah on the access to the shoreline at Strawberry; is that ever going to change where they don't have to pay their \$5.00 just to park on a state or a county road and walk down to the lake?

Roger Wilson: You're talking about the fees then not necessarily opportunities but fees?

Clair Woodbury: No, the fees that they have to, just to park their car and walk down to the shore to fish.

Roger Wilson: I don't see that changing. You know it's a, and Steve could answer this as well as I, but when you do go with a concessionaire the money that's brought in actually stay locally. And so there's an incentive for the local forest to use concessionaires. And you know that's part of the program collecting fees. And I don't know, maybe Steve, do you want to address that at all?

Steve Flinders: A short answer to concessionaires, it's a decision made on a national level and it's controversial. You know there's some that think it's too cheap; some think it's too expensive. And I don't know anything about the particular situation at Strawberry other than folks probably striving to manage a situation that at one point was deemed out of control or something.

Clair Woodbury: What they do . . . Everybody's perfectly happy you know on the launches at the boat ramps and stuff like that, but just anywhere on that lake if you walk down to the shore you have to pay a fee. And that's where they anxiety and bitterness actually are happening. A lot of people I know have just quit going.

Roger Wilson: Well I understand that and that's an issue elsewhere too; it's not just Strawberry. And that's really more of a Forest Service issue than one for us. But I've heard that expressed.

Clair Woodbury: But where we're providing a pretty darn good fishery there, we the State of Utah, I think our anglers should have access to those fish without paying a private concessionaire to walk down to the bank.

Roger Wilson: Well I understand what you're saying.

Clair Woodbury: So anyway, we'll probably hear this again next year. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: It depends how far you park and hike I guess too, right. I don't have any comment

cards.

Comments from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: So we're ready to deal with this as a RAC.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Does anybody have a motion?

Rex Stanworth: If nobody will make the gesture to go forward, I'll make the motion that we accept Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rex. I saw Cordell. All those in favor? Any opposed? It looks unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Let's move on to number 6, Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule. Roger, again.

**Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58 (action) 33:44 to 36:30 of 1:04:41
- Roger Wilson, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thanks Roger.

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: How many of those tagged fish contests are sponsored a year?

Roger Wilson: Do you have any idea Drew?

Drew Cushing: Half a dozen.

Steve Flinders: Is that right? It's not a big deal. Any questions for Roger from the RAC? Questions from the audience?

Rex Stanworth: Let me just ask Roger one here.

Steve Flinders: Sure Rex.

Rex Stanworth: In regards to the contest, are you getting any static from sportsmen that are there when these contests are going on? Has there been any flack from the public?

Roger Wilson: Are you talking general contests or tagged fish contests?

Rex Stanworth: These tagged fish contests where it's organized.

Roger Wilson: I don't believe we are. Drew, are you aware of any?

Drew Cushing: Never. Regular contests, yes, but not tagged fish contests.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? I don't have any comment cards.

Questions from the public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: So we're ready to move ahead.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: Any further RAC discussion or motion? Go ahead Clair.

Rex Stanworth: I'll make a motion that we accept the Fishing Contests Can Clinics Rule R657-58 as presented.

Steve Flinders: Thanks, I saw Layne down there as a second. All those in favor? It looks unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept the Fishing Contests and Clinics Rule R657-58 as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Roger. Let the record show the last 2 votes included Layne and Cordell. Moving on to agenda item number seven, Proposed Fee Schedule, Fiscal Year 2012, Angie.

**Proposed Fee Schedule FY2012 38:17 to 42:16 of 1:04:41
-Angela Van Scoyk, Regional Support Services Coordinator**

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Sure Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I'm still a little fuzzy on the dedicated hunter \$60.00 one year. What exactly is the purpose of that? I know it's a three-year \$180.00 program right now.

Angela Van Scoyk: Yes it is. And what they're doing is in anticipation that we may eventually go to a unit by unit hunt strategy, they're creating this one year certificate or registration rather than, some of the concern is that we will have some units that will have, by the time you take up the lifetime license holders, dedicated hunters, there won't be permits allowed for the public. So what they're doing is talking about creating a one-year certificate of registration and have the dedicated hunter process be a one-year program. Now that's not necessarily going to take place but it gives the Division that latitude should the rule and when it goes through the RAC and everything else if it heads that way.

Clair Woodbury: I guess I'm still fuzzy. On the two-year, you can take two deer in the three-year process, um...

Angela Van Scoyk: It will be a, the dedicated hunter rule, should this go into affect, should they decide to utilize this that dedicated hunter rule will have to be completely revamped to address that. And at that time that will come through here. What they're doing right now is just establishing the fees so that if in the event that we go to a hunt unit strategy then they can utilize this if they need to. Does that help?

Clair Woodbury: Okay, that will work if they change (unintelligible).

Angela Van Scoyk: Oh yeah, if they change the rule you'll get to, yeah, it will come before you, absolutely.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

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

Questions from the Public:

Steve Flinders: I see one.

Paul Niemeyer: Paul Neimeyer. I'm not sure that I still understand the dedicated deal. If you did it right now you wouldn't really put it in effect right now though, is that right?

Angela Van Scoyk: No, no, no, it just puts it on the boards. I mean we don't have, we do not have a certificate of registration that's a one-year certificate of registration. So if they opted to change the dedicated hunter rule, let's say next year to do a one-year certificate of registration, we don't have a fee on the board that we can utilize. So this is just getting it on our fee schedule so that if and when they decide to make any changes to that dedicated hunter program, should they take it from a three-year certificate of registration to a one-year, then they'll have a certificate of registration available to utilize.

Paul Niemeyer: But you won't enact it until something like that happens.

Angela Van Scoyk: Oh, no, no, no, no, no. In fact we have several fees that are currently on our fee table that we don't use. So just because it's on the fee table does not necessarily mean that it's going to be utilized. If it is going to be utilized it will be in conjunction with a rule change which will come before

you guys. Okay?

Paul Niemeyer: Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Paul. Any other questions? I don't have any comment cards.

Comments from the public:

None.

Steve Flinders: Further discussion and motion?

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: I'll make a motion that we accept as presented by DNR.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Cordell. Seconded by Rex. To approve, all those in favor? It looks unanimous.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept the proposed Fee Schedule for FY2012 as presented by DNR. Rex Stanworth seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Next in the agenda item. I need to thank Kevin for accepting to come and speak to us on short notice. This is one the heels of last month's meeting, talking about cougar depredation, cougar and bear depredation; depredation in general. Kevin, you could shed some light on what it is Wildlife Services does for the Division, we'd appreciate it. We'll try to . . .

**Wildlife Services Livestock Depredation by Cougar/Bear (informational)
-Kevin Dustin, US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Kevin Dustin, US Fish and Wildlife Service: I'll be happy to take a shot at it. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to the RAC. My name is Kevin Dustin. I'm the district supervisor for the southern half of Utah. I go into Arizona a bit and we, I cover all that country. Just a small overview of the Wildlife Services program; we are the ones that do the predator work as far as coyote work and that; with a memorandum of understand with the Division of Wildlife on cougar and bear. And I assume that's what I was to speak on more tonight. There's a big difference in how we approach our cougar problems and our bear problems compared to our everyday coyote work. We plan ahead; we do preventative control on coyotes, bear and lion is completely different. When there's losses on the mountain or in the desert, wherever they may be, we go out and we have to confirm and go and actually physically look at the kills, confirm that a bear or a lion killed it, then we can initiate work on bear and lion. On coyote work, you know like I say, we plan ahead. We have areas that meet with the Forest Service and BLM, that we work you know, year round, lion and bear are different. And so only after a kill is found and then we confirm it do we initiate control on bear and lion. And I think a lot of the folks in the public have confusion there. They think that well we're out there just hunting bear and lion but that's not the case. Right now in the district, you know I was thinking today before I came, I think there's maybe fourteen places where bears have killed that we either have equipment or are working; only maybe one to two with lions. Lions have been down for us the last quite a few years, but bears

have been on the upswing a little bit for us. That's the major difference as far as work. The other time we do bear and lion work is at the request of the Division. If there's a problem bear that they deem to be problem enough that it needs to be removed, at their request we show up and work with them to try and remove the problem animal. And that's the only other time we do bear and lion work. In that case the reason we have to go and confirm each loss with bear and lion and try to find, you know if the herded says hey I have ten up there in the bed ground, it may take, you know and it is a difficult, for those of you that spend a lot of time on the mountain, it's not flat, it's steep, there's downfall, there's brush, and when you start saying okay you found ten and I go up and I find two, or I find three and I'm looking around and after an hour I really don't want to spend my whole day trying to find these kills. Once I find one or two and I know a bear has killed then I initiate, I don't have to sit and count every one. But there is a reimbursement program that we do fill out a proof of loss forms and put down the numbers we find that are confirmed and the Division does pay on those. I think last year it might have been 100 percent, I can't remember Doug if that was . . . In years past it had reached its max and so it was prorated. It used to always seem like it was in the high 50's or low 60's that the livestock producers get reimbursed on their losses. In a nutshell that's kind of what we do with bear and lion. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have on that. Go ahead.

Steve Flinders: I appreciate it Kevin. That's a great overview. I wish Sam was here. I'm remembering some of the discussion that we had. Layne's chomping at the bit; go ahead Layne.

Questions from the RAC:

Layne Torgerson: I just have a question. Maybe this is, I'm throwing this out to the Division as well as you Kevin, is there ever a situation, and I'm speaking as a sportsman here of course, but has there ever situations where we've had a problem bear or a depredating bear where say a guy's got a fall bear tag and it's August that the Division calls somebody that's got an unused bear tag and he can go take that animal?

Kevin Dustin: There has been in the past. Did you want to answer that Doug?

Douglas Messerly: Yeah, let me hear you (unintelligible). Actually Teresa go ahead.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, if it was in August we'd probably call, and we just did this in two instances just last month, we called 2 hunters to go early. We had some bear activity up by LaBaron on the Beaver Unit and we had one on Cedar Mountain. And in those, we love to have sportsmen take those bears if possible. One of our, and if we get a visual of the bear and we see that it's going to be a descent bear that a sportsman is going to take. If it was maybe after the spring hunt we may call a spring hunter. It just kind of depends if we're going to call a spring hunter or a fall hunter. And also, the thing that we are concerned about if it is a bad bear that needs to be removed, whether it's depredating or if it's a nuisance situation where it's getting into cabins, we want to have some sort of commitment by the hunter that they're going to remove that bear. You know and if it's a small, you know, like two-year old male or something that's not very big a lot of guys aren't going to want to take that. So that's some of the problems, but we love to have the opportunity to have the sportsman help us in those circumstances.

Douglas Messerly: If I could just add to that a little bit; the thing we've found over the years Layne is although we try this as much as we can it's not very effective because the sportsman can't come until the weekend, and they can only hunt for three days and then they've got to go back to work. And if it's a

nuisance bear, what we call a category two bear, that we can harvest using this method we'll try that. And sometimes it is effective; and we do like to do that every chance we get. On the other hand if it's a category three bear that we deem to be a public safety concern we call Kevin and his crew, or my guys go and we take care of the bear. And that's, we just can't afford to wait. The other thing that we have actually had happen is we call sportsman in to take the problem bear, had them run it up a tree and decide they didn't want it. And it's pretty frustrating when that happens, so. But sometimes it works out very well. This year the two that we've authorized I don't think they've harvested but they've put some pressure on the bear and they help us in that way too.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Go ahead Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I just have one question; did you get that bear on Beaver Mountain because he was right next to my cabin, about fifty yards away?

Kevin Dustin: I didn't go up on that one there.

Cordell Pearson: I know they let a hunter go up there. I heard it was a lady. Did she kill that bear? Does anybody know?

Teresa Bonzo: Sorry Richard was. . .

Steve Flinders: Did they harvest that LeBaron bear?

Teresa Bonzo: No, not that I have heard. The period of time that the gal was authorized to hunt early, she had to report back to us. I haven't seen or heard that it's been checked in. So I'm not aware. The gal that was chasing after it early she was a Minersville gal. But we didn't hear so she didn't take it before.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, my next question, are you still trying to do something with that bear? Because that bear put a guy right in his trailer. And he was right next door to mine crawling in the back of Mike Hutchings' truck. I mean there cabins all over there; something needs to be done with this bear before it kills somebody.

Teresa Bonzo: We have not received until moments ago, when you said that, we have not received any other activity of that bear being around. So maybe we need to talk.

Steve Flinders: The fall hunt's open as of a couple of weeks ago so that bear may be getting some hunting pressure as of late.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I'll let you know.

Teresa Bonzo: Awesome.

Kevin Dustin: Just a little comment there, agreeing with Doug, it's completely the Division's call on nuisance bears and that. When it comes to livestock a lot of times it's, I feel a lot of pressure from the livestock producers because if the hunter doesn't show up the next day, and you know, he may kill again. And then if they don't catch him and they run him, so on the nuisance bears I know the Division, that's a prime opportunity for sportsman. I think it really is. On the livestock ones, I don't mean to put

my personal opinion in but it's a, that's a, it causes me, you know, I don't know it seems like it's a, I've tried to have the hunters there and a lot of them their horses aren't in shape or they're not in shape and on a bear, you know, if you don't get right there then you're going to run him all day. And so it is, it's kind of a fine line on livestock. And we do put a lot of time, but you know, and we are able to use foot snares, which the public doesn't. And that, you know, even being a hound guy I admit foot snares work better on bears, that's just how it is; if you can get him to come back. And so that's one of the tools that I think we have that truly helps us in situations with livestock; where you have something that they're coming back to and they're coming to that specific spot. And that would be different than the nuisance bears and the campground bears.

Steve Flinders: Sure Steve.

Steve Dalton: I've just got a comment Kevin; I appreciate your work last year on the coyotes out around Sandy Ranch and on the Henrys. I called twice, they showed up after we had a fresh snow and they were very successful on the coyotes. Put a big dent in them and it shows this year. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Sure Dell.

Dell LeFevre: How do we get a hold of you? Over on the Escalante desert they've probably lost 50 calves this spring to coyotes. There's a few shooters. I've got, I've probably got fifteen, twenty bobtailed ones and chewed up ones that lived.

Kevin Dustin: Are you down below Escalante (unintelligible) 50?

Dell LeFevre: I'm right out of Escalante, and then I go up the backside of the 50 all the way to Page. And there, there are no rabbits and them old gals that are having their pups, and the cows was weak and we was feeding on the range this year and they really hammered us.

Kevin Dustin: I can give you phone numbers. I can give you my number.

Dell LeFevre: I appreciate it. Because that's in the monument, can you work in the monument?

Kevin Dustin: I was just going to say, I meet every year with the monument and they've been really good the last, you know, little bit. There's, I can't remember the fellow's name right now but they've been great to work with. And that is a place though, once we're, we kind of need to have a, not a kill but we need to have problems. And then we can go to them and say there's problems we have to work there because the monument is, it's kind of treated more as a park. And we're the only people in the state that can't go there and call a coyote. You know everybody else in the state can go there and blow their call and shoot all they want but we can't. And so when you . . .

Dell LeFevre: They shot quite a few of them this spring but they was only getting the county bounty out of them so they weren't really wild about it.

Kevin Dustin: Well we used to, you know I can get the plane down on that. We used to fly that every year. I've been right on your place and used to spend quite a lot of time there.

Dell LeFevre: We're missing you; we want you back.

Kevin Dustin: Thanks. Well yeah and just, I can get with you right after this is over and get you numbers.

Steve Flinders: Good question. Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I guess he even answered my question. I was wondering a private citizen with problems; they contact you direct or do they go through the Division or through the Forest Service? How does that process work?

Kevin Dustin: Most all the livestock people know us and know who to call because it's kind of a year round thing, you're always dealing with the predators. If you're talking about, not depredation but more nuisances, you know breaking into the cab of your truck, then you'd call the Division. And if you called me I'd have you call them because that would be up to them on how to treat that bear, lion or whatever it may be. If it's coyotes you can call me because we do that kind of everywhere.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, I've got one more, it's not for you but it's for the Division. What recourse does a person have when you have a cabin and a bear comes in there? Can you shoot it? Can't you shoot it? Do we have to call you; or does it have to kill somebody first so we can shoot it?

Douglas Messerly: There were I think about 7 to 10 instances last year statewide where people took matters into their own hand and killed the bear. I'm not aware of any there were prosecuted; if that answers your question. Currently it's not provided in the law that you can, that a person can legally take an animal that they feel threatened by. Actually there's a proposal in the works that I think you'll see shortly that corrects that. But the way it is right now, just like any crime it's the job of the investigative agency to collect the facts and present those to a prosecutor to be screened for potential prosecution. In my career of some twenty-five years, I've never seen anyone prosecuted for a legitimate self-defense taking of a cougar or a bear and some also not so legitimate were also not prosecuted in my opinion. But in any event the courts and the prosecutors have been very liberal about that. In terms of what recourse you have there's no, there are no provisions or funds for reimbursing people for damage to personal property and it runs the gamut from vehicles, to ATV's, to cabins, to food, to dog food, to bird feeders, etc, etc, etc. You know what we will ask you to do if you report those sorts of problems to us is we'll show up and we'll ask you to clean up the attractant to try and keep from attracting the bears into your area. And that's our first line of recourse. We actually have a policy that's pretty detailed in regard to what we're supposed to do and what we do do in terms of handling nuisance bears; and I'll send you a copy of the Cordell. And it's something that actually runs through this committee occasionally, and has run through this committee, the one that we're currently operating under. But it talks specifically about how we deal with nuisance bears. And in a nutshell what we do is we take the reported actions of the bear and things that we can observe ourselves and we categorize the behavior into one of three categories: category one, two or three. Category one bears we talk to the people that have been affected. We ask them to clean up the attractant, do whatever it is, stop doing whatever it is they're doing that's attracting the bear to their place; and warn them and educate them about the fact that the bears live there. A category two bear s a repeat offender. It really hasn't done anything serious but they're a real nuisance. And in those cases and in some areas of the state they move the bears. In the southern region, generally what we do is we either make arrangements for sportsman to come harvest the bear whenever

that's possible, we'll attempt hazing to some extent, but again, mostly about removing the attractant and educating the public. A category three bear is a bear that's displayed aggressive behavior or seems to have lost its fear of humans. We just don't mess around with those bears. And we go to a lot of effort to remove that bear lethally and take it out of the picture. The bear at LaBaron, as far as we know, is a category two bear, what's been reported to us. It's a nuisance bear; we've authorized a hunter to take it. If it's done something more serious than that, if it's done significant property damage or displayed aggressive behavior, we rely on the public to inform us about what's going on. Brent Farnsworth has spent a lot of time working on that bear and I believe contacting cabin owners in the area to let them know what's going on, help remove the attractants and provide a contact point for them. So we need more information if the bear's doing activity we're not aware of.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. Any other questions? It's been a good discussion with Kevin.

Douglas Messerly: I'd just like to publicly thank Kevin, not only for his appearance here tonight but the good work that we do together in my opinion. He's always responsive to us. He's very helpful when we need to take one of these bears out or cougars out for that reason, or for that matter. And I appreciate the relationship we have with Kevin and his crew. And the communication is really good right now I think. And you know I think between the two agencies we can take care of most of the problem animals that come up. It's a big country for both of us and there's lots of canyons to cover, as you know Dell. If you'll communicate with us together I think we can help you with the problems to the best of our resources and abilities anyway.

Steve Flinders: Nice wrap up. Thanks Doug. I don't have any other business.

Questions from the public:

None.

Comments from the public:

None.

Comments from the RAC:

None.

Other Business (contingent)

-Steve Flinders, Chairman

None.

Steve Flinders: If anybody else has anything further I'll take a motion to adjourn.

Dell LeFevre: I'll make it.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Dell. Next meeting's November 2nd in Beaver, Bucks Bulls and Once In A Lifetime CWMU'S. Are we voting on the going home? That's unanimous. Always.

Dell LeFevre made the motion to adjourn. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm