

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
165 S 700 E, Springville
November 10, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as transcribed
Passed unanimously

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed unanimously

Statewide Deer Management Plan

MOTION: To accept option two as presented
Motion dies for lack of second
MOTION: To accept option one as presented
Passed 10 to 1

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline

MOTION: To accept as presented
Passed unanimously

CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011

MOTION: To accept as presented
Passed unanimously

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011

MOTION: To accept as presented
Passed unanimously

Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game amendment

Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule amendment

Depredation Policy amendment

MOTION: To accept the rule and policy amendments as presented
Passed unanimously

Other Business

MOTION: To change the trap check rule from 48 hours to 7 days for coyotes
Passed 8 to 2 with 1 abstention

MOTION: That a study is conducted to determine the impact of elk on mule deer
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Junior High School
165 S 700 E, Springville
November 10, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

John Bair, Sportsmen
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Michael Gates, BLM
Byron Gunderson, At Large
Richard Hansen, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Doug Jones, Forest Service
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Allan Stevens, At Large

Members Absent

Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Others Present

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board Chair
Ernie Perkins, Wildlife Board Vice Chair

1) **Approval of the September 14, 2010 minutes (Action)**

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the minutes as transcribed

Seconded by Matt Clark

Motion passed unanimously

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

VOTING

Motion was made by Gary Nielson to accept the agenda as written

Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald

Motion passed unanimously

3) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

4) **Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment (Action)**

- **Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

John Bair – If a unit is right on the verge of 18 bucks per 100 does and then it takes a nose dive is there any kind of a safety valve there that you can step in before the three year average drops?

Anis Aoude – If you are at 18 and then have one year that is five the three year average will drop below 18.

John Bair – On option one you are talking about a 7,000 permit cut. What regions and how would we divvy that up?

Anis Aoude – You would look at the regions and what the buck to doe ratio is and then cut them. The way it looks now it would probably be the northern, northeastern and possibly central that would have cuts in permits. That also includes the three units we would be pulling out of the cap.

John Bair – Do you think we saved a few deer this year with the shortened season and bad weather?

Anis Aoude – It is too early to tell.

Richard Hansen – When you calculate the buck to doe ratio is that a post season ratio? Is there any assumption that half of the surviving fawns are going to be bucks?

Anis Aoude – No.

Richard Hansen – So those are hard horned bucks.

Anis Aoude – Those are bucks that we actually see.

Allan Stevens – We are only two years into the management plan. We had a working group that worked for a long time on this process. I am wondering who has introduced all these new proposals. What good is a five year management plan?

Anis Aoude – Direction was given to us by the wildlife board to look at tweaking the plan. Of course no plan is perfect. We tried to put together the best plan we could when we met as a group but through input that the wildlife board received they felt that it needed some modifications.

One of the options they asked us to come up with is unit by unit and the other two are options the Division came up with as alternatives.

Allan Stevens – So did the wildlife board even recommend that we have another deer working group like we did before.

Anis Aoude – No.

Allan Stevens – So basically the wildlife board has ignored the five-year management plan process.

Anis Aoude – I think they are pleased with the majority of the plan. There were some things they would like to see changed and they didn't want to have a whole committee do that again.

Byron Gunderson – Fred said you would give us a run down of the result of a three point or better rule and why that was not given consideration. Could you do that please?

Anis Aoude – Certainly. Basically the idea and use of three point or better has been around since probably the late '70s. Utah tried it for almost nine years. We had it on some units. We did an exhaustive study for the last five years we had three point or better. I forwarded that information to the RAC. Basically what it said was it is a total and utter failure. What it did is shifted the hunting pressure, because we did not decrease permits. You had the same number of people and the only thing they couldn't shoot was a yearling. So it shifted the hunting pressure from that yearling class, which is the most numerous in the population, to the older age class. You ended up harvesting the majority of the older bucks in the population. Basically the only thing left was a yearling. Most are three points when they are two years old and most were shot as two year olds. All you are doing is delaying the inevitable one year. It hindered the hunters from being able to shoot the most numerous numbers of bucks. It is actually a good thing to shoot yearlings and get them out of the population because they have the lowest survival rate from year one to year two. Biologically it was a bad idea. Not only did Utah try it but every western state tried it around that same era and every western state has gone away from it. Law enforcement wise it was a disaster as well. Many, many yearling bucks were killed and left in the field because they were illegal. Biologist and conservation officer used to be a double duty back then the older biologists will tell you horror stories about filling the backs of pickups with two points that were left in the field. I don't know why we would want to bring back something that so utterly failed; not only for Utah, but every other western state just because the perception is that if you let a deer grow from a one year old to a two year old you will have more bucks in the population. Without reducing the number of permits hunter success did decrease a little but not a lot. You ended up

saving that yearling class but killing everything else. It does not make sense biologically. You actually kill the animals you want to be around to breed instead of killing the yearlings that most does will not breed with.

Fred Oswald – Could you also comment on why you chose not to present as an option the closing statewide of the deer hunt for one or more years.

Anis Aoude – Again we are talking buck hunting when we talk hunting in Utah because that is the only thing we harvest except for a few exceptions on depredation issues and things like that. When you are only hunting bucks the only thing you save when you close a hunt is bucks. By saving bucks when many of our ranges are limiting in habitat you basically leave those bucks to compete with does who are trying to rear fawns. You are actually reducing your reproductive rate. If you want to grow herds you should kill as many bucks as you can every year, only leaving enough to reproduce. That maximizes growth of a herd. On general season units we are trying to maximize herd growth so we can maximize opportunity. You manage differently for general season than you do on limited entry because you are not trying to maximize the number of deer being produced. That is the biological basis for not closing a unit. All it does is save bucks. It does not grow the herd. I have heard that I don't know how many times. It is counterintuitive because people think if you don't kill something the herd is going to grow but it is actually contrary to that. Every buck you don't kill is competing with a doe.

John Bair – That would only apply if we are at carrying capacity.

Anis Aoude – I think we are at carrying capacity.

John Bair – Then why is our objective way more than what the population is now?

Anis Aoude – The objectives were not set biologically. We are still trying to catch up to those. We have never been at 425,000 since the early '90s. We have been right around 300,000 since 1993. When a population hovers around a place that is carrying capacity. Any person who has ever done any kind of biological education will tell you that. We do have objectives that are higher than that. It doesn't mean the carrying capacity is higher than that. If something is limiting it is usually habitat. That is what is happening with our deer herd. I agree with you, we have objectives that are higher than what we have populations and hopefully with all the habitat work we are doing we could raise that carrying capacity but to be honest with you I don't think the carrying capacity is any higher than the population we have today.

Matt Clark – In option two, if you were to cut permits and also have 29 units, who bears the cost of implementing that? You are going to cut tags but also need additional resources to manage that.

Anis Aoude – Likely we would have to raise permit costs.

Matt Clark – What additional resources would you need under option two.

Anis Aoude – If we cut 13,000 permits that is roughly 750 to 800,000 dollars that we currently use to manage the resource. That is basically four or five biologists.

Richard Hansen – You are saying we are at carrying capacity and the population objectives are not what they should be.

Anis Aoude – Correct.

Richard Hansen – Me and a lot of other people have looked at the graph and we have watched the deer herd decline in the west since poison bait was banned. Now we have another factor involved. It is not just available browse but it is how many animals predators are taking out of the population. What could survive with that pressure? Why are we not trying to find out what those population numbers should be?

Anis Aoude – We are. Here is where it gets sticky. It's hard in any venue to sit down with sportsman and tell them we should have less deer. That is not a very popular thing to put out there. In all honesty we are probably where we need to be as far as carrying capacity. We would like to grow the herds to where our objectives are but it's going to take better and more habitat and some precipitation as well. I agree with you predators are a part of the equation. When we calculate our annual survival predation and everything is calculated in. Our survival

rates right now for does are no different than they were when we had predator control. About 85 percent of our adult does survive, maybe even higher in some areas.

Richard Hansen – Why are our fawn survival rates so much lower now?

Anis Aoude – They are not. The production is lower but the survival rate is similar to what you saw back then and what you see in other states.

Richard Hansen – Why?

Anis Aoude – Habitat related. When you are at carrying capacity your production goes down. It is basic biology.

Richard Hansen – I can kind of agree with you in some areas where there is a lot of encroachment. There are some places in southern Utah where that is not the problem.

Anis Aoude – Places in southern Utah have a summer range limitation not a winter range limitation. You get the whole gamete in Utah. You have units that are summer range limited that have low production but high survival and you have areas that are winter range limited that have high production but low survival in hard winters. We have to look at the whole thing and not just one thing at a time. I agree with you that it does vary but overall the biggest limiting factor to mule deer growth is habitat, second is predation and then third is probably highway mortality and so on and so forth. There are a lot of factors. It is not one thing. I think the biggest factor is habitat quality. That has been proven throughout the west. Mule deer herds are declining not only in Utah but throughout the west.

Richard Hansen – So what you are saying is hunters and sportsman shouldn't expect it's going to ever get any better.

Anis Aoude – We are doing hundreds of thousands of habitat treatments every year but those won't pay dividends for ten to fifteen years down the road. These are browse species you are talking about that are long lived. The projects we are doing today are for the future of the deer herds and hopefully in the long term we will have more deer. We are not going to have more deer if we hunt fewer bucks or manage unit by unit. Those are things to do socially so people can see and hunt more bucks. Basically they are not doing anything to increase the deer herds.

Fred Oswald – RAC members, we need to avoid these one on one dialogs with Anis. Let's go ahead with questions on his presentation.

Byron Gunderson – You said Utah's deer herd was in the 400,000s in the '90s.

Anis Aoude – No, I said it has been around 300,000 since 1993.

Byron Gunderson – So before then it was bigger. Since that time we have watched Utah's elk herd grow significantly. Is there an impact to the deer winter range by elk? Maybe we might think about decreasing elk in some areas to increase the number of deer.

Anis Aoude – That is a million dollar question and nobody can really give you a straight answer on that. There are areas where elk may be affecting mule deer. There are areas in the west where there are no elk but mule deer are still declining. There is not a straight correlation. There is really no good research out there that says elk directly compete with deer. We have all seen it and in some cases they probably do but to say across the board to say that is true probably isn't true.

Questions from the Public

DeLoss Christensen – Do you know if there are any board members here tonight.

Fred Oswald – You must have come in late but there are two board members here.

DeLoss Christensen – Would you allow them to respond to my question?

Fred Oswald – The questions that you have ought to be directed at the presentation. If you have questions for the board members I would suggest that you go to the board meeting on the second of December.

DeLoss Christensen – The question I have then, Anis is ... I was the individual who wrote the presentation that you asked about sir (Allan Stevens) as to why we are here tonight after the five

year plan was put in place. Myself and a group of concerned citizens stood next to you last year at the southern RAC and the southeastern RAC and that is why we are here. At that meeting panel there was never a question in our mind about hunting. The reason we approached the RACs last year to get it to the board was to allow the board to review whether or not we needed to do something to improve our deer herds. My question tonight is when did the Division and who in the Division changed the request that I believe the board made to you to turn this year's conversation into a discussion over hunt management versus the health and recovery of a sick deer herd. When did that happen and whose watch was it that made the choice to do that?

Anis Aoude – Our specific directions were to look at unit by unit as one option ...

DeLoss – Option for what?

Anis Aoude – Option for changing hunting recommendations.

DeLoss Christensen – No sir, that was never our request. Not one word about hunting. Only about the health and viability of the deer herd. Secondly you said there was no committee formed. My understanding is that the board asked for another committee to study this issue last year. We will have to review the board minutes but you folks have done a masterful job of turning this into an issue of hunting rather than the concern that we brought to the board last year over the health of deer not the harvest of deer.

Fred Oswald – Let me interrupt here. I understand your question and I can appreciate you asking it but indeed you are correct that question should not be asked to the Division, it should be asked to the board.

DeLoss Christensen – It is the presentation that was made because that is why this issue has been brought before the RAC.

Fred Oswald – I understand what you are saying. Please understand what I am saying. The Division is here tonight because the wildlife board asked them to be here. If you have a concern about that this is not the venue to ask that question. Go to the wildlife board on the second of December and ask them why the Division is here tonight. Don't ask the Division. They are here tonight because the board asked them to be here.

DeLoss Christensen – But the Division knows whether or not I am asking a valid question.

Fred Oswald – I am telling you the Division is here tonight because the board asked them to. The answer to your question is to go to the board meeting and ask the board.

DeLoss Christensen – May I ask you to pass a handout to your RAC members.

Fred Oswald – I will.

Charles Sipes – We are talking about permits based off a baseline. Those change every year so we already see fluctuations in permits. Are these permits decreases in addition to what we already see on an annual basis or are these semi-permanent changes.

Anis Aoude – To maintain 18 bucks to 100 does they are almost permanent. That is the permit cut it would take from current numbers to maintain the buck to doe ratio.

Charles Sipes – We talked about a three point or better area, however we manage our elk herds with spike only units.

Anis Aoude – That is the opposite of three point or better.

Charles Sipes – You are telling us there are more mature bucks being harvested in the three point or better areas yet our mature bull elk are being held out by maintaining a spike only unit. Why would we not manage our deer herds similar to that?

Anis Aoude – We harvest spikes and then they are not harvested again until they are mature bulls with a limited number of permits. That is totally the opposite of three point or better. With three point or better you are saving the yearling and harvesting every other older animal. It gets you the opposite result.

Charles Sipes – That is what I am asking you is why is that not a considered option?

Anis Aoude – Because elk are a long lived species. They can live into their teens, mule deer cannot. One bad winter could wipe out a whole cohort of mule deer. With elk you can stock pile bulls, with mule deer you cannot stock pile bucks.

Brian Robbins – Clarification on option two. For archery when would statewide or unit be decided?

Anis Aoude – The board would probably like to see unit by unit, that is the direction they gave us. It is possible to be statewide. Our preferred option would be statewide. That would be decided December second.

Brian Robbins – Would there still be extended archery units?

Anis Aoude – It would probably remain for any archery hunters with an archery tag. During the regular season you would probably have to have that permit but for the extended part likely all archery hunters would be able to hunt it.

Richard Stevens – You mentioned you would have a reduction in hunt permits. Is this through all hunters or is this just another ding to the rifle hunters?

Anis Aoude – It depends on the option. The first option it would be all in rifle or muzzleloader because there would be a separate cap for archers. The reason for that is that it took a long time to get that many archery hunters out there. It took a lot of incentives. Their harvest rates are a lot lower than those of rifle and muzzleloader hunters. We don't want to lose archers. We can have those permits out there and have less of an effect on the resources. Under option one and three it would likely come out of rifle and muzzleloader. Under option two it would likely be across the board.

Richard Stevens – How do you know what the doe and fawn survival is if you don't count them?

Anis Aoude – We have hundreds of collars out on seven units statewide where we monitor both doe and fawn survival.

Brett Ogden – I listened to the pod cast before I came and have a couple questions. When taking the 7,000 the 3,000 and the 13,000 reductions was the option considered of cutting rifle permits and increasing archery permits because harvest success rates are so much lower? There are some areas in northern where success rates are as low as five percent

Anis Aoude – Where is there a five percent success rate? I think the lowest is 25.

Brett Ogden – Raft Rivers for archery hunters. It is a fact that archery hunters have lower success rates. Why not take some of those tags and give them to archery hunters instead of eliminating them completely.

Anis Aoude – Basically we don't do it because we have more rifle and muzzleloader hunters than we have archery. We need to cater to that constituency as well. That is why we have a set number of archery permits, and we would like not to go below that. But as you saw there is a push to go below that. Still the majority of hunters are rifle and muzzleloader hunters.

Scott Newman – You are talking about building herds but what I see in the north in the soapstone area where the deer were actually harvested twice this year because of the buck and bull combo. Deer were taken during the general hunt and also the archery and everything else. If this is about the herds you are doubling up with the buck bull combo, I don't understand.

Anis Aoude – The buck bull combo is not doubling up. We took 2,000 permits out of the northern region cap and moved the hunt in time. Basically the same number of bucks are going to get killed but 2,000 of them are being killed at a different time. We have had it for at least three years now.

Ryan Ellis – If we do option two and archery goes to unit by unit will we have some archery only units and will we have some late archery units besides the Wasatch front?

Anis Aoude – The current extended archery units would probably remain in place. You would have not additional archery units. It would basically be the same seasons.

Dave Woodhouse – I need a clarification Anis because I think the wildlife board did ask you to get the mule deer committee back together last winter and you didn't. I was wondering why you changed your mind. I have your emails that said we were supposed to meet again and it got brushed under the carpet.

Anis Aoude – It didn't get brushed under the carpet. The board asked us to come up with a unit by unit recommendation and run it by the committee but we were given until 2012 to do so. That was fast tracked in the last board meeting that we had. Basically they told us in two weeks put a unit by unit recommendation together and take it out at the next RAC meeting. There was no time to convene any committee or get any input.

Dave Woodhouse – Yes, there was. I got the email from you that we were going to meet last spring and that was canceled and you said we would set a later date.

Anis Aoude – Right, because initially we were given until 2012 to implement unit by unit but it was fast tracked about a month ago at a board meeting. The hunt structure was put aside and they said you will take out unit by unit and whatever other options you want to take out.

Don Peay – Thank you for some information you got us on the fawn survival and the adult survival study in seven parts of the state. Obviously people are here because they are concerned about hunting bucks which is correlated to how many does and fawns survive. Could you add that to the next RAC meeting to show the data of survival to help them understand you are trying to solve this?

Anis Aoude – I was waiting to get a full year worth of data before we presented that because that is really when it is meaningful. We captured in December and we will get a full year this December and then we will present it to the public.

Don Peay – If you have 100 fawns per 100 does at birth come fall when you captured last year you had approximately 60 fawns per 100 does and of those 60 fawns 60 percent survived so you basically have 36 fawns per 100 does surviving and 40 fawns per 100 does is basically a break even.

Anis Aoude – 45 post season so actually it is a lot lower than that to break even.

Don Peay – Regarding habitat, we gave up hunting deer in Utah and went to Nebraska to hunt pheasants and seen a whole bunch of mule deer in Nebraska and there is not a sage brush plant. We saw a whole bunch of deer in eastern Wyoming on the agriculture land and there is not a lot of sage brush. Why can they survive there?

Anis Aoude – They certainly can but there are a lot lower densities.

Don Peay – There were very high densities in Nebraska.

Anis Aoude – Right where you saw them but over the landscape there are a lot lower densities.

Tony Abbott – Inside the outdoors radio show – This has been a hot topic. Most of the questions were answered but I do have a few. So biologically this has nothing to do with our deer herds. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude – It won't affect the biology.

Tony Abbott – So this is strictly social to get more bigger bucks. What economical impacts will cutting 3,000 to 13,000 deer hunters out have as far as hotel nights, gas, and food across the board? Has that been discussed?

Anis Aoude – No.

Tony Abbott – Once you take something away you usually don't give it back. If we cut 3 to 13,000 deer hunters do you see us ever getting them back?

Anis Aoude – Under one scenario, if we get the population levels up.

Tony Abbott – You think we are at carrying capacity now. If we cut 3 to 13,000 out are we going to get those back?

Anis Aoude – If we raise carrying capacity, yes.

Gordy Bell – Going back to the hunt structure plan, can you go over what the result would be versus the 29 units as far as hunter density and how that is controlled?

Anis Aoude – Both of those deal with social issues more than biological. That one separates hunters in time and space where this one just cuts permits. It is splitting the pie differently.

Jason Binder – How many general deer tags are we currently selling in the state?

Anis Aoude – 94,000.

Jason Binder – In option one, two and three why are there so few cuts?

Anis Aoude – That is all it would take to get to 18 bucks 100s does.

David Hanson – What is the definition of a buck, a doe and a fawn?

Anis Aoude – A buck is any yearling and older, anything antlered. A doe is an adult doe a fawn is a fawn.

David Hanson – So when you do your buck to doe counts you are not including the fawns in that count.

Anis Aoude – We do a fawn to doe count as well.

David Hanson – So when we look at the number of bucks per does that is not including the fawns?

Anis Aoude – No, adult does.

David Hanson – You are determining the number of bucks, does and fawns through aerial observations, driving?

Anis Aoude – Ground observations.

David Hanson – So people are actually out there observing them at different times? And that is done by management unit?

Anis Aoude – Correct.

Mike Christensen – Is the Division already managing the deer herd on a unit by unit basis overall?

Anis Aoude – Yes, we collect the data on a unit by unit basis but we hunt on a regional basis.

Mike Christensen – So the doe herd is managed on a unit by unit basis. So if you have a high density of does in a small unit like say Panguitch Lake you could target those animals with an antlerless hunt. So the Division is already managing unit by unit. The regional hunting of bucks, are those bucks managed unit by unit also?

Anis Aoude – Yes, data is collected on a unit by unit basis as well.

Mike Christensen – So under the current regional format are those units meeting the buck to doe objectives set by the wildlife board?

Anis Aoude – The majority are.

Mike Christensen – All but the three chronically struggling units.

Anis Aoude – Correct.

Mike Christensen – On September 26 when the wildlife board met and had their mule deer working group I watched as the board gave direction to the Division to present the option one and option two, correct.

Anis Aoude – Yes.

Aaron Anderson – If an area is below 12 bucks per 100 does you said they would be pulled out of the general season hunt. Are they closed or will there be a separate draw?

Anis Aoude – They won't be closed but they will be under a separate draw.

Bryce Ballantyne – I think we all agree something needs to be done with our deer herds. The youth are given extra special privileges to hunt all three seasons and then this year they got to hunt longer. Would taking away some of those privileges take care of part of the problem?

Anis Aoude – No, because they still harvest less than most adults do. The harvest rate is no higher by giving them the extra days.

Bryce Ballantyne – How does that work because there are multiple youth in my family and they killed multiple bucks in that three day period.

Anis Aoude – What I am saying is a youth tag is still just one tag. Even if they harvest at the same rate as an adult it is no more bucks killed, or less. If you cut the youth out we are cutting permits so what is the difference?

Bryce Ballantyne – If you put in for a rifle permit you only get to hunt the rifle hunt. The youth can hunt from August until the middle of October until they harvest so you almost ensure they kill. I think that is hurting our deer herds.

Anis Aoude – I guess I would disagree with you because the statistics show they are not.

Michael Anderson – Why do use three year averages instead of one year?

Anis Aoude – The reason we use three year average is to moderate the change. If you do annual you are always moving the target. In biological systems there will always be years where you are above or below. By using a three year average it keeps you on an even kill and you are not always increasing or decreasing permits.

Courtney Sim – You are here under the direction of the wildlife board and something has encouraged them to respond to a perceived need or want. Is the Division prepared to respond just as quickly and effectively if the board goes in another direction?

Anis Aoude – The board is the decision making entity. We recommend and collect the data but we are not a decision making body so we do what the wildlife board tells us to do.

Courtney Sim – I believe that as hunters we realize and if we don't take care of the health and viability of our deer herds hunting is in jeopardy. I am not sure that any of these options will remedy the problem we really have.

Ken Strong – You have always talked about managing the deer herd by buck to doe ratio and you mentioned that 300,000 deer is probably what we will stay at because of habitat. Why don't we in some areas use not only buck to doe ratios but numbers of deer?

Anis Aoude – The reason we manage by buck to doe ratios is because we are hunting bucks. That is the best measure to try to figure out how many you need to harvest. It does tie back to the population. If you have a smaller population with the same buck to doe ratio and you put too many permits on you will decrease the buck to doe ratio. Buck to doe is a very good surrogate for the population size especially when you are hunting buck only.

Comments from the Public

Jeremy Anderson – Eagle Mountain – I am a Utah sportsman and a representative of the Mule Deer Foundation. The mission of MDF is to ensure the conservation of mule deer, black tailed deer and their habitat. With their national headquarters based in Salt Lake City MDF has received numerous calls from our Utah members and have expressed an opinion in options being presented to change the Utah deer management plan. The main message is Utah needs more deer. In 2008 MDF was invited to participate in the Utah statewide mule deer management committee along with other local conservation groups. This group spent countless hours coming up with the best possible plan to manage the Utah deer population. This plan to effect at the beginning of 2009 and it is the current mule deer management plan. Since the wildlife board action has asked us to take action on one of the three options, and if this action is required, Mule Deer Foundation believes that option one best reflects the objectives outlined in the Utah statewide deer management committee. After the 2010 deer hunt MDF received many complaints about the lack of deer during the hunt. While the recommendation attempts to reduce hunter pressure and improve buck to doe ratios they do little to help the overall population of mule deer. MDF is a partner in the Utah Watershed Initiative which funds habitat projects through the state for mule

deer and other wildlife. MDF believes that after ten years of intensive habitat work the overall mule deer populations are still in decline. We recommend that the Division look at the causes for this continued decline. While we believe our main focus should be on habitat other factors such as predators and highway mortality keep deer populations at historic low levels. We need to get more aggressive and more creative in coming up with ways to address these issues and we need to do it soon. MDF believes increase the overall mule deer population will result in more bucks which in turn results in higher buck to doe ratios. Since MDF believes that option one best reflects the current deer plan but allows for some changes to help improve the plan we strongly encourage the RAC to support option number one.

Ben Lowder – Utah Bowman’s Association – Thank you for your service. Concerning the deer proposal UBA supports the Division’s preferred option, option one. We recognize that none of these options will increase the deer herd, however we believe that option one increases quality hunters have been asking for. It also continues to provide reasonable opportunity for the majority of Utah’s deer hunters that enjoy and want to see that continued. There are several other benefits; it gives the ability to the Division to restrict numbers of hunters in under objective units. The past effort of shortened seasons hasn’t worked. This is a better option to control the numbers of hunters. We like the idea that when these units recover they will be able to come back into the region and be hunted on a region wide basis. Another benefit of option one is the dedicated hunter program. We recognize the importance and the value of the dedicated hunter program and we don’t want to see man hours lost. The thousands of hours of free labor are worth millions of dollars to the Division. Option one allows archery hunters to continue to hunt statewide. As was determined in the archery committee last year there is no reason to disallow statewide archery hunting. A lot of families continue to participate in a traditional family hunt. When we went to five regions a lot of people said that destroyed family hunting yet a lot of people are still able to continue that tradition. If we split the state into 29 units we believe that would destroy the family hunting tradition that has been going on for decades in the State of Utah. Again, UBA supports option one and we would encourage the RAC to adopt that.

Michael Anderson – Vice President for Bow Hunters of Utah – I want to thank the RAC tonight and also want to extend some appreciation to the wildlife board understanding that the board needs to deal with many issues. I was a member of the mule deer committee which consisted of 20 some odd members. Many different groups were represented from all over the state. We worked many hours and worked with the benefit of the advice of biologists who were present and over 150 pages of documentation dealing directly with mule deer. It is somewhat of a surprise, understanding that mule deer is a very dynamic population, that within a year the wildlife board came in with changes to the mule deer committees plans by shortening the hunts. A year later without the benefit of the result of the shortened season they are still coming on with more changes. That five year plan isn’t even three years old yet. BOU wants to remind you of a survey that was conducted prior to the mule deer committee meetings that showed overwhelmingly that hunters want to hunt. If we can kill a deer that is great but bottom line is we want to hunt. Option two is a minor tweak to the plan, some would say, but it is a major overhaul really. We have no evidence that we are not at carrying capacity. I would love to see some evidence that says if we have more bucks we will have more does and fawns. We have to decide do we want to raise healthy herds or do we want to kill trophy bucks. That is what we are talking about here is the size of antlers not the number of bucks. If the population goes down, the population of bucks goes down as well. We want the RAC to support the current statewide plan or the option that most closely resembles that plan, option one. We believe the original plan was good. The original plan called for adjustments to be made in those units where there was a problem with the buck to doe ratios. The Division has identified three units and we support taking the actions necessary to bring those buck to doe ratios to a healthy ratio. We want to point out that unit management, hunter management, has been tried. This is not a new idea. The 2008

post season buck to doe ration was given of 31 bucks to 100 does in Nevada. That sounds great. This may be good news to those applicants in Nevada who were able to draw permits however it is also a liability because according to the Nevada biologists with so many bucks in the population they are directly competing with does and fawns for limited quality forage and thermal cover on winter range and they are likely contributing to decreased body conditions in both the does and fawns. That information is on the states web site. In the past 15 years Nevada's deer herd has gone from 125,000 to just 100,000 so obviously unit management has not helped Nevada grow more deer. Why is it going to help Utah? BOU asks you to support UDWR in their plan. Regional hunting with three units placed in micro status as is required for the preservation of a healthy buck to doe ration.

Gene Isom – Thank you. One of the items in my family and friends is the five day hunt that really injured our future desires to hunt in Utah. That is a great proposal. I hope that it continues so we can keep some of our family traditions. I am not sure how it is done in the central area when there is an area with too many deer but instead of professional shooters like in Bountiful I ask you please consider letting hunters take care of the shooting of those does. I don't know if this is in the city but you should have a special hunt for the hunters to keep the deer down in problem areas.

Jason Binder – I like to hunt deer as much as anybody. I don't think we are cutting the deer tags enough. For anybody over 18 we ought to cut the deer tags in half. Let the younger generation hunt. We are obviously going to kill the deer off in this state and we might as well let the youth do it. The deer are not there. If we are not going to protect the whole population then we might as well let the kids hunt and take the deer.

Richard Stevens – Looking at these proposals I wonder how much of it is political and how much biological. I have a real problem with your counts. Many of your own biologists have no faith in buck to doe ratios. As far as management of habitat, I have been with the Division for 34 years and worked with all the western states in habitat. On the west Manti there is no habitat problem. If we have a habitat problem on the west Manti with 300 deer something is wrong. We talk about habitat improvement. I spent my whole career in habitat improvement and I question some of the things that we did. As I look at the new habitat projects I see three things that are accomplished by them. Watershed and provide grass for cow and elk. Many projects I have been associated with have destroyed deer habitat. I really question some of the habitat projects. As far as the proposal I would go with one or three it doesn't make a difference.

Michael Christensen – I am a member of the mule deer committee. We met in 2008, we saw the data. The committee as a whole is represented by every sportsman's group you are going to hear here tonight. There was no real dissention when we left micro management out because the data shows that under the current regional management we are meeting the buck to doe ratios and objectives. There was no need to micro manage because we are already micro managing our herd overall. We can implement predator control, doe harvest and other things. I would ask you to support option one because it follows the deer management plan that was passed just last year. Micro management will not grow more bucks. Only cutting hunter numbers will grow more bucks. You are cutting hunter opportunity on units that already meet buck to doe objectives. Many people will claim that our surrounding states have better hunting. Nevada has lesser units and it takes their residents three to eight years to draw. They have a 40 to 50 percent success rate. Of those who are successful 40 to 50 percent harvest a four point buck. People in Nevada are having to wait three to eight years for a 20 to 25 percent chance at harvesting a four point buck. Currently in the southern region it is a three year wait to draw. They have a 40 percent success rate. If you go to micro management under this plan, option two, people are going to be waiting much longer to draw. People just want to hunt. Every one of us wants to get out there and hunt.

I think every person in this room wants what is best for the mule deer herd but carrying more bucks is not what is best for the mule deer herd.

Charles Sipes – I want to express that the whole goal of hunting is to increase opportunity for those of us out there. As a dedicated hunter I love to be able to go out and have the opportunity to hunt all three seasons. I love the fact that I can spend the time in the field and harvest a mature buck. I don't like having to go to an annual basis where maybe I draw. There are several national publications they are recommending not to come to Utah to hunt deer. I don't think increasing buck numbers are going to increase that. Access to public property that we have may affect this. CWMUs manage their herd and make their money for themselves. The public has very little opportunity. Maybe we increase the demand of the CMWUs to allow more public hunting or allow access through to get to public land. Is this becoming a rich man's sport? If we cut all these permits we are. We are going to eliminate our family and friends hunting. I grew up hunting and I want to continue that. I would support option three.

Andrew Chamberlain – I would like to hear more from Richard Stevens. I have a handout.

Fred Oswald – I cannot allow you to give your time to other people.

Andrew Chamberlain – I can understand that there are habitat problems on the Wasatch front but other areas have habitat. I think predators are a real issue and we can do a lot more control that way than we can by eliminating hunters.

Kim Hansen – handout given to RAC – Thanks for the opportunity to be here. We are going to go with option D which is none of the above. We prefer to stay with the status quo. I represent a group of concern sportsman. Our concern is about predation. I think what I am going to talk about here is a way to allow more hunters in the field and not have to cut any of the tags. Predators on average are killing about 50 deer a year to survive, mostly cougars. They hunt 365 days a year and if we were to take 200 cats off of our state lands that will equal 8,000 to 10,000 deer per year. If we take the average that the DWR says we kill that is about 25 to 33 percent that is going to amount to about 32 to 40,000 extra tags per year. The DWR says we have approximately 2,000 to 3,000 cougars in the state of Utah. 2,000 cougars times 50 kills is approximately 100,000 dead deer per year that the hunters don't have an opportunity to partake of. During the years of 1950 to 1970 approximately 2,500 deer were killed each year on the San Juan, Elk Ridge unit. After the '70s when mountain lions were protected and 10-80 was banned deer herds disappeared. From 1980 to 1983 the San Juan, Elk Ridge unit was closed. In 1984 it was opened as a limited entry unit and deer herds were low. They are still declining and at present, only 40 tags were allotted last year. Now days one single cougar will kill more deer than all the hunters combined. Predators bring virtually no revenue to the state but they cost us thousands. If we lose deer tags we are losing federal money as well. When hunting opportunity goes away there becomes less and less financial support. Predators and their supporters do not and will not foot the bill. Ratios alone are not good. We need to look at numbers also. I agree with the SFW numbers. We need to approach the 425,000 deer in the state of Utah. The reason I say ratios alone are not good because you could have 100 deer with 18 bucks and we meet our quota. I am proposing we do something similar to Idaho. Idaho allows you to shoot a deer, a bear or a cougar on one tag. In Texas cougars are still considered predators. Even if we did declare all out war on the cougars they are so elusive that we would have a difficult time hurting their numbers. I am not proposing that we do eradicate the cougars. If you look at the Oquirrh mountain study several cougars were collared and they tracked them day and night. Those cougars were in and out of that town and were never seen by the average individual. Maybe we could set aside one unit and eradicate the predators as much as possible and see what happens to the deer. So far we have been concentrating more on habitat than anything else and I think predators are a big thing we need to do. Once we eliminate tags they usually don't come back. Thank you for your time and I propose that we don't go with any of these options.

Don Peay – I am representing myself and my two sons tonight. If you want to have kids and families who love hunting you have to have success. My son and his friend went out and they shot a nice little four point elk and we taught them how to pack it out and quarter it out. The kids were so excited they bagged the U of U football game and went out and sat on their kill. They saw a bear and a bunch of coyotes. We decided lets go hunt deer. You won't see those kids hunt deer again. South Fork of Provo canyon is absolutely pathetic. There are absolutely no deer. We are pretty good hunters and have pretty good optics. Those kids will not hunt deer in this state. I fought the Division tooth and nail to get the dedicated hunter program so we could hunt and not kill. It is sad to stand here tonight and say I don't care about the dedicated hunter program. The hunting is that pathetic, it's not worth the time. I know a lot of time and effort has gone into trying to fix the deer population. Somebody has got to figure it out and turn it around pretty quick or you will loose that next generation of hunters. As a lot of people have said, the hunting strategies don't matter. You've got to fix the deer herd.

Bryce Ballantyne – I agree with option one. I do believe 12 years old is early for the youth to hunt. I think we could do a better job at protecting the people who have put their blood, sweat and tears into the program for a long time and allow these middle aged gentlemen to have an opportunity to hunt and not give all the opportunity to the youth. I do want the youth to be able to hunt but that is plenty young.

Tony Abbott – Inside the Outdoors radio show – This has been a hot topic for the last month. I would ask a couple minute latitude because as I think I have a lot of information that comes from the public. I had two pages and you noticed I only gave you one because the first page is facts and the second was opinion and my opinion isn't worth anything. I just want to go over the numbers and I think these numbers will surprise you. I think they will put a very good light at what is being proposed with these three options. These numbers come not only from the State of Utah's database but also from WAFWA, which is the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. In 1983 Utah didn't have an actually deer count. I did find in 1985 WAFWA said that there were 360,000 deer in Utah. In 1983 there were 228,907 buck hunters in the state of Utah. In 1983 82,552 bucks were shot in the state of Utah, which is a 36 percent success. Jump forward ten years. There were an estimated 240,000 deer in the state of Utah in 1993. There were 140,741 buck deer hunters in the state of Utah and in 1993 there were 24,763 bucks shot in Utah for a 17 percent success. We lost a bunch of hunters, success rate went down. Winter had a lot to do with that. This is where it gets interesting. In 2003 the deer numbers were increased to 270,000 deer. There were 97,000 tags and 25,000 deer shot. In other words fewer hunters same amount of dead deer. In 2009, last year there were an estimated 302,000 deer in the state of Utah. There were 94,000 deer tags and 23,000 bucks shot. Utah has shot more lions than any other western state, that's a fact. Utah has shot more coyotes than any other western state, that's a fact. Utah has done more habitat restoration than all the other western states combined and that's a fact. Utah has fenced highways, built underpasses, cracked down on poaching and family party hunting. Utah has even fed deer in the winter. Utah has lost hunters, 59 percent. Since 1983 134,907 hunters are gone. Since 1993 another 46,701 deer hunters are gone. We cut them out of the equation. We are killing the same amount of bucks. What does this show you? Decreasing buck hunters is not saving any deer. These are hunters we well never get back. We are now talking about cutting another 3 to 13,000. The one thing that has never been studied, has never been addressed. I was the general manager for the Mule Deer Foundation for five years. I met with every western state biologist. There is not one study a state can give you to show the impact of elk on deer. Anis will tell you here, people will tell you everywhere, there is no study. Why are we not looking into the one thing that the state hasn't done? We are the best at everything else; killing coyotes, fixing fence, predator control and habitat. Why can't we take some money and see if elk impact deer? In the '60s and '70s, Utah's deer herd hay days, there were less than

5,000 elk in the state of Utah. In '83 there were 25,000 elk and in '93 there were 60,000 elk and in '09 there were 68,000 elk. There are talks out there of increasing the elk herd even more. You can do a great thing here tonight. This is my opinion now. You can say no. We have a mule deer management plan that was put in place and enacted last year. Let's give it the five years and let it work. Send a message to the board; tell this state to put a little bit of money into seeing if there is an impact that our elk are having on our deer.

Burke Davis – I agree with Don Peay. I took my boy out hunting this year and saw very little deer. My question is why we count deer on 29 units but manage on five units. Why do we manage Nebo like we do the west desert? I agree with option two with more units. Give the units a chance to come back.

Bryce Davis – I manage 900 acres in the Thistle area. We don't allow hunting on it and since about '96 the deer herds have diminished year by year. It is great winter ground and it's not getting hunted. Something else is taking the animals that don't write any checks to generate any revenue which seems to be the only thing the Division or the state seems to care about. I think we ought to do more with predators.

Justin Alder – This is my dedicated hunter tag, for third year it is not used. The deer herd is pathetic. My dad won't hunt in Utah. He hunted in Colorado last year and in a few days he had a nice four point. I don't know the facts and a lot of the differences but I truly believe that I would much rather hunt every other year and have a chance to shoot something decent. I hunt a lot. I shed hunt. I spend as much time in the mountains as anybody here. There is not a deer on the mountain that I could find that I would want to shoot. They are there but they are very hard to find and there are very few. I support option two. I hope that you think about the hunters that don't have a voice that don't have a voice, the hunters who don't have property and they go up on the mountain and they have to hunt for deer.

Jason Jarvis – I'm a dedicated hunter and a hunter education instructor. I don't like any of the options and would like to keep it the way it is. I want to see opportunity for these kids to get out and hunt. I have been a dedicated hunter since the inception of the program and I have killed two deer. I am going to go out and chase a trophy buck. Let the kids kill the smaller deer and enjoy it. My daughter killed a two point this year. That is a trophy to her. Let's keep the quality there for us and our youth to do out and hunt. At least I have a dream. I can dream that I am going to kill a big buck. I just want to be out there. The opportunity is more important than anything.

Shawn Shaw – I am for option one but I would ask you to consider a few changes to that. Number one is decrease the total number of permits. Consider managing the CWMUs. What are they really doing for state? I know there is a five year plan they have to submit but who is managing that they are following that plan?

Shane Cornaby – Thank you for the chance to speak. I am for option two. I would like to add more units to that. Several friends and I go hunt Colorado every year and they have over 100 units. Some of the units have three or four hunts on each unit. We are not at that point we need to get our deer herds built before we can consider that. They say there will be less chance to hunt as families. With more units we are doing that. You may not draw every year but we still hunt as a family and still have fun. We need to increase youth opportunity. Colorado's youth tag is 13 dollars and 75 cents. I think we have just as good genetics as Colorado. I don't know what they manage their units for. Another thing we notice in Colorado is we see a lot of out of state hunters from all over. I don't see that here. If we are micro managing our units but still have the five regions why don't we consider putting it into smaller units and better control where the hunters go. If we make units smaller, better management. With more out of state hunters you bring in more revenue.

DeLoss Christensen – Richfield – I am concerned about the ability to hunt in Utah. I want everyone who wants to hunt to be able to. I want every child to have the experiences that I did and my boys have had and now my grandsons are having. I want more than that, to have a viable, replenishable deer herd in the state of Utah. My family and so many more are willing to give up anything today so that we can do that forever. That is what we are talking about here, sacrificing today so that all of us can hunt deer forever. There are two positions here tonight. One is that we have all the deer we are ever going to have, or that we don't have many deer left. At one time we had 82,000 bucks harvested. The last five or six years we have had below 20,000. Even if we reduce tags by 50 percent we are still going to kill the same number of deer because we are so darn good at it. I have a list there of all the different changes that have come into hunting. There are three pages of issues against deer. We get them all. At the same time we have lost every doe. If we have 300,000 deer today than I guarantee you we had a million deer in '83. In central Utah from Manti to Kanab there are no does and fawns left. The question you have to ask yourself is, is that true or do we have all the capacity there is and all the deer that we are going to have. We should not be asking ourselves about 29 units, we need to be asking ourselves about the original 62 units. With 62 deer herd units you can apply pressure points. You can look at everything on a unit. You can't do it on large units. If you are going to get this deer herd back where it can be you have to manage small units. This meeting has been hijacked. This was never supposed to be about hunting. It was about restoring deer. If you look at the agenda item it says deer management, that's what the board wanted. You decide who is credible and who is not. Thank you.

John Bair – So are you for option two or are you for more small units?

DeLoss – The request we made to the board last year was that they consider herd unit management. We never gave a number.

Jeremy Joyner – If I have to pick an option it would be option two. What we are talking about is regulating the masses. If you can regulate the number of hunters in the field we can pin point what we need to do in specific areas instead of in five regions. If you have a central tag and with the economy the way it is everyone hits the Wasatch front. In central region you get 80 percent of the hunters on the Wasatch front and they eradicate the deer in the main canyons. We have to be able to micro manage the units and manage them for the masses and the deer numbers. The other issues are why are we talking about raising buck to doe ratios? When you have low deer density and you are managing 15 bucks per 100 does but there are no does we have to raise the deer numbers. I hunt all over. I just got back from Colorado. I drove right down the road in my truck and I found several deer that people would drop dead to shoot here or have the opportunity to hunt. They are micro managing their units and they are doing a better job. We need to take a hard look at things and determine how to do this and raise deer numbers in general not just buck to doe ratios which will increase opportunity all together.

Patrick O'Kelley – I have been a dedicated hunter ten years and I have killed two bucks. I am here to tell DWR there is no deer out there. I would question your counts. I am not seeing them and everyone I talk to is not seeing them. I guess I would be in favor of option one. If you reduce hunters you still kill the same amount of bucks. I can't believe the three point or better doesn't work. I have been out there and watched spikes and then seen hunters take them. Yearlings are all killed before they can get larger. I would like to see bigger better bucks. I have killed two four-points. Give me a tag for a four point our better. I am sure there are other people who would do the same thing.

Dave Woodhouse – Utah County Chapter, SFW – In talking with our members they seem to go with the 29 units, option two with three point or better for adults for the first two years. The

youth would be allowed to take any buck. We need to go to 29 units minimum. I would love to hunt the whole state. I am a dedicated hunter and have hunted the fields around my house this year with my bow and that's it. It's not worth it here. My daughter is 12 years old and she drew a southern region tag. I turned it back in and she drew in Colorado on her third choice unit. A relatively poor unit over there and in two days she turned down 12 two points and spikes and killed a three by four buck. My dad killed a 25 inch beautiful buck. In that same areas the next day we saw three more four point bucks. That is the difference between here and Colorado. I have a tag in Nevada. I took my other kids there and found multiple mature deer. Hiking around we saw multiple two points and tons of does and fawns. You can't find that here. I took them out on teat mountain road and sheep creek. We saw 12 head of deer. You used to see hundreds of deer there now you are lucky to see 100 head. We have to do something, this is a start. I know the wildlife board is very concerned and that is why this is being brought up. None of these issues were really talked about in mule deer committee. SFW wants the deer objective higher at 425,000 or more. We can handle that many deer in the state. If we have 300,000 this year then we had over a million in '88. I look at what I see today and what I saw back then with my own eyes. There is no doubt about it. Our deer herd is pathetic and we need to do something. This RAC has a chance to send a message. We need more deer and we can get them. We are losing youth. I don't know how many guys here took their kids out and did not see anything and they don't want to go hunting anymore. I work so I can afford to hunt and I can go out of state because Utah sucks. The deer hunting is not good in this state. We can do something about it. We can't do it by hunting five regions. When there is a big buck or two the guys from Utah County go and kill them. We are killing all the deer. I want to take my kids and want to see deer. Right after this meeting tonight we are going to Colorado because I still have a tag. If we grow the deer the hunters will come. We grew big elk. It takes years to draw an elk tag.

Byron Bateman – Thank you. We have heard a lot of compassion tonight and a lot of different ideas and a lot of different plans. It is great to see people concerned about our deer herds. I think the consensus here tonight is we have a problem. We are talking about three ways to manage hunters; this is not going to fix the problem. We need to get to that management goal with a population of 425,000 deer. We get to that 425,000 and we are not suppressed by anything other than predators. I gave you a handout with three major issues. The number one major issue is population objectives. Until we do the things we listed and get the wildlife boards attention to address these issues: coyotes, cougars, bears, habitat, transplants, fencing highways, winter feeding. What we are doing right now is just like reshuffling the chairs on the deck of the titanic with these three proposals. Even though we had our statewide board come together last week to discuss this subject our board came up with a 60/40 split vote for the 29 units. They felt that was the best for the resources and isn't that why we are really here, to protect the resources. If you look at that list A through G. We have initiated the watershed objective. We have been the largest contributor. SFW got the money for the coyote bounty, aerial gunning, and the work with wildlife services. We need to manage cougar and bears to balance their populations with their prey base. Habitat, we can't say enough. We have done more than all the western states combined. Transplants do work. We have done them in the past. We transplanted deer to the Henry Mountains. We had one doe that lived for over eight years. It is now the best deer herd in North America. We got the money for fencing highways and crossings. Like Tony mentioned we haven't done a study to determine if elk displace mule deer. Utah has always been at the forefront of everything in the western United States. Changing hunt strategies won't make a big difference until we get our population to 425,000 deer. We did vote for the 29 units. We also want to jump start this by going to a three point antler restriction. We hunt elk with an antler restriction. We also have a management deer hunt on the Henry Mountains and the Paunsugunt. We can, times have changed, hunters know what a three point is. There have been problems in the past. You say we can't, it's not the right the answer. You say we will, that is what everyone here tonight wants you to do. Send a message to the wildlife board to fix this problem. The other

thing is we don't want any doe depredation tags until we reach the 425,000 objective. Let's transplant those deer. If they die, they die but at least we tried. Transplants have worked in Texas and Mexico. It is no different here in Utah. Another thing that you can vote on here tonight is to change the trap check rule for coyotes, which is a non-protected species. Again I thank you for your time.

Chad Coburn – member of the Utah Houndsmen Association – I would like to address predator management as well. I liked the fact that Mr. Abbott said we have killed more lions in this state than any other western state. After 13 years of aggressive predator management we are still standing here tonight asking where's our deer. In the early '90s we were killing 500 lions and we are barely hitting 250 now. With more houndsmen and tags over the counter and hunting six months, where are the lions. We need to do real predator management. The ultimate predator here tonight has two legs and four wheels. A 3,000 to 13,000 permit reduction is not even a start. Colorado has a spectacular deer population and they have lions and bears like a mad dog. Bottom line is you need to adjust the tag numbers. I don't care what hunt strategy you go with but let's do predator management. Like Mr. Peay said, he killed an elk and then had a bear problem. He was the original predator. Reduce the numbers.

Gale Christensen – I was born and raised here in Provo, Utah and I have never been able to draw out on a tag for limited entry. We hunted across Tabby Mountain on Friday and there were over 50 ATVs. I had a diesel truck. We decided to go down to the Strawberry pinnacles and found out they are full of oil rigs. We used to hunt there and they have shut off access to the white river area. Then we went to the pond area off highway 40. There were four vehicles with ATVs and ended up where it said no ATVs. I am saying that unless you get the ATVs under control then the deer herd will be decimated. I have seen it I have seen what is going on. There were three deer at the restaurant and four deer on the mountain and all had ATVs around them. To me that is self destruction. In the pond areas there were two fawns and ATVs came out of that area. I feel Colorado has one thing going for them. They actually charge people 150 dollars if they want to use ATVs. That is how they maintain their herds.

Shane Cornaby – I think we should keep the dedicated hunter program but make the projects deer specific. I have been a dedicated hunter for six years and I haven't done anything yet that benefits the deer.

Kenneth Oetker – I just wanted to say I am for option one. I don't see how everyone in this room can see that saving a buck is going to grow the herds. Right now there are only 1,600 doe tags issued right now. About two thirds are on public areas and the other third on mostly private. I can't see even how keeping those 1,600 does will make the herd grow to the numbers that SFW and other people want. I don't see how people think that killing fewer bucks is going to make more deer in this state.

Dave Vincent – I wanted to comment that none of these options are good, they are just band-aids. The problem is everything is just a band-aid. People look at predators as the problem, or elk as the problem. It is not one specific problem; it is a host of problems that need to be addressed. It is not one thing that has caused the downfall. We maintain our elk herds to have mature bulls but that leaves people limited opportunity to go hunt elk, once every fifteen years probably. The three point or better doesn't work because we need to harvest the younger deer. I would like to see a percentage of what the harvest rate is. I dare say that most of the deer harvested are younger deer. Unfortunately I think we have got to the point that there is nothing we can do. It is just a band-aid to fix one problem.

Phil Holmes – I am pretty concerned just listening to the presentation today for the hunts. I have hunted all my life, not always in Utah, I grew up in Washington. Some of these changes could significantly affect me and my family and how we hunt. It seems some of these proposals have been thrown together. We have questions without answers. The data hasn't been looked at. That really concerns me. I wouldn't want to vote for any of these options but the one that makes most sense to me is option one to keep it the way it is and get some more data. We want to fix it but throwing three options out there without any real understanding of what we've got. It doesn't seem anybody has the best answer but we must make a decision.

Gordy Bell – The reason we do the five year plans is just for that reason. It is not a spur of the moment; make a decision, vote on it tonight. Making comparisons from Utah to Colorado is not an accurate assessment. The habitat is different. The private land is different. It is not a fair comparison. If Utah was Colorado then we would expect Colorado type hunting. That is not the situation. I can't urge you strongly enough to not go backwards on the trend that has been there since 1994. Removing buck hunters out of the equation does not grow your mule deer herds. It just reduces opportunity.

Bob Corbett – Orem – Last fall I had a chance to go down to the Henry Mountains during the rut. I saw some magnificent 30 inch bucks. I would like to see some of those opportunities throughout the state. It seems to me one thing that would do this is to increase the ratio of bucks. For this reason I am in favor of option two. I prefer to get a four point every three or four years. To restrict the numbers I propose we limit the general hunting to age 14 and the limited entry to 16.

John Berry – Cedar Fort – I have had the opportunity to ride the Oquirrh range on mules and horses ever since I could ride. Anyone of you that want to come and go for a ride and really check on how many does and bucks you've got on the Oquirrh mountains I am more than willing to take you. I think your counts are pathetic. I had one of your officers tell me there are 16,000 deer on the Oquirrh Mountains. I rode the Oquirrh Mountains every week this summer and haven't seen 100 head of deer. There are more elk than deer and even the elk herd is getting screwed up. I have had sheep and cattle on that mountain range my whole life. When we stopped the cyanide guns and the 10-80s to protect the eagles the predators went nuts. You have more cats on that mountain range than you have deer and now they are working on the elk herd. What are we going to do about it? I propose that you have a mountain lion hunt in the state of Utah and let the deer rest for a couple of years. I have planted 500 acres of CRP ground. It has been in CRP for several years. We used to have 300 head of deer winter on my ground. I don't have any deer. They should be in there in droves on the hay patches right now. There are none. What are we doing about it? We are talking about restricting the hunters. Let's restrict predators. Thank you.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I think we have found out there are just about as many opinions about the deer herd and deer management as there are people in this audience.

Audience – Are you going to tell us which option people who didn't want to address the RAC wanted?

Fred Oswald – There were two cards. One for option two and one for option one.

John Bair – I have been trying to keep score here. We have gone around in circles here. I appreciate everybody coming and making your comments. I have gone back and forth on this sitting here. I think we should just put it to a vote and see where we fall. I think it is pretty clear cut that option one and two are far and away favored by the majority.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept option two as presented

Motion dies, lack of seconded

Allan Stevens – The comment I would like to make is shame on the wildlife board. Shame, shame, shame. We went through a process and had a five year plan. They have not followed the five year plan once since its inception. Now they spring this on us in the middle of a five year plan, shame on them. I don't know why we have five year plans. If we are not going follow our five year plans that you, the wildlife board, votes on then why the hell do we do it. I want to know and I would like an answer from the board.

Motion was made by Allan Stevens to accept option one.

Seconded by Doug Jones

Richard Hansen – How accurate do you think your deer counts are? To preface that, three years ago you changed the model you use. On the Nebo they said there were 22,000 deer and the next year it dropped to 10,300 because we used a new model.

Anis Aoude – The models are as accurate as the data that goes into them. Our classification data the best data we collect out there and we have a lot of confidence in that data. That is the buck to doe and fawn to doe ratio data. The reason those models were changed was because we brought everybody to use the same model. We did it to be consistent. That is why those two units changed. Basically all a model is is a calculation where you plug in ratios and mortality and it pumps out how many animals you should have to have those ratios and that harvest. It's not that one is better than another but it made it more consistent statewide. We have high confidence in that model.

John Bair – I think personally I would like option two. Anis, could you clarify if we cut 7,000 tags do we assume that the people who do draw will spread out.

Anis Aoude – Those cuts will likely be spread between the northern three regions which are below 18 bucks per 100 does.

John Bair – Addressing the wildlife board, everyone has a plan until you get hit. Like Dave said the deer hunt situation sucks. I sat on the committee and I don't have a problem changing it as long as it is for the better. I think option one is the way to go if we don't go with option two.

In Favor: Michael Gates, Larry Fitzgerald, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, John Bair, Doug Jones, Byron Gunderson, Allan Stevens, George Holmes, Jay Price

Opposed: Matt Clark

Motion passed 10 to 1

5) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

- **Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Allan Stevens – Are these still Saturday openers?

Anis Aoude – Yes, except the muzzleloader is a mid week opener as usual.

Allan Stevens – So you will set permit numbers in March meeting?

Anis Aoude – In the April/May meetings.

Allan Stevens – Why can't we crunch the application period after then?

Anis Aoude – We don't usually get harvest data on antlerless until late February or early March so we will have better data if we wait.

Allan Stevens – But why can't we move the application period back until after you set the permit numbers.

Anis Aoude – People don't want us to move it back so they can schedule time off earlier.

Questions from the Public

Charles Snipes – Other states allow the application to take place in a short time period which would allow us to do it after the permit numbers are set. Why do we not have a later time to apply so we can have the permit numbers before we put in?

Anis Aoude – People want to be able to know what they drew and get their time off but we don't get data until later.

Charles Snipes – We know we are waiting for data. But why not have the draw after that?

Anis Aoude – One reason is that we want to be ahead of other states so people put in here instead of other states. The permit numbers are not usually that different from the year before.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the proposal as presented

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

6) CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

- Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

John Bair – Has the Spring Creek Dodge boundary been cleaned up?

Boyd Blackwell – The local C.O. is working with the unit to do a better job at posting.

Byron Gunderson – Is there any plan to stop more CWMUs that keep eating up some of the best deer and elk country in the state?

Boyd Blackwell – Well it is private property. If it is private property and they want to be a CWMU we encourage them to be a CWMY because it will provide opportunity for our sportsmen to go onto that private property to hunt. It provides you the same opportunity it provides me not just his buddies.

Jay Price – What about the ratio of permits.

Boyd Blackwell – The biggest part of the program is we need to provide an incentive to private landowners to let people on their property. If that incentive isn't there then they don't have to be part of the program. We addressed that two years ago and will again in three years. They can choose between a 90:10 split, an 85:15 split, an 80:20 split or a 60:40 split.

Jay Price – If you change the ratio there is still plenty of incentive.

Boyd Blackwell – Put your self in their shoes. Would you feel compensated enough to let somebody you don't know hunt on your property?

Jay Price – Yeah, if I could sell permits for 5,000 a piece I would be happy with less.

Boyd Blackwell – That is a 90:10 split which provides an opportunity for public to come hunt. The way we try to make up for that is for example with elk, if they take a 90:10 split then 100 percent of the antlerless permits goes to the public. We push them to provide a minimum of five days for bucks and bulls and a minimum of two days for antlerless, they can hunt the whole unit. If it's open for one, it's open for all. There is a lot that goes on to try and balance this out to make it even and fair for our sportsman.

Questions from the Public

Scott Newman – I don't think its right that private landowners can block access to public land. In the north we have a problem with that. They are blocking access. This is a rich man's game anymore, like my dad said. He is ready to give up. What are we fighting for?

Comments from the Public

Charles Sipes – I don't feel there is enough public opportunity. The numbers and ratios are out of line. That is why they are getting bigger. When I ask for answers the response is that is 200 more permits is more than we had before. We are managing these public animals. Why are we not saying if you allow hunters access then we will allow some permits?

Tony Abbott – When you start talking public animals and private property it is touchy. On one hand they are public animals but on the other hand if we just didn't give these guys something to put us there they would shut us out completely. Therein lies the fine line. CWMUs serve as a nice breeding ground for animals. They feed animals that spill off onto access. Is 90:10 perfect? No. I am not a landowner but if I was and I let ten percent one that is a lot more than zero.

Kim Hansen – I am kind of sympathetic to both ways. I see that we have public animals on private property. I would recommend we do increase the ration though to and 80:20 split. I think that would be fair.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I always think it is a good idea when we are talking about CWMUs that we have the opportunity to say what we think about them and what we think they ought to be and what we think they're not but the action item we are talking about tonight is permit numbers for 2011. I am going to ask for a motion on basically Boyde's presentation and CWMU permit numbers.

John Bair – Boyde does a good job. That is a nasty think to have to oversee. I was on the CWMU committee and you want to talk about a lot of complaints and work. He has a tough go there and I think he does a good job.

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept as presented

Seconded by Gary Nielson

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 7) **Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept as presented

Seconded by Doug Jones

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

- 8) **Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**
- 9) **Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**
- 10) **Depredation Policy Amendment (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

VOTING

Motion was made by Byron Gunderson to accept the rule and policy amendments as presented

Seconded by George Holmes

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

11) Other Business

Motion was made by John Bair to change the trap check rule from 48 hours to 7 days for coyotes

Seconded by Jay Price

Boyde Blackwell – The trap check rule is under a different proclamation, the furbearer proclamation and should be addressed through that proclamation.

Fred Oswald – I want to say that I don't think this is an appropriate motion to make at this meeting.

In Favor: Michael Gates, Larry Fitzgerald, Gary Nielson, Richard Hansen, John Bair, Matt Clark, George Holmes, Jay Price

Opposed: Doug Jones, Byron Gunderson

Abstained: Allan Stevens

Motion passed 8 to 2 with 1 abstention

Motion made by Matt Clark to request that a study is done to study the impact of elk on deer

Seconded by John Bair

In Favor: all

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

270 in attendance

Next board meeting December 1st & 2nd at the DNR boardroom, Salt Lake

Next RAC meeting December 14th

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Nov 9, 2010

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

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

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Randy Wood
Phil Douglass
Boyde Blackwell
Anis Aoude
Darren Debloois
Kirt Enright
Jodi Becker
Justin Dolling
Bryan Christensen
Kevin Bunnell
Mike Kinghorn
Mitch Lane
Clint Brunson
Scott McFarlane
Dave Rich
Nathan Long
Rick Larsen

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins
Bill Fenimore

RAC Absent

Michael Gates- BLM

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 23

Introduction: Brad Slater-chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda and Sept 19, 2010 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline
CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011
Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011
Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game amendment
Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule amendment
Depredation Policy amendment

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Introduction of RAC Members

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Sept 19, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Motion: Van Tassell- Accept as presented

Motion Second: Leonard

Motion Carriers: Unanimous

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the meeting minutes as corrected.

Motion: Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3.Wildlife Board Update

None

Item 4. Regional Update

None

Item 5. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Rich Garrett- When you are doing the recap; option 2 specified a post-season count of bucks. That was not on the other two options.

Anis Aoude- All of those are post-season.

Rich Garrett- Ok, because that was the only place where post-season appeared so I was just wondering if there was something we were missing.

Anis Aoude- No, nothing you are missing.

Mike Wall- Option 1 and Option 2, if I understand what you are saying, you are managing both by units. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude- We manage currently by units. All three options we still manage by units.

Mike Wall- I am having some difficulty understanding why, if you are managing by unit, you have a 100% greater potential loss of permits with option 2 than option 1; 3,000 vs. 7,000.

Could you build my understanding of that?

Anis Aoude- The reason for that is under option 1, we are still managing the units for 15-25 bucks per hundred doe's. So a unit can be at 15 and permits do not need to be reduced. We managed a greater region for 18 bucks per hundred doe's. So if there is one unit that is higher and one unit that is lower and it averages out to 18, you could still have more permits. Under option 2, every unit has to be at least 18 bucks per doe's. That is where the cut permits take place. Every unit has to meet that objective.

Lindsey Tanner- Has there been some consideration or do you have to add on the, four point or better, type of things to try and get a better buck herd going? Has there been discussion about a reduction with the CWMU stuff where there is extended season and extended permits vs. the general public?

Anis Aoude- Yes, the point restriction is something that has been tried in Utah back in the 80's and it was a total disaster. Basically, all it does is shift the pressure on the yearlings, which are the most numerous proportion of the buck population to the older age class. So, basically you are targeting those deer that are 2 years or older. You end up depleting that segment of the population and leaving yearlings to try and do all the breeding. The second part of that is a lot of illegal take happens and people left those in the field when we tried it. There is about a 20 page that documented when we tried 3 point or better and biologically it is unsound and law enforcement wise, it is unsound. We ended up killing a lot of young bucks and left to rot in a field. We also killed a lot of older bucks and took them home and left very few bucks on the hill to do what needed to be done. It did not work in the past. Almost every western state has tried it and gone away from it. Most CWMU's have lower harvest rate than the general season surrounding them. They have a limited number of permits on those CWMU's. They cannot exceed the harvest around them.

Mike Laughter- Mule Deer Foundation- In regard to lifetime license holders, my understanding is that there is 4,000. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude- There are about 4,000. Not all of them are active every year. I think around 3,500-3,700 actually get a permit every year.

Mike Laughter- Mule Deer Foundation- How do you feel that will impact unit by unit in option 2?

Anis Aoude- We looked at how those are distributed currently on the units and they distribute themselves fairly well so don't think that will impact any one unit greatly because it will be close to 80,000 permits with only 3,700 or so distributing themselves.

Mike Laughter- Mule Deer Foundation- Do you think it will make it tougher to draw if a unit becomes popular?

Anis Aoude- If that happens, it would make it harder to draw. From the way it currently is, they distribute themselves fairly even across the board and that is why we felt we could still let them choose their unit. In the future, if they are targeting one unit, we could have a drawing for lifetime license holders. Currently, we do not feel that is an issue.

Justin Richins- On option 1, is that similar to what we would experience in Wyoming where we have region K and within that region we have X number of units. Then, if one of those units fall below the criteria, that unit within the region would be closed?

Anis Aoude- It would not be closed but it would be hunted differently. It would be hunted under a lighter hunting regime. It is very similar to what the current program is but we would pull out units that are not performing well.

Justin Richins- Units within the region?

Anis Aoude- Correct.

Cathy Curiallen- Is there going to be a different number of permits for out-of-state hunters and is the price going to change?

Anis Aoude- Right now, out-of-state non-resident hunters are capped to 10% of the permits. Proportionately, they would be reduced as well. If a permit increase does happen, they would also take their share of the permit increase. We are probably one of the most restrictive states so to restrict it any further would not be favorable for out-of-state hunters.

Doug Erickson- Maybe to help manage deer herd, allow either sex during archery season. When you drop the rifle hunt down to three days, you should include the muzzleloaders.

Anis Aoude- Was that a question or a comment?

Doug Erickson- Comment.

Cody Christensen- I have not been able to locate the 2009 overall deer numbers for the state of Utah. How do you obtain those numbers?

Anis Aoude- It is right around 309,000-310,000. It is an estimate based on classifications which we do in the fall. We calculate the number that has to be available to produce that many in the harvest.

Cody Christensen- Was that the same calculation used to determine the antelope herd on the plateau this last season?

Anis Aoude- Similar.

Jason Carlisle- Under option 2 with the unit harvest plan, what is the main distinction between the units and the limited entry units?

Anis Aoude- It is the buck to doe ratio that we manage for. On the limited entry units, we manage for 25 to 35 bucks per hundred doe's. On general season we would manage for 18-25. So, there would be more opportunity on the general season units than on limited entry units.

Kevin Smith- How many acres do you have to own to be considered a landowner?

Anis Aoude- If you have 640 acres, you can get one permit.

Kevin Smith- It does not affect the guy who has 30-40 acres?

Anis Aoude- No.

Dominic Barrett- Under option 2, would the dedicated hunter program be pretty comparable to what it is now?

Anis Aoude- No, it would not. The person would draw a unit first. If they wanted to opt into the program, they could pay whatever the fee ends up being. The only benefit would be to hunt the three seasons.

Dominic Barrett- As far as price and service hours, would it be comparable?

Anis Aoude- It would be comparable.

Casey Kelley- If option 2 does go through to where we have a whole state that is limited entry, why don't our limited entries go in there too? Why don't we have one rule for the whole state? Why don't we put the limited entries in with this?

Anis Aoude- The reason for that is we manage general season for opportunity. If we turn the entire state into limited entry, we are talking probably 20,000 permits statewide for everything. You are cutting 70,000 hunters out of the picture. The future of hunting depends on hunters being out there in the field. We still want to maintain general season hunting for opportunity.

Mike Wall- Early on, you talked about these options for raising buck/doe ratio not taking in consideration increasing population density of the herd itself. Is there an assumption that you are already at max population now or is there some improvement that can be had in improving population in these units?

Anis Aoude- Our objectives are to have more deer but long term data shows that we are at capacity for the last 10 years. We have been hovering around 300,000 deer statewide. We do anticipate increasing numbers of deer but that is not something that can happen overnight. If deer herds increase, hopefully we can increase permits. Short-term, I do not see it increasing rapidly.

Tom Poppleton- On option 2, is archery hunting a closed extended unit?

Anis Aoude- No, we would still maintain the extended archery unit.

Tom Poppleton- If you go down to those sub-units, is there any way of taking out the large chunks of private to figure out buck to doe ratio?

Anis Aoude- When we do our classification, it is split out public and private land units.

Chester Mitchell- There is the debate between the regional vs. unit hunting. Obviously, it is managed on a unit by unit basis. Do we know the number of hunters by unit even though we currently award by region?

Anis Aoude- Yes we do.

Chester Mitchell- If we chose option 2, do we know what the impact is going to be in those particular areas?

Anis Aoude- The numbers we would choose to put on those units would be based originally on the number that currently hunts them. We would then adjust them up and down based on what the buck to doe ratio is. That would be our starting point.

Chester Mitchell- Clarification on comment made earlier about the fact that I am impatient, taking 15 years, changing trends or getting to certain levels? I missed the comment.

Anis Aoude- Most winter ranges for deer are brow species and these species take 15-20 and sometimes 50 years to mature. There is frustration from those who are instrumental getting these projects on the ground. The deer may come 15-20 years down the road.

Chester Mitchell- What specifically are we doing to improve access to and/or quality of winter ranges?

Anis Aoude- We have spread close to 60 million and treated close to 600,000 acres of mostly winter range.

Casey Kelley- Are there going to be any changes to the CWMU program?

Anis Aoude- I do not see any anticipated change in the CWMU.

Casey Kelley- When I was younger, I was able to hunt private property and now that is all gone so now all of the hunting pressure is in the same place.

Anis Aoude- That is unfortunate but that is kind of the way it is.

Justin Muery- What level of consideration has DWR or the Wildlife Board given to weapon reallocation in terms of maximizing opportunity and minimizing harvest?

Anis Aoude- That is certainly a way to get less harvest and still maximize opportunity. Most things are done through this public process and the majority are rifle hunters. That is the reason why we end up with more rifle. That is why it is allocated the way it is.

Neil Anderson- Is everything going to be draw?

Anis Aoude- Yes.

Neil Anderson- Is the point system going to be affected at all by that or is it going to be the same?

Anis Aoude- It will be the same.

Neil Anderson- You can't change that at all with the new system?

Anis Aoude- There are two point systems, one for limited entry and one for general season. It would still be the general season system.

Neil Anderson- The odds would stay the same as they are right now?

Anis Aoude- I don't know what the odds will be on some of the popular units. It is hard to say.

Neil Anderson- Would they consider changing the point system?

Anis Aoude- There is no point system in the world you could put that is going to change supply and demand.

Neil Anderson- You guys are talking about cutting permit numbers so obviously hunters are going to want to hunt in certain areas.

Anis Aoude- Sure.

Neil Anderson- Our point system right now is pretty random. Have they considered any change so people have greater opportunities?

Anis Aoude- We have not. Even though it is a different system, it works exactly the same. The overall odds will still be exactly the same. I understand where you are coming from.

Bryan Lundahl- In these three options, I did not see anything about starting the opening day of the rifle hunt on a day other than a Saturday. Is there any consideration in changing the hunt from a Saturday to a day in the middle of the week?

Brad Slater- That is a great question and I think we are going to come to that topic in item 6.

Chad Simmons- I read in the paper the other day about getting rid of a thousand doe's up in Bountiful. I went up there and I did not see a thousand doe's. Why do we want to shoot a thousand doe's? Is this just the paper making a big lie?

Anis Aoude- I think the numbers are exaggerated. I am not that familiar with that. The regional folks may be if they want to address that.

Randy Wood- Northern Region Wildlife Manager- I did not read the article in the paper. We estimate the total population in Bountiful, and it is just an estimate, of about 500 deer in that area. There is no set removal. We were working in Bountiful in some localized areas where the deer population is higher. There is no goal set as to how many.

Chad Simmons- I think what the paper said was exactly 1,000 and there is not 1,000 deer up there right now.

Mike Wall- Follow up on population density. Could you comment on relationship between grazing permits and the capacity on some of these units?

Anis Aoude- That is a tough one and it is really hard to say. Grazing has decreased over time and population have been higher when we have more grazing on the mountain so I do not think there is a direct correlation between those. I do not see livestock as a limiting factor. It all goes back to how healthy the habitat is.

Kevin Bosley- Clarification on option 2. If you are in dedicated hunter and it is your first year, what happens to that if option 2 goes into effect next year?

Anis Aoude- We are still working through that but what we will try and probably do is you will be able to pick a unit your first year and if we find some units are getting overwhelmed, then the following year we will probably have a drawing. Once this goes into place, there will no longer be a three year program. It will be a one year program.

Cody Christensen- In option 1, you take an average of all the units in the region, is that correct?

Anis Aoude- Correct.

Cody Christensen- If you have a unit that is high, in private property, that has a high buck to doe ratio, that is averaged in with the low buck to doe ratio? Where as in option 2, if there is a unit with smaller private land with lower buck to doe ratio, you would focus on that more specifically that we have in the past. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude- Yes and I want to clarify that we do not use private land units in the average of the region. All those units that are mostly private land, do not average into the regional average. We only use the public land units in the average.

Kevin Lindsey- Total number of permits you are talking?

Anis Aoude- Currently, on the books, we have 97,000 permits. We are not hunting that many, we have reduced them. Right now, we are at about 94,000 permits statewide. Basically, you are talking about 2 ½-3% permit decrease.

Dominic Barrett- If option 2 were to be implemented and settled in around 2012, would it be safe to say that dedicated hunters that come back to the program year after year would receive some kind of preference points?

Anis Aoude- There would be some kind of point system. These are things we are still working out. If we reached the cap, we would look into a preference system.

Jim Johnson- Can you address how the youth hunts would affect these units as far as drawing and so forth.

Anis Aoude- Currently, we have about 20% of the permits going to youth. It would continue to be the case under this program. There would only be a minor change that the 20% would come after the lifetime license holders and all those have gone out of each unit. It makes it a little bit more fair. We want to maintain that 20% of permits going to youth.

Justin Campbell- I heard a gentleman earlier talking about the four point only preserving the genetics for bigger horns and stuff in our deer herds. Is the state looking to do anything like that?

Anis Aoude- I think I already addressed that but I am glad to address it again. The genetics of a buck are no better when he is a yearling than when he is a four point. It does not matter if you shoot them as a yearling, you are not preserving genetics. Biologically, if you have an

open population, genetics do not play into it. Half the genetics are in the doe. As far as how big a rack gets, has very little to do with genetics.

Justin Campbell- In areas where bigger horns are found has nothing to do with genetics?

Anis Aoude- It has to do with killing fewer bucks to allow bucks to get older. That is the only thing that will raise bigger bucks. That is not achievable on a general season unit where you are trying to optimize opportunity. You can either have opportunity or big bucks, not both.

Chris Bowen- On the youth hunts, has there been any consideration, if the second part of this passes, to making the youth hunt statewide?

Anis Aoude- That is a consideration but not one we are presenting here.

Jason Nielsen- Buck to doe ratio's are such a critical component for all three options. Can you explain in more detail how you get those numbers?

Anis Aoude- Post hunt, our biologists go out and classify the mule deer herds on their units. They will classify from 400-1,000 deer and then get a fawn/doe ratio and buck/doe ratio.

Tye Boulter- Has there been any consideration or discussion regarding tag reductions, if the any weapon or muzzleloader would prefer or change to an archery tag rather than be faced with reduction in lieu of reduced harvest?

Anis Aoude- Yes, we have considered some of those things but those rifle hunters do not want to see their rifle tags lost and archers picking them up. Even though archery success rate is lower, they still harvest quite a few deer.

Casey Kelley- You guys are talking about predator control. Are you talking about changing any of the laws or having units you can spotlight in?

Anis Aoude- Are you talking coyote?

Casey Kelley- Yes, coyote and bobcat.

Anis Aoude- Spotighting rules for coyote are left up to the county. We do not even manage coyote. Coyote are under the Department of Agriculture. All we can do is predator control that we pay for.

Clint Andrus- With option 2, is the major perk of the dedicated hunter the ability to hunt all seasons?

Anis Aoude- Correct.

Clint Andrus- Is it the viewpoint of the Division vs. option 1 and 3, that hunting all three seasons is why the dedicated hunters do it. Or do they do it because they have to draw once and get three years worth of hunting?

Anis Aoude- The surveys we have done show the main reason people put in for dedicated hunter is that they can pick the region they want. Unfortunately, when you go unit by unit, that is no longer an option so it does take away a big incentive.

Steve Sorenson- Cache has the worst deer herd in the state because it is put at a 3 day season. Is that correct?

Anis Aoude- No, it does not have the worst.

Steve Sorenson- One of the worst right?

Anis Aoude- No, it is actually up there now.

Steve Sorenson- Regardless, it had a three day season.

Anis Aoude- It did this year, yes.

Steve Sorenson- Why was the lion hunt just changed to no over the counter tags in the Cache? Why would I have a three day deer hunt and then have the lion tags changed to no over the counter tags when you say you are doing predation.

Anis Aoude- I said we are doing predator control on coyotes.

Steve Sorenson- I think you should change that because less lions killed means less deer in the field.

Anis Aoude- Actually, the way we have gone does not mean less lions killed and the same number of lions are getting killed.

Steve Sorenson- What do lions eat? They eat deer. The more lions you kill, the more deer you will have. I do not want a three day season.

RAC Questions

James Gaskill- Why are we doing anything? Is it reflective of a dissatisfaction on the part of hunters? Is it reflective dissatisfaction on the part of the Division? Is it reflective of a lower deer herd?

Anis Aoude- It is probably a combination of all of those. The first one being the most. Hunters want to see more bucks in the field, that is the main reason.

James Gaskill- Is that the result of the surveys?

Anis Aoude- That is not through any formal survey. It is the vocal folks that get peoples ears. It is through the RAC's that comments get passed to us to do something.

James Gaskill- If we have a thousand deer on a unit, and we have 180 bucks and we reduce the herd to 100 deer and we have 18 bucks, are these unit restrictions still going to apply? It seems to me that is a pretty limited criteria.

Anis Aoude- The reason we use buck to doe ratio is because it is an index of how many we have in the population. Basically, if you have too many permits and a smaller population, you will overharvest the bucks. When you do your post-season classifications, you will find fewer bucks. Buck to doe ratio is a very good indication to how many bucks are out there. It is a very good indicator when you are hunting bucks. If you are hunting doe's, you need to know what the population is.

James Gaskill- That is assuming that hunting is the primary mortality.

Anis Aoude- We have radio collar studies out there looking at mortality rates on doe's as well. We know how many die and how many are being replaced. Similar mortalities will happen to bucks other than hunting of course.

James Gaskill- Much greater?

Anis Aoude- No, it is not much greater for bucks. We are on general season units and we are the primary cause of mortality for bucks.

James Gaskill- Once they become antlered bucks right?

Anis Aoude- Right, so it actually is a good measure. It does tie it back to population in a very precise way.

James Gaskill- You have data that support the fact that when you reduce the number of tags, you do increase the number of bucks?

Anis Aoude- Certainly, look at our limited entry units. We have 25-35 bucks per 100 doe's with much fewer permits.

James Gaskill- This is not tied in any way to the size of the antlers, is that correct?

Anis Aoude- That is correct.

James Gaskill- We don't necessarily expect any of these proposals to increase average antler size?

Anis Aoude- It actually could because if you had more bucks out there, the chances of having older bucks out there also increases which does increase antler size. The more bucks you have out there, the more likely to have older bucks out there as well.

Robert Byrnes- Let's say we have a unit that is limited by habitat, population wise. If we increase the number of bucks, we will probably end up decreasing the number of doe's right?

Anis Aoude- Yes, slightly.

Robert Byrnes- Do we really expect people to experience seeing more bucks by raising the buck to doe ratio by 3, that is approximately 9,000 deer statewide.

Anis Aoude- It is actually less than that but people will notice that difference. It is a high percentage of change.

Robert Byrnes- Okay.

Craig Van Tassell- When you were talking about predators, mostly coyotes and spotlighting, I need a little clarification.

Anis Aoude- We do not have any regulations on the books on spotlighting. It is usually a county sheriff or county ordinance. Every county has a different ordinance. There are ordinances on our books for spotlighting game. Coyotes does not fall under our jurisdiction. I know in some areas it is legal and some areas it is not.

Paul Cowley- If we were to shift to option 2, you mentioned that right now you already know approximately how many hunters are using the individual units and you set the number of tags by the number of hunters that are currently using those units. I am wondering why you wouldn't shift that to the number of deer within the unit and proportion the tags based on the number of deer vs. the number of hunters that are currently using those unit areas.

Anis Aoude- Because buck to doe ratio is the best measure to manage buck harvest. If you do it by population, you do not know the number of bucks harvested every year and you are not tracking the bucks you are harvesting. You will not know whether you are increasing or decreasing.

Shawn Groll- If that unit falls below 18 to 100 doe average and in that unit there is also a CWMU, are their permits also going to get cut back the same way the general season would?

Anis Aoude- The way the rule is written for CWMU's is they cannot have a higher harvest than what is outside proportionately. If it falls below that then they would have to cut their permits. I do not see that happening because they have such a light harvest.

James Gaskill- Would you address the issue of transplanting deer.

Anis Aoude- First, where are these deer coming from?

James Gaskill- Don't ask me questions, I ask you questions.

Anis Aoude- We do not have many units in the state that are overpopulated. If we are going to move urban deer into other places we are talking maybe 500-1,000 deer. All of the research we have done in deer transplants have led in failure because deer are so traditional in their movements that when you put them somewhere, they look to go where they wintered last year and if they can't find it, they will die getting there. We have tried it 2-3 times in the state and within 2 years all the deer we transplanted were dead.

James Gaskill- Would you reiterate the effective season lengths on this whole big picture.

Anis Aoude- Basically season length only works if you limit the number of days. Most hunters right now hunt about 3 ½ days. Unless you limit that number, you will not affect the harvest.

James Gaskill- Am I correct that it was not an original DWR recommendation to go to 3 days in Cache County?

Anis Aoude- That is correct and all our data indicates that the overall harvest ended up being the same.

James Gaskill- So that was something decided by the board but not necessarily your choice?

Anis Aoude- Correct, as you will see in the next presentation, we are recommending a 9 day hunt again because we believe there is no need to limit it to a 5 day hunt.

Jon Leonard- At one time you were working on a split season. Is that out the window with this?

Anis Aoude- That has been tabled and may come back after we decide what to do here. The board wants to take on one big change at a time.

Public Comment

Lance Postma- With regards to the proposals that are on the slate, it is my understanding that we just put in several hundred hours in developing a deer management plan that was implemented a little over a year ago. Can I ask who it was that has brought about the sudden need for a change in the plan that is only one year in progress?

Anis Aoude- We were asked by the Wildlife Board to bring these proposals forward.

Lance Postma- So this is based on the Wildlife Board recommendations that there be changes to a plan that is already in place?

Anis Aoude- Correct.

Lance Postma- As a lifelong sportsmen, I have a lifetime license, we are landowners and I have two kids who are hopefully going to be able to hunt in the future. We have spent hundreds of hours developing a plan over a five year period to sit down and study our deer population and the impacts of hunting. Why not let it play out some and get some scientific data based on the current plan rather than changing it so short notice into the program that has already been approved by multiple wildlife organizations.

Justin Muery- Reiterate what Mr. Postma just said. Let's let the current plan play out. We are only one year into it. Cutting tags and seasons is not the solution we are looking for.

Cody Christensen- (*See handout*) The group I deal with is in support of option 2. Asking that the board put in mule deer committee that looks at each individual unit and puts pressure on the points that will help the herd increase.

Brad Slater- Do you represent an organized group or just a collective kind of group?

Cody Christensen- A collective group. We are not organized because I represent sportsmen.

Byron Bateman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- (*See Handout*) Had a board meeting and we had a 60/40 vote. Would like to ask that this RAC to have the DWR to present a plan with budgets, programs, personnel and timelines to achieve the 425,000 mule deer in Utah. Ask the RAC to vote up or down tonight, the extension of TRAP check requirement on coyote traps to 7 days. Coyotes are an unprotected species and we believe coyotes are the major problem that needs to be addressed for depressed deer populations.

Eric Tycksen- Mule Deer Foundation- Received complaints about lack of deer. Recommend that the division look at the causes for this continued decline while we believe our main focus should be on habitat. We believe other factors are at play here. In support of option 1.

Kevin Bosley- Not sure dropping the number of hunters will not take care of the problem.

Casey Kelley- Statewide plan including CWMU program. End giving CWMU tags and make CWMU hunt when hunters hunt.

Craig Woodland- Utah Bowman's Association/ Brigham Bowman- Supports preferred option 1. Provides increased quality.

Gordy Bell- Bowhunter's of Utah- Let this plan run and give it a couple of years to develop some data and then make changes if necessary. Comparison to Nevada plan and buck/doe ratio. Oppose turning general season deer hunt into a limited entry hunt.

Kent Meyerhoffer- I am on the planning commission of my city and we put requirements on people getting permits. You need to talk to your planning and zoning people. They should plant game type landscape. Nothing was addressed about wolves. They kill more deer than coyotes do. I don't know what the law is and if we can shoot them in Utah. Less hunter's increases road kill. Options for youth under 14 to have either sex. Did not like 3 day hunt.

Dillon Hoyt- Letter sent out. In favor of option 2. Consider not selling tags leftover after the draw. Would like to see more mature bucks and I don't think you can count on hunters to disperse themselves. Keep the statewide archery. Require harvest reporting every year.

Gary Jeppesen- Do not include 3 day hunts units with combo hunts. Youth opportunities vs. old-timers. Non-resident point system vs. residents.

RAC Comment

Jon Leonard- Disappointed we are dealing with this after developing the state management plan and being only one year into it. Many emails have been received regarding this topic.

Paul Cowley- Could we look at a fourth option of no action and just allowing the deer management plan to run through at least a year or two to get a better grasp on that.

Anis Aoude- Even though we did spend a lot of time on the statewide plan, no plan is going to be perfect. There are some deficiencies and one of them are those units that are chronically low. In the plan, we said that we would try shorten seasons and deal with it that way. I was opposed that shortened season but the committee thought that they wanted to try. Shortened seasons do work if you shorten them excessively and that does limit a lot of things people do. I guess that is why option 3 is there to come as close to the status quo but still deal with those chronically low units.

Robert Byrnes- Option 1 is going to make some people feel better and they might see a few more deer. Option 3 is very close to our current management plan but it does allow to address those chronically low units. I would support option 3 before I supported the other two.

James Gaskill- In response to Paul's question, we can vote whatever we want to vote.

John Cavitt- It seems to me that these proposals are mostly related to hunter satisfaction in the field. Very little biological aspect to this. Given that, I am uncomfortable with the fact of trying to decipher hunter public opinion on the basis of female correspondence and those who have chosen to show up here tonight. I think the division should take an opportunity to do a real detailed hunter survey so we can better understand how people want to balance quality hunt vs. opportunity vs. favorite hunting locations and so forth. I am uncomfortable having to make a decision based on the kind of information we are given.

Anis Aoude- When we had the committee, we did do a formal survey and that committee based its decisions on that formal survey and it is only 2 years old. The main thing that came out of that is that the public wants to hunt every year but they also want to shoot a big buck every year. That is why we maintained the general season as it is. The committee struggled with unit by unit. They wanted to go that way but once they had all the information, that is what formulated the plan as it is today. For some reason, that data is not being looked at seriously.

James Gaskill- I was asked to bring a comment to this meeting by a local attorney. He asked to remind the DWR that their fiduciary responsibility is to the wildlife and not the hunters. I agree with option 3 over the other 2.

Brad Slater- I am experienced in looking at population trends in a much different population, primarily with the jail setting. I have found that long term analysis suits better decision making. While we have 3 option presented, there are other options available to take no action, recommend something else or recommend no action.

Jon Leonard- The division supports and recommends option 1?

Anis Aoude- Yes.

Jon Leonard- Yet, option 3 is one that more closely parallels the approved plan?

Anis Aoude- Correct, and the reason for that is we are trying to walk that fine line between opportunity and antler quality. Agreed, option 3 would provide the most opportunity without harming biologically the deer herds. We were given a charge by the board to try and improve quality as well and that is why option 1 is our favorite. That is what is driving our recommendation. We are trying to.....

Jon Leonard- Please the wildlife.

Anis Aoude- Not only the Wildlife Board but those constituency that asked us to look at that.

Brad Slater- I think the Wildlife Board responded to some constituency who did not like what was happening so they came and responded. Byron, I think it is interesting to note on a 60/40 vote the SFW Board voted to go to 29 regions. What would we then say next year when the SFW Board comes back to us and says we want to go back to region hunting. It is important to hear those kinds of things but I really worry about taking some steps without a long term experience.

Bret Selman- I like a lot of things the SFW paper has in it. I am always for more coyote control. I really like A-G and wondered if the board would consider adding that to option 1,2 or 3.

Paul Cowley- In response to your comment, it seems that is pretty unrealistic to expect a detailed plan in less than 3 weeks to be put together to address those issues. Long-term, they probably should be addressed.

Anis Aoude- Many of those things are addressed in the current plan for those of you who are familiar with it. We are being as aggressive as we can be with coyote control with the funds we have. I do urge all hunters to control coyotes.

Jon Leonard- One of the positive things that came out of this exercise, with all due respect to the board, was the enthusiasm, interest and comments received from the public. Collectively, those will be retained and hopefully the Wildlife Board will review those. Feel very good about long term habitat projects.

Shawn Groll- What it boils down to is that we are selling a product here. Some of that product is public perception and maybe if we can go with option 1, that does not make a big difference or change a lot. It may be a way to merge some of these ideas together. I liked Byron's comment.

Craig Van Tassell- In favor of letting the deer management plan play out. In favor of tweaking it to option 1. That is a step in the right direction.

Russ Lawrence- In this letter that SFW had, there is a list of items to address. Elk was not on that list. Is there competition between elk and deer?

Anis Aoude- There is really no one good study that says there is. It is really hard to say. If habitat is in good condition, you can have multiple species. If not, everything is competing.

James Gaskill- Thank DWR for their work. I think it has resulted in getting some good opinions and discussions. None of these options are designed to improve or increase the size of the deer herd. The reason I like option 3 is because it gives me hope that I will get to hunt each and every one of them.

Motion

Motion: Byrnes- Adopt Option 3 amendment to the statewide deer management plan.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Fails: For: 4 Against: 8

Motion: Wall- Adopt Option 1 amendment.

Second: Gaskill

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 6. Bucks Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Jason Nielsen- Question on the dates that draw that the results are posted. Is May 31st later.

Anis Aoude- Yes, we have delayed the process a little bit to get more data so we can recommend for everything all at once. It delays it by about 2 weeks.

RAC Questions

Russ Lawrence- Why do we allow shed antler season to happen in January, February and March when it is tough on those deer and other animals on the winter range?

Anis Aoude- We allow it during that time once people have taken. The reason we don't disallow it or make it illegal is because it is really difficult to enforce. We decided to go the education route and make them take this course.

Russ Lawrence- People still do.

Anis Aoude- There are laws on the books for harassing wildlife so we can enforce that but it is hard to enforce antler gathering.

Robert Byrnes- The additional changes that were required for the management plan amendment, there were several rules that needed to be changed. Are you going to bring those up for individual changes or are you just going to have the Wildlife Board change them?

Anis Aoude- The rules were under that other one. Once you approved it, you approved the rule changes that would need to take place to do option 1.

Paul Cowley- One of the things I heard from folks who emailed was the concern over the length of time that bow hunters can hunt where most of your rifle and muzzleloaders are 9 days. Yet, we have bow hunters out in the field for quite a while longer. Do you feel that has any impact as far as the number of bucks that are not actively sought once hit, where a shorter

season would encourage a hunter, if they hit a deer, to actively pursue it because of a shorter hunt?

Anis Aoude- There are a lot of studies on wounding laws and things like that. It does not show that there is that much higher of a wounding law with archery equipment than there are with rifle. Having said that, there may be some unethical things going on. Archer success rate is almost half of rifle hunters and the wounding loss is no greater so there is no reason to restrict archers.

James Gaskill- We had some emails that questioned the length of season on CWMU's vs. the general hunt. Their point seemed to be that deer hop the fence and the general tag possessor could not shoot it but the CWMU could and I am wondering how you would respond to that?

Anis Aoude- The way we limit harvest on CWMU is through harvest numbers. So, they can only shoot a certain amount of deer. Whether it hops one way or the other, they can only shoot a certain amount. They cannot kill more than the number allotted. CWMU's are limited entry and general season is general season.

James Gaskill- The emails I read seem to be more of a fairness issue.

Anis Aoude- Life is not fair.

Public Comment

Casey Kelley- He mentioned wounded game with archers. I am an avid archer and this year, they put a form on my truck telling me they would not allow me to pursue a wounded game on their property. I always thought we had the right to do that but we don't. As soon as I got that letter I called DNR because I do not trespass. The DNR guy said they would go get it and donate it. Is there something we can do with that? If it is a CWMU, shouldn't something be given where we can pursue our game?

Brad Slater- This is a great comment but we will talk about the CWMU in a few minutes.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the 2011 season dates and timeline as presented.

Second: Selman

Discussion on the Motion

Cowley- We did have a comment earlier about starting the hunt mid-week. I am wondering if we want to try and address that or not worry about it given the motion at hand.

Slater- We could certainly dispense with this motion that is there if there is a desire to send a recommendation, we could treat that as another motion.

Gaskill- By dispense, I assume you mean vote on?

Slater- Yes.

Cowley- I would think if you vote on it we are accepting the dates as presented and were moving forward.

Slater- That would be the current motion on the floor. That would not preclude us or if there is someone who wants to make a substitute motion.

Gaskill- It would not preclude you from making an amendment or secondary motion.

Cowley- I think we will leave it where it is in view of some of the short hunts, the Saturday certainly needs to be in there.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Casey Kelley- From what I understand, the way they divide how many elk or deer tags they get is through the biologists. Correct me if I am wrong.

Boyde Blackwell- You are wrong.

Casey Kelley- How do they do that?

Boyde Blackwell- If they are tied to a limited entry unit, the CWMU is proportionalized. If the size of their CWMU is turned into a percentage of the whole unit and we take the permits on the whole unit and it is proportionalized. They get a proportion of the permits available to the public and not what the biologist thinks unless it is going to be detrimental to the population or if the population is over objective. If the population is over objective, we may ask them to take more antlerless permits which the public gets more of. On the general hunt units, we manage them on a larger scale. The biologist will take a look at that unit and may add a few more permits or they may take them away depending on surrounding units and what have been killed in the past.

Casey Kelley- I was just curious because I don't know if these guys are getting any information of that.

Boyde Blackwell- We stay pretty close to a formula so it is fair for everybody.

Jason Nielsen- When Deseret's deer permits cut in half, which is what they are proposing, that is based on an overall population in the area? They are making that proposal or the DWR is making that proposal?

Boyde Blackwell- They made the proposal and talked to the biologist about it. They have a lot of permits and they said they cannot handle that many permits so we need to cut back.

Justin Richins- Change proposal on Jacob's Creek CWMU.

Brad Slater- We have your card and you can give input at the comment phase.

RAC Questions

Robert Byrnes- Explain the 90/10 male split in the antlerless so that the public would know what is going on there.

Boyde Blackwell- For every 10 permits, the public is guaranteed one permit and that equals the 90/10 split. The CWMU has the option to take a 90/10 split or take an 80/20 split or an 85/15 split. Each one of those, the public gets more permits. The higher the split for the public, the less of the antlerless permits go to the public.

Public Questions

Casey Kelley- Why do they have the option whether to pick if they want 90/10 or 80/20? Why can't it just be 50/50. They are supposedly the public's animals.

Boyde Blackwell- I realize that but they are also living and being fed off of private property.

Casey Kelley- When hunt pressure comes around then it pushes them in there. I guess it is a now win situation but

Boyde Blackwell- It is a situation where we need to provide incentive to a private landowner to be part of the program. It would be impossible to make a perfect program. The splits seem to be working out ok.

Casey Kelley- There is so much hunting pressure now on public grounds.

Brad Slater- You are making comments now as opposed to a question.

Boyde Blackwell- There was a question asked of Anis that I would like to expand on. There was a question asked about the days and the number of permits. We allow a CWMU 61 days. They have to provide sportsmen a minimum of 5 days to hunt and a minimum of 2 days for antlerless animals. This gives them the opportunity to get people in and out.

RAC Questions

Paul Cowley- In your charts, I was having a hard time seeing how much of the additional land that was added to these CWMU's was public land vs. private land.

Boyde Blackwell- You have a table there and it tells you any that have public land. I have not identified public vs. private on any tables in the presentation. If they were to use any public land, we would make up in the way of permits or they have to provide private land somewhere else to hunt on.

Paul Cowley- My question was how much of that is National Forest lands and how much of that is communicated through the ranger or the individual CWMU's?

Boyde Blackwell- We have asked our biologists to make sure they let the forest service know if they use any. I am not sure.

Paul Cowley- I am not seeing the change list here so I am having a hard time distinguishing that.

Boyde Blackwell- I'll see what I can do to fix that.

Paul Cowley- It would also help to have a map showing where these are.

Boyde Blackwell- I'll take that into consideration.

Paul Cowley- I really appreciate the effort the division takes mapping these online but the changed ones I have a hard time seeing.

James Gaskill- There are some that are fairly high percentages like Double Cone which is 47% public.

Neville- That is in the Northern Region.

Boyde Blackwell- There are some but they have been that way for a long time.

James Gaskill- I am not questioning that I am just pointing out that there are some.

Public Question

Jason Nielsen- Help me understand how a CWMU can include public property?

Boyde Blackwell- There are three reasons. First, is to make a good definable and forceable boundary. Next, is if there is public lands totally surrounded by private land and it is not accessible. Last, is if it needs to be added in order to meet a management plan objective. What we have done here is defined a boundary and it may take in a strip. If it does take in that strip, the CWMU has to sign that boundary every so many amount of yards. We do allow that and it is no different than any other hunting boundaries.

Jason Nielsen- But it has to be adjacent?

Boyde Blackwell- Yes. It has to be touching.

Matt Mortensen- You said they make up for the permits if they include public land. What is the ratio? Is there a formula?

Boyde Blackwell- For example, if 10% of their CWMU make up of public land, that 10% of their total number of permits comes right off the top and is set aside. Then we do the 90/10 split and we add those back in. They do not even count towards the 90/10 split. Do you understand?

Matt Mortensen- Yes.

Boyde Blackwell- It is really hard when you start talking about percentages.

Jason Forsberg- As I read the proclamation, it is my understanding that if it is a CWMU for elk that I, as a public, have the right to hunt the public land for deer or anything other than what their CWMU is for right?

Boyde Blackwell- Right. If it is accessible.

Jason Forsberg- So if I have to cross his land, he can tell me “get lost”.

Boyde Blackwell- That’s right.

Jason Forsberg- But if I do have access to it he can’t say anything to me?

Boyde Blackwell- Right.

Jason Forsberg- What if I was kicked off a CWMU or told to leave?

Boyde Blackwell- You would have to take that up with the regional office where that CWMU is located and we would try and handle that situation.

Paul Cowley- We have had a few of those instances where we had poorly marked boundaries and we have tried to make corrections on those.

Lance Postma- I have been dealing with this issue in Idaho where we own property and farm it and we are running into landowners who are closing off public access routes to traditionally open forest service as well as BLM lands. If, for instance, there is a CWMU unit that has public lands in sight of it or one that is being presented as a new one or boundary change, it was my understand in dealing with the Idaho side that the forest service or BLM is required to provide some kind of a moderation between to allow access to public grounds for public use.

Paul Cowley- Typically, what we run into is when we have a piece of private land that has no access and is surrounding by national forest land. In that case, we are required to figure out a way to provide access. On public lands that are surrounded by private, that is really a private property issue and we have a problem providing access. We would have to go through a legal process to get a right of way in those cases.

Lance Postma- With regards to that, if there has been given granted right of way for sheep access or cattle access in the past, doesn’t that typically grandfather in a right of way?

Paul Cowley- It depends on how much the individual, district or forest wants to take that on. In the past, there has not been a big push in that direction. A lot of times with sheep and cattle, usually that is made up of part of the base property so those two are run together private and public similar to a CWMU are run together as one allotment.

Lance Postma- We have a piece of property that has BLM behind it. There was a through access that is a 30-foot wide right of way all the way through the property to the public on the backside from a state road. My understanding is that right of way is state owned ground. It has been fenced as such and continues from the state right of way on one side in a direct manor through. If there is a road access that has been in there prior, would that be considered part of that right of way?

Paul Cowley- You would really have to visit with the individual forest or district and the county.

Lance Postma- Where there is an existing road.

Paul Cowley- Even if there is an existing road, it does not necessarily mean they have a legal easement.

Public Comment

Justin Richins- I would like to make a change to my Jacob's Creek CWMU application. Currently we start our deer hunt September 10th and I would like to change that to September 1st. Change in management plan giving the option to repair fence damages occurring from elk to neighboring fences giving us the option to repair on our own or inspect it to make sure it is not a 40 year old fence that has fallen down.

Paul Cowley- That was for Jacob's Creek?

Justin Richins- Yes.

Paul Cowley- Based on the dates in here, it is September 1st.

Justin Richins- Then that was changed when? Jacob's Creek was actually in as September 10th.

Brad Slater- The one we have says the 1st.

Justin Richins- Great. And on the management plan issue.

Brad Slater- Are you talking about the fence damages?

Justin Richins- It consistently comes up for us every year.

Brad Slater- Have you tried to address that?

Justin Richins- We have tried to address it in the past and we feel this would be the best way going forward is to be able to address it on our own rather than just receive a bill.

Brad Slater- I am thinking that would be to the regional office and the CWMU coordinator.

Justin Richins- I was asked to address it here as well.

Boyde Blackwell- We have it in his management plan that they would pay 50% of the damages on fences. This came about through an issue last year. They are requesting that we maybe modify so they can fix it themselves or look at the damage and make sure it is not to an older fence.

Justin Richins- Correct. To clarify, it was September 1st on the deer hunt for Jacob's Creek?

Paul Cowley- That is what it says here.

Boyde Blackwell- I will double check that in our database.

Paul Cowley- I am wondering on whether or not a fence is run down and basically needs the old piece replaced, why a CWMU along with the division couldn't outline on a map of that

CWMU which fencing would be repaired or funds provided for repair vs. which ones are basically in need of replacement which then becomes the responsibility of the adjacent both landowners.

Boyde Blackwell- I think that is something that could be worked out with the area biologist.

Paul Cowley- I think that is the best way to handle that.

Jon Forsberg- 5 day timeframe for public to get permits for CWMU. Landowners not willing to work with you and are strict on access areas to hunt.

Boyde Blackwell- The success of this program is based on the premise of the public being accepted to it. One CWMU can ruin the entire program. I am not going to let that happen.

We do have a process available to the public. It is an official complaint process and if you go into the regional office and get a hold of this gentleman, you are more than welcome to fill out the official complaint form and it will be followed up. By rule, we have a CWMU advisory committee that is put together and they hear all of the complaints whether it is from the public, division or whoever has a complaint against a CWMU.

Brad Slater- What area of the state is it in? Is it in the Northern Region?

Jon Forsberg- No.

Randy Wood- Come into the Northern Regional Office. I can give you the forms.

Brad Slater- I have been on that committee a little bit and it is listened to. They either comply or they don't.

Matt Mortensen- My experience is that CWMU in the Northern unit have limited public access to private land that was previously accessible to the public. I would like to see more public permits available to the public.

RAC Comment

Ann Neville- I need to excuse myself from voting for this because I am part of a CWMU.

Bret Selman- I need to excuse myself as well. I see different CWMU's where since the mid 80's they have doubled their elk numbers. It has actually provided more hunter opportunity with the increased elk numbers to the public than there ever use to be before.

Robert Byrnes- The important part to remember is this is almost entirely private land.

Increasingly, landowners are discouraged by allowing a lot of the public on their property because of bad experiences. They are also tolerating wildlife on that property when they could tell the division to kill them or that they do not want them on there. It's kind of bad that the public cannot access those areas anymore but it is just modern times I'm afraid.

Brad Slater- You have identified an interesting dynamic that has changed over the last 30 years. Private land is private land but access to it has changed.

Motion

Motion: Cowley- Approve the proposal that was presented by the division.

Second: Lawrence

Discussion on the motion

Jon Leonard- Do we need to incorporate the request of Mr. Richins in that proposal?

Brad Slater- That would be handled through the wildlife management plan for that operator.

Boyde Blackwell- If the RAC would like me to address that change, I can.

James Gaskill- I do not recall that we have ever tried to micromanage that way from the RAC so I would resist a motion to that effect.

Jon Leonard- I would too unless it is required.

Paul Cowley- I think there is already a process to deal with that. I do not see a need to deal with it here.

Boyde Blackwell- The problem was is that this request came after our deadline for making changes and recommendations. In fact, we did not even know about it until now. That is why it has ended up being presented now. As long as the RAC knows about it. We can just make that change on our own. My biggest concern is that we don't have a landowner that lives next to them that understands we made that change. It needs to be worked out with the two landowners.

Paul Cowley- I would recommend the division deal with it in their existing process and not try and deal with it here.

Motion Carries: 10 For, 2 Recues. Selman and Neville

Item 8. Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Mike Welch- If the board decides to go with deer hunt option 2, as I remember, there was a program in place for general season landowner permits. Is that program still in place?

Boyde Blackwell- Yes, it would still be in place.

Mike Welch- I have been scanning through the 2010 big game proclamation and cannot find it. If it does go to unit by unit for deer hunting, landowners in the northern region have not been affected by the limited permits because the northern region is always undersubscribed. However, if it goes unit by unit, very potentially, many landowners could not hunt their own land which is why that program was put in place. Is that program still in place. Is it going to be advertised in case option 2 is selected so that landowners in the northern region know about it?

Boyde Blackwell- It will still be in place, maybe not exactly the same. There may be some changes, we have not addressed that at this point. It is something that we have talked about and it will still be in place and in the proclamation.

Mike Welch- The reason I bring that up is because when you look at the CWMU recommendations, the bulk of those are in the northern region because that is where all the private land is in the state.

Motion

Motion: Neville- Move to accept the landowner permit numbers for 2011, DWR recommendation.

Discussion on the Motion

Paul Cowley- Is that for DWR or permits requested?

Ann Neville- DWR recommendations.

Second: Byrnes

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 9. Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game amendment

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Motion

Motion: Lawrence- Move that we accept the R657-5 taking Big Game amendment.

Second: Ferry

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 10. Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule amendment

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Robert Byrnes- Is there wording included that will allow you to take desert big horn sheep that have moved out of the unit? I believe there was a discussion at the wildlife board working meeting.

Boyde Blackwell- We have included that in there. Down in the southern region there is an area down there that the sheep come down.

Robert Byrnes- Domestic sheep nearby.

Boyde Blackwell- Yes.

Robert Byrnes- This will allow you to do that also?

Boyde Blackwell- Yes.

Robert Byrnes- I think that is in an official unit that can be hunted. If they move out of an approved management area, it would allow you to have depredation?

Boyde Blackwell- Yes.

Robert Byrnes- A hunter could still take that instead of just being shot by the division?

Boyde Blackwell- Exactly right.

James Gaskill- Concern with reference to nuisance hunters.

Boyde Blackwell- I didn't say nuisance hunters.

James Gaskill- It says it in the rule change here. A couple of places refer to nuisance hunters and I know there are a lot of them.

Boyde Blackwell- I will check on that.

Motion

Motion: Byrnes- Accept Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment.

Second: Gaskill

Discussion on the Motion

Russ Lawrence- Make changes that are mentioned because they are there.

Brad Slater- On the nuisance hunters? They will check into that.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 11. Depredation Policy amendment

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Motion

Motion: Paul Cowley- Accept Depredation Policy amendment as presented.

Second: Van Tassell

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Meeting Ends: 10:25 p.m.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Western Park, Vernal/November 18, 2010

7. CWMU PERMIT NUMBERES FOR 2011

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

8. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2011

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

9. RULE R657-5 TAKING BIG GAME AMENDMENT

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

10. RULE R657-44 DEPREDATION RULE AMENDMENT

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

11. DEPREDATION POLICY AMENDMENT

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

5. STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

REVISED MOTION: to go with Option 2, also a 3-point or better hunt for two years

Favor: Mitch Hacking, Floyd Briggs, Ron Winterton, Rod Morrison, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Beth Hamann, Wayne McAllister, Brent Bibles

Abstain: Brandon McDonald

Motion passed

6. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2011 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: to accept as presented
Passed unanimously

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY
Western Park, Room 4
November 18, 2010
Started at 5:30 pm; Adjourned at 9:00 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Brandon McDonald-BLM
Brent Bibbes-NonConsumptive
Wayne McAllister-At Large
Bob Christensen-RAC Chair
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Floyd Briggs-At Large
Ron Winterton-Elected Official
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Beth Hamann-NonConsumptive
Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture

EXCUSED RAC MEMBERS:

Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture

VACANT POSITION:

Ute Tribe

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Boyde Blackwell-SLO Wildlife Pgm Coord
Anis Aoude-SLO Wildlife Pgm Coord
Randall Thacker-NER Wildlife Biologist
Derrick Ewell-NER Wildlife Biologist
Dax Mangus-NER Wildlife Biologist
Charlie Greenwood-NER Wildlife Manager
Dan Barnhurst-NER L.E. Sergeant
Torrey Christophersen-NER L.E. Lieutenant
Clint Sampson-NER L.E. Officer
Brian Maxfield-NER Sensitive Species Bio
Gayle Allred-NER Admin Aide
Ron Stewart-Conservation Outreach
Lowell Marthe-NER Wildlife Biologist

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady
Ernie Perkins
Rick Woodward

INTRODUCTION OF NEW NER RAC MEMBERS: Bob Christensen

Wayne McAllister representing Public At Large
Brent Bibbes representing Non Consumptive

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Bob Christensen

MOTION to change agenda; to move ahead with other parts of the agenda starting at agenda item #7 until 6:30, then proceed with agenda item # 5.

MOTION by Ron Winterton to approve the agenda including order change

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Kirk Woodward to approve the minutes

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

3. OLD BUSINESS – Bob Christensen

Update from Wildlife Board Meeting regarding Fishing Guidebook and fishing contests. There wasn't much controversy. They passed everything as the NER RAC proposed.

4. REGIONAL UPDATE - Kevin Christopherson

We appreciate everyone coming. This is a big deal, probably the biggest change that has been proposed in years.

Seep Ridge Road Radio Collaring:

A year ago we radio collared 50 deer on Seep Ridge on the Book Cliffs and 50 by the Colorado border. The purpose of the study was to look at collision mortality on that road. Is it a problem now, or will it be a problem after the road goes in? The Uintah County worked with us on that. We're doing a number of deer mortality studies around the state. It's all preliminary but we had 14 deer die from winter mortality. The Book Cliffs had a heavy winter. Interestingly, we also had 7 mortalities this summer. We'll be watching that real closely.

Pheasant Hunt:

A youth pheasant hunt held last week was a great success. It was put together by sportsmen and an anonymous person donated the birds; we showed up and helped. We had 30 kids there and almost everyone got a bird.

Personnel Changes:

NER's conservation officer vacancy in Duchesne County will be filled by John Owens.

Overcrowding at Linwood Bay:

Lake trout spawning goes on this time of year at Linwood Bay at Flaming Gorge and we're getting complaints about fishermen's boats bumping into each other. We've had requests to close it down because of the overcrowding. We don't want to do that. We'll have more law enforcement out there and try to make sure people respect each other's rights. The lake trout spawn runs mid-October to mid-December. We'll have a little more Outreach effort also.

Wildlife Board Members Present:

Bob Christensen: We'd like to recognize three of our Wildlife Board members who are here tonight: Rick Woodard - Wildlife Chair, Ernie Perkins - Co-Chair, and Del Brady - member.

Reminder to use Comment Cards:

Bob Christensen: I'd like to remind the audience to use the comment cards provided at the back of the room. Fill them out and pass them forward. If you have a comment on the three statewide deer management plan options, please label your comment card with which option you want to discuss.

7. CWMU PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2011 – Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Pgm Mgr

There are no changes in any of the CWMUs in the NER.

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

RAC comment and discussion:

MOTION by Floyd Briggs to approve as presented

Second by Ron Winterton

Passed unanimously

8. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2011 – Boyde Blackwell

There are none in the Northeastern region

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

Dave Chivers for Stoney McCarrell (Diamond Mountain Landowner Association): In the past we've had a variance for cow elk tags. We request a variance again as we have done

for the past 15 years. (Read letter). We're not required to allow the public hunters to enter private property but many of us do so of our own free will.

Comments from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: This is not a change then, they're asking for a continuation of the program?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes. By rule, they need to ask every year and that will be taken before the Board.

Mitch Hacking: The reason this was done 15 years ago, it was one way to put cohesiveness with limited entry tags. To just turn hunters loose up there, we just couldn't do it.

MOTION by Ron Winterton to accept as presented, including the variance request from the Diamond Mountain Landowner Association.

Second by Kirk Woodward

Passed unanimously

9. RULE R657-5 TAKING BIG GAME AMENDMENT – Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

This amendment will address depredation bison in the Book Cliffs that move off the unit. The Depredation Hunter Pool will add moose and bison options.

Questions from RAC:

Rod Morrison: How do you choose hunters from the depredation hunter pool?

Boyde Blackwell: We have an online depredation hunter pool form. People fill that out which builds a data base. If there was a bison problem on the Henrys, we would use the limited entry bison list for that. Since it's the Book Cliffs, and we don't have yet have hunts in that area, we have to use a depredation hunter pool list.

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Beth Hamann to accept as presented

Second by Brandon McDonald

Passed unanimously

10. RULE R657-44 DEPREDATION RULE AMENDMENT – Boyde Blackwell

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Kirk Woodward to accept as presented

Second by Beth Hamann

Passed unanimously

11. DEPREDATION POLICY AMENDMENT – Boyde Blackwell

Change wording to include Once-In-A-Lifetime species and nuisance big game in depredation and nuisance situations.

Questions from RAC:

None

Questions from Public:

None

Comments from Public:

None

Comments from RAC:

MOTION by Floyd Briggs to approve as presented

Second by Ron Winterton

Passed unanimously

5. STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT – Anis Aoude

These options are not designed to increase the deer population. That is being addressed by doing habitat work and depredation work. Today's proposal is about hunting bucks.

Option 1 – DWR Preferred Option

Option 2 split general season units into 29 units. Hunt and manage on unit-by-unit basis (couldn't be implemented until 2012)

Option 3

(See handout)

Questions from RAC:

Wayne McAllister: So tell me about three year average.

Anis Aoude: Three years tells a lot, instead of drastically increasing or decreasing every year we use a three-year average.

Rod Morrison: Whichever option we choose, I'd like to recommend eliminating all antlerless hunts. How do landowners feel about that?

Floyd Briggs: Right now, I have 60–100 deer on 100 acres every day. As far as antlerless tags that are given out, I've had antlerless tags for five years. This year, I found three people who wanted a doe, the rest of the years maybe one. I don't know how other landowners feel but I don't think they have a big impact on the numbers. If we're talking about the doe population or the deer population, in the last two days, I've had coyotes killing within a ¼ mile of my house and that's a bigger problem than the deer.

Mitch Hacking: I feel that we'd have to do it on a unit-by-unit basis. We can take it on Brush Creek but not on top.

Brandon McDonald: I thought I read on one of the first couple slides that none of these three options are geared toward increasing populations. Why?

Anis Aoude: When you're buck hunting there's no way you can tie that back to populations because it's a buck-only hunt and you only need so many bucks to service the does. What you do to increase deer populations has nothing to do with buck numbers.

Brandon McDonald: It has to do with the ratio.

Anis Aoude: It means how many bucks hunters will see in the field, not the deer populations per say. If you're managing livestock, you don't want to have as many bulls as cows because you're trying to maximize reproducing cows. You don't want extra bulls out there.

Kevin Christopherson: I was going to address the antlerless hunts. I'm not sure the Wildlife Board has the authority to do what you're asking. By law, we have to respond to

landowners who have depredation issues. There are two reasons we have an antlerless hunt. One is agriculture crop damage, and the second is range damage. If we see that there are too many deer on the range and it's affecting the range, we'll call a hunt. The second one you may be able to modify (range impacts). The depredation I don't think we do.

Anis Aoude: It would be all monetary compensation and it ties our hands quite a bit.

Questions from Public:

Bob Christensen: We have comment cards in the back. If you want to make a comment, you have to fill out a comment card and pass it forward. Please put which option you would like to see approved. Also, when we do get the comments, we request that individuals can have three minutes. If you represent a group you'll be given five minutes. Questions will be first. Save comments for the comment period.

Zachary Mecham: How is the Tribe going to be affected? Are their numbers going to be reduced? Is it a free-for-all for them while we get cut?

Charlie Greenwood: The Tribe gets permits for limited entry units and exterior boundaries.

Randall Thacker: The exterior boundary tags would be reduced proportionately. The trust lands tags would be up to them. They're a sovereign nation unto themselves.

Zachary Mecham: Can the RAC do anything?

Randall Thacker: There is an agreement between the government and the Ute tribe that actually states which violations the state has the authority to prosecute on and not. It has to be a felony before we can even consider it.

Torrey Christophersen (DWR): We try to meet with the Tribe every fall to coordinate hunts. It's a nightmare for us to have a hunt going on that lasts longer than our hunts. They're pretty good about working with us with the exception of the deer hunt. We've told them it's very difficult for us because we get the calls but the deer hunt is the one exception.

Zachary Mecham: On Unit 9A around the Right Fork of the Duchense, how do we know what deer are always on the Tribe?

Randall Thacker: With deer, they don't know what the boundary is, per say. We classify deer that move down onto the Tribe. It would be impossible to segregate which deer stay on the Tribe. We try to make a large enough sample unit to get 1000 deer classified to make up for any bias that might occur. We classify on the Forest and on the Tribe.

Greg Gilroy: Is the buck-to-doe ratio figured before or after the hunts?

Anis Aoude: After the hunts.

Greg Gilroy: So we should have 18 bucks/100 does average right now?

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Bob Christensen: Just a reminder to be courteous and address your comments to the RAC.

Carrie Mair: I have a question. What is the standard deviation of buck/doe numbers?

Anis Aoude: 95% confirmation.

Carrie Mair: There is a study which was done in 2008 regarding what people want to see out of their hunts. Do you have any information from that and can we hear what the survey results were?

Anis Aoude: I don't have the whole survey. Do you have a specific question?

Carrie Mair: Do they want opportunity or large bucks?

Anis Aoude: The majority wanted to hunt every year.

Fred Goodrich: A lot of fellow sportsmen feel the same as I do. We need to reduce the number in the field. The revenue that you're talking about, how much revenue does it take to operate the Salt Lake City office? We feel we need to close the Salt Lake City office down and work out of regional offices where the wildlife is.

Bob Christensen: We take comments during the comment period.

Rick Murray (landowner and hunter from the UPALCO/Arcadia area): As an alternative to shortening seasons or reducing permits, there has been discussion for other strategies such as a point limit, like 4-point buck or better, as a way to increase the number of quality bucks that are in the field. Has that been considered as another alternative, along with the three proposals you have here that would shorten seasons and reduce numbers?

Anis Aoude: Not only has that been considered but it has been tried in the 80s, and what it showed that it increased buck/doe numbers slightly but also did a bunch of negative things. Without reducing permits you put all the pressure on the older age class bucks. Yearling bucks are the most numerous so you want to harvest some of those. When you have a 3-point or better, you take the majority of them out and you leave the yearling bucks to do the majority of the breeding, so the rut is extended. Also, another thing that came out is that a lot of illegal kills were found; hundreds of thousands of bucks were shot and left to lie in the fields. Almost every state has tried it and has gone away from it because it is biologically unsound and there are a lot of illegal activities surrounding it.

Weston Terry (Dedicated Hunter): In the Dedicated Hunter program you can harvest two deer in three years. If this does change, how does that affect the season as a Dedicated Hunter?

Anis Aoude: The whole program would have to change and you would have the opportunity to harvest a buck every year.

Mike Davis: If we go to Option 2, will the numbers of bucks being allowed to be taken, are the landowner tags going to be included in those (depredation tags)?

Anis Aoude: We currently don't give buck permits for depredation. The majority are doe permits. Only on limited entry units do we have buck permits for associations.

Kim Hansen: If we go with Option 2, are we willing to do anything radical? What we're doing now is not working. Would we be willing to take certain units and try things that are different from anything else we've done?

Anis Aoude: That depends on what you mean by "radical things." I'm willing to try any radical thing that is in my purview to do. We already manage on a unit level. We could do it under any of these options.

Adam Eldredge: Concerning the youth, I have three children who are going to be hunting soon and most of us here have grandchildren or whatever. We're trying to get the buck numbers to come up and I'd like to see the population numbers come up. Have we considered a youth hunt only for 2-point only in the Book Cliffs and draw areas?

Anis Aoude: There is nothing in these recommendations on limited entry. As far as the youth go, if we make it 3-point for adults and 2-point for youth, that's still not going to be enough harvest and it still opens up the whole illegal take thing. We've all heard of somebody shooting a deer and having their kid tag it. Let's not go there would be my recommendation.

Kevin Christopherson: Option 1 is the most family friendly.

Mitch Hacking: Do you ever take your kids cow elk hunting or doe hunting?

Adam Eldredge: We do that. There are a lot of people who don't have that opportunity.

Mitch Hacking: So you do have hunting opportunity with your family?

Adam Eldredge: If we have one tag per family, let the youth have it to not only go out and hunt but to have the opportunity to harvest something.

Eric Reynolds: Question on Option 1, third bullet point. We hunt in Unit 23 every year. There were lots of bucks when we first started hunting there. This year I saw one doe.

According to the bullet point that unit will be shut down. How long will it take to bring the unit back up?

Anis Aoude: We will still hunt it but we will hunt it at a lighter rate than we have and we would do that for three years and then re-evaluate the numbers.

Brad Jenkins: I know that revenue is a consideration. Has anybody offered a Lieutenant-Governor tag?

Anis Aoude: None of the conservation permit funds are used to operate the Division's operating expenses. They come out of the other permits. It's an opportunity issue. We can make the money up, it's not about the money, it's about losing hunters and those hunters are the future of hunting.

Les Gardiner: I'm wondering what steps they are willing to take if the buck/doe ratio isn't going to be that. If a unit is overrun with coyotes or lion, it's never going to come back up. A lot of these units don't even have the does, much less the bucks.

Anis Aoude: All units currently that fall below objective, if we feel it's a predator issue, we have predator management plans and an increase in cougar harvest and coyote management. And of course, if it's a habitat issue, we address that. Habitat treatments take a long time to bear fruit.

Weston Terry: As far as antlerless deer tags that are given throughout the state, when a doe is bred and then she's shot later in the season that kind of eliminates the deer seasons. When are the antlerless tags being given and when is the unit being hunted? It's frustrating to have a buck tag and you're in the same area and season as someone who has a doe tag.

Anis Aoude: There are very few doe tags in this state and most of them are geared to where we have habitat damage or depredation on croplands. It's going to be around 500 - 900 permits statewide. We have hunts in August for crop damage, and the does are not going to be pregnant then. In November they may or may not be pregnant. In December, January they are going to be pregnant. We worry more about fawns than does because we want to reduce the population, so it's the most effective to kill a doe that's pregnant.

Weston Terry: Why are doe hunters able to hunt?

Anis Aoude: We try not to time doe hunts during the general season. We do have them during the general season; we try to keep them away from the limited season. Those hunters are trying to get meat; you're trying to get meat, whether or not it's a big rack also.

Ryan Baker: What about extended archery for these three options? Why do I need to hunt the whole state and need a month to do it?

Anis Aoude: We would probably keep it the same. Those are geared toward hunting in hard-to-get areas that we can't hunt with regular weapons. As far as why you would need 28 days and statewide, we were trying to attract archers into the archery weapon type. Even with that 28-day season, their success rate is about half of the other weapon types. They're not harming the resource.

Morgan Beal: This year I signed up for the Dedicated Hunter program. If you go with Option 2 will you follow-up with agreement I made?

Anis Aoude: The agreement you made was if we change, you'd have to change. With Option 2 you would have to choose a unit and it would be phased out.

Morgan Beal: We're required to put in 16 hours. What happens to the hours I did?

Bob Christensen showed a 'power point presentation created from e-mailed documents sent in from public. See handout.

Bob Christensen: We received quite a few comments from people. We tried to compile them by people from the Northeast Region. You can see Option 1 and Option 2 were pretty even. Option 3 was lower and there were several "Other" options. Several liked Option 1 but would be willing to go with Option 3 as a second choice.

Comments from Public:

Greg Gilroy: We want to increase deer populations so in the future we need to address those issues. If buck/doe ratios don't increase deer numbers, we need to look into other areas like increase in habitat, predation. On this issue though, I favor Option 2.

Carrie Mair: I care about youth hunting. If you reduce tags by 12%, that's not best for the State of Utah, for your kids. I think Option 1 is the best of three evils but this is not a good option, it reduces opportunity. We need to increase deer populations.

Mike Davis: We can guarantee all youth hunters a tag. If you reduce tags, make them the adult tags and leave the youth alone regardless of which one we choose. We need to change landowner tags. A landowner should kill the deer on his land not on the general season areas. I support Option 2, except by doing that we're going to allow special interest groups to have landowner tags in the general season, so I just changed my mind and I'm going to go with Option 1.

Ed Attryde (Ft. Duchesne): I have a degree in biology and I teach Science in Roosevelt. I like the goal of increasing the buck/doe ratio. I like Option 1. I'm a Dedicated hunter and don't want to gut the program. You lose the Dedicated Hunters and you lose valuable hours.

Byron Batemen (Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife): This is a tough issue. It doesn't change anything; we're just shuffling the deck. Option 2 is the best strategy for the deer. If we don't increase the deer population, we're not doing anything. Coyotes are the number one problem with depredation on deer; then there are coyotes, bear, and cougar. We shouldn't be issuing any more depredation permits until we reach our goals. Another thing that would give more opportunity to youth would be 3-point or better for two years. The hunts in the 80s didn't have the optics we have now; hunting has changed. When someone draws a tag now, the whole family goes. I've hunted for almost 60 years; I've seen lows and highs. We're in the lows. We need to stop hunting cow elk prior to December 1. The only exception to that would be the Governor's tag for elk and deer. Give deer a chance for a normal season, and no doe depredation hunts until we get to the population objective. We need to raise more awareness for people to harvest coyotes to help our deer numbers. We need to change the 48 hour trap check law on coyotes. The Division is spending \$600,000 on coyote control; \$500,000 goes to aerial gunning and \$100,000 is going to County bounties.

Clay Hamann: It's our fault we are where we are. We have 97,000 deer permits statewide; the Northeastern Region has 14,000 of those permits. We made the Book Cliffs a limited entry area and kicked those people off. We made Diamond Mountain limited entry, which kicked more people off onto the Taylor Mountain area. Neither Option 1 nor 3 will take care of that. Only Option 2 is the one we need to pursue if we really care about our deer populations. That likely holds true for other problem areas as well. We're building on deer winter range; on the Book Cliffs we're going to be drilling more wells and making more roads, which will make a big impact in our deer herds. We're going to have to get used to the idea we're going to have less and less habitat acreage wise. We're either going to have to improve the habitat we have or lose opportunity and the deer will be the losers.

Kevin Christopherson: It's a little confusing, but Option 1 has a huge reduction. In NER we would be down 4000 permits for the region, so the cap would be 10,000 region wide. Don't think that Option 1 isn't huge cuts; it is.

Michael Cook: If your kid goes out all season and doesn't get a deer, they're not going to like it. If they can't hunt because they don't get a tag, they'll get involved in other stuff and they won't be hunters. Cow tags are not the same. Deer hunting is traditional and it's important. In this area, closing down Diamond and the Book Cliffs and moving pressure to Taylor, that's when the deer hunting went down. You do that and you can't keep the buck/doe ratio up. Maybe we need to open up some areas. If you opened the Book Cliffs up, it would reduce the pressure on the mountain by half. When you closed Diamond Mountain, it smeared the Three Corners area. I'm for Option 3 because I want to keep the opportunity for families open, but also look at some different management strategies. A \$7.00 increase per person adds up.

Rick Myrin: I would encourage everybody to take your kids coyote hunting. From a landowner perspective, a shorter deer season would reduce the time that we have to put up with frantic hunters and trespassers; from a hunter's perspective, it's time to find time

to hunt within a shortened season. Landowner tags are important. Contrary to what the other person said, landowner permits are limited only to landowner property. I don't dispute answers given to antler restrictions and people taking illegal game, but we need to keep our minds open to possibilities for improving buck and bull quality.

Kim Hansen: Option 2 is the best choice if we agree to find out what's causing the deer decline and do something about it. We know coyotes are real hard on the fawn crop. If we take lions, there are approximately 2000 to 3000 lions that take large numbers of deer every year. If we increase the cougar harvest, that will be an extra 100,000 deer still alive and can increase deer tags. If we lose deer tags, we're losing federal money and we're losing enthusiasm. We've got to have ratios but a 425,000 deer population is a modest goal. With Option 2, let's figure out what's causing the problem and fix it statewide.

Rod Weaver (Utah Bowman's Association): The Utah Bowman's Association supports Option 1. Allow under-effective units to continue. Maintain the Dedicated Hunter program. Allow bow hunters to continue to hunt statewide. I'd be happy to shorten the archery season to two weeks if we could hunt the first two weeks in October and abandon the rifle hunt.

Brett Campbell: Option 2. People need to learn their boundaries.

Daniel Davis (Bow Hunters of Utah): The Bow Hunters of Utah support Option 1 and strongly opposes Option 2.

Tyrell Abegglen: On 3-point or better, taking out the 3-points in the Book Cliffs took out the good genetics and left 2-points and smaller bucks.

Weston Terry: When is the final decision going to be made and implemented for the three options?

Bob Christensen: The RAC here will make recommendations to Wildlife Board who will make their decision December 2.

Anis Aoude: Option 1 and 3 could be implemented in 2011; Option 3 would be implemented in 2012.

Lynn Hadlock: I support Option 2. I don't hunt with a gun every year but I go hunting every year with family friends and neighbors in the hills. Being a sportsman doesn't just mean killing an animal.

Comments from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: I like Option 2. Limiting to a sub-unit is not totally a disadvantage. It makes it a little more difficult to draw for some of the popular units; let's take some of the pressure off some of those popular units. We should focus more on antlerless hunts. If

people get involved in smaller hunt areas, they'll help law enforcement. As far as the permit fees, I think permits are greatly underpriced now.

Floyd Briggs: Two years ago we had the late opener in the South Slope, Vernal part of the NER. When that happened, it was chaos. There were so many hunters complaining. I'm concerned that if the South Slope part of the unit gets below the buck/doe ratio we're going to likely see the pressure on the northern part of the region. I'm in support of Option 2.

Kevin Christopherson: On Option 1, the cap would drop from 14,000 to 10,000 and the number of hunters in the Vernal unit would drop by about 1,500.

Floyd Briggs: So the reduction of tags statewide is different?

Kevin Christopherson: There are only three units in the state that have really bad ratios, so we would take about 4,000 out of those 7,000 permit reductions. So some of them would go to Daggett County but not as many.

Kirk Woodward: In Option 1, we'd lose 7000 tags statewide. In Option 2 we would lose 13,000 tags statewide. So using your same logic, we'd lose even more tags.

Kevin Christopherson: Conceivably.

Kirk Woodward: Plus we couldn't guarantee that Daggett wouldn't be infused.

Kevin Christopherson: Daggett would not have a fixed number.

Mitch Hacking: I keep hearing that if you reduce tags in an area they'll go somewhere else. Are there other opportunities as far as other hunting opportunities such as cow elk tags?

Anis Aoude: Every hunt we have has more people applying than there are permits. They could apply for an antler less tag but they would be applying with people who are already applying. Any time we have permits left over, they're usually on private land where there isn't a lot of opportunity.

Brandon McDonald: I appreciate DWR's gesture in eliminating the antler point restriction. It's been proven it does not work in many states; not enough honest hunters, I guess. I'm concerned in Option 2 about land lock issues. In BLM we have one law enforcement officer whose head is spinning with land lock issues. Subdividing into 29 units would be a concern.

Anis Aoude: There may be some boundary issues that would have to be delineated in the 29 units.

Wayne McAllister: I first looked at Option 2 but Option 1 is the way we're presently managing anyway. That management's being taken care of where we're watching the numbers, we're looking at things. Option 1 still seems to be a better fit, but working with habitat, predation, mortality, some of these things need to be looked into.

MOTION by Rod Morrison to go with Option 2, and add a 3-point or better for two years. Also to have no antlerless hunts except in severe problem areas for one year.
Second by Mitch Hacking

Discussion:

Rod Morrison: I think with 3-point or better, we will get our numbers back.

Brandon McDonald: All of the studies I've read said it would ruin the genetics but they were done on long-term not short-term studies.

Floyd Briggs: Question - When we add 3-point or better into the motion is this going to take away the vote on the option?

Kevin Christopherson: It would be a modification on the option.

Floyd Briggs: So this would be a motion with a modification but the motion would still follow Option 2. Would it have to go before the deer committee?

Kevin Christopherson: No.

Mitch Hacking: That would be the Wildlife Board's decision on that?

Kevin Christopherson: Yes. The Wildlife Board makes the decision.

Bob Christensen: Our RAC makes the recommendation; The Wildlife Board makes the final decision.

Kirk Woodward: The doe hunt, part of that's just legal issues.

Anis Aoude: Doe hunting is not in this rule or season. You can make that recommendation as part of that motion but there's nothing we could enact as part of this statewide plan.

Kirk Woodward: That's a whole different topic for another time.

Rod Morrison: I'll take that off if you'll put that in your notes.

Kirk Woodward: That's something we can deal with in April.

Vote to modify the motion

MOTION by Rod Morrison to revise the motion to accept Option 2, and go with a 3-point or better hunt for two years.

(Removed antlerless wording because it doesn't directly relate to the options)

Second by Kirk Woodward

Favor: Mitch Hacking, Floyd Briggs, Ron Winterton, Rod Morrison, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Beth Hamann, Wayne McAllister, Brent Bibles

Abstain: Brandon McDonald

Brandon McDonald comment: From a BLM stance, we would like to see a different proposed option because BLM's mission differs. I don't feel any of these options are more specific to that.

6. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2011 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE – Anis Aoude

See handout

Questions from RAC:

Floyd Briggs: on your application and notification times, why do you need to wait until the end of May to give the notifications?

Anis Aoude: Because we won't have the RAC meeting until April and the Board meeting in May, so that's the timeframe it would take to get that all accomplished. They can't do the drawing until we set the permits and we set the permits in late April, early May. We have people apply, we set the permits in May 4 or 5, and then we do the drawing, so they know how many permits are available.

Kirk Woodward: They can't set the number until they have their counts and their counts don't happen until the spring.

Kirk Woodward: What about the general, it's in our packets.

Anis Aoude: That's also included in the recommendation but it's not in the presentation because it's so long.

Kirk Woodward: We have archery and muzzleloader back to back and then the hunt. Are they the same dates as we've had in the past?

Anis Aoude: Yes. They are the same dates as in the past.

Questions from Public:

Lance Hadlock: Why did they decide not to let the archery hunt go a little bit more in the rut?

Anis Aoude: We had a whole different hunt structure that was going to be proposed to 2011 and that was tabled so we could bring these three hunt proposals we submitted. It was felt that three major changes were too much information to present to the public in one year. Hopefully we can bring this back; once we get this sweeping change in place, we can get the season changes in place.

Kirk Woodward: So if it's tabled, it's not eliminated.

Anis Aoude: Correct.

Comments from Public:

Brandon Campbell (by Bob Christensen): Comment on Once-in-a-Lifetime hunt. Want to extend the Once-In-A-Lifetime moose hunt longer than it was.

Clay Hamann: Combing agendas makes them awfully full. By putting bucks and bull hunt numbers with antlerless will make the meeting awfully long. Additionally putting the notification release date to the end of May makes it hard. A lot of people have to put in for their vacation at the first of the year and by not finding the results until May or June makes it difficult.

Comments from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: You had a once-in-a-lifetime tag. Was the time sufficient? I've heard lots of comments that they've had not enough time.

Bob Christensen: The season length was fine for me. I had some extenuating circumstances but the season length seemed fine.

Beth Hamann: I'm worried about this April RAC meeting being so long and so many people, and it's going to get so confusing.

Ron Winterton: I have those same concerns. I'd just as soon have them spread out over two meetings instead of one.

Bob Christensen: What was the rationale for that?

Anis Aoude: So we could present all of the data for all of the species then. We don't get the antlerless information until then. Plus these will be the only things on the agenda. There won't be any other items. This meeting shouldn't be as contentious because it's based on what has already been done in the past with just a few possible changes.

Rod Morrison: On the desert bighorn sheep I would like to recommend one week later on the hunt.

Anis Aoude: Then the biologists miss the rut and the counts are off as they're trying to fly to do the counts. And they don't want to fly while hunters are trying to hunt.

MOTION by Ron Morrison to accept as presented
Second by Brent Bibles

Passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Next meeting December 9, 2010.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Beaver High School
Beaver, UT
November 16, 2010
5:00 p.m.**

REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as submitted.

VOTE: Unanimous.

STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

MOTION: To accept Option 2 presented by the Division

VOTE: 7 in favor 2 opposed

MOTION: That archery hunters must choose a unit

VOTE: 6 in favor 3 opposed

BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2011 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented

VOTE: 8 in favor 1 opposed

MOTION: That the DWR look at any way they can to minimize impact to limited entry elk hunters especially archery.

VOTE: Unanimous

CWMU PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2011

MOTION: To accept CWMU Permit numbers for 2011 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2011

MOTION: To accept Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

TAKING BIG GAME AMENDMENT RULE R657-5

MOTION: To accept Taking Big Game Amendment Rule R657-5 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

DEPREDAATION RULE AMENDMENT RULE R657-44

MOTION: To accept Depredation Rule Amendment Rule R657-44 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

DEPREDAATION POLICY AMENDMENT

MOTION: To accept Depredation Policy Amendment as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

OTHER BUSINESS

MOTION: To propose that the Wildlife Board look at the option to create a rule to address the issue of bison on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit.

VOTE: 6 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstained

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Beaver High School
 Beaver, UT
 November 16, 2010
 5:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Vice-Chair Cordell Pearson Rex Stanworth Layne Torgerson Mack Morrell Paul Briggs Clair Woodbury Dale Bagley Steve Dalton Sam Carpenter Dell LeFevre	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Blaine Cox Jacob Selby Lynn Chamberlain Anis Aoude Rhianna Christopher Kent Hersey Teresa Bonzo Heather Grossman Jason Nicholes Blair Stringham Jim Lamb Dustin Schaible Scott Dalebout Zed Broadhead Brian Shearer Kody Jones Josh Pollock Paul Washburn Vance Mumford Boyde Blackwell Keith Fullenkamp	Jake Albrecht	Steve Flinders

Cordell Pearson called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm. There were approximately 190 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, Wildlife Board members and DWR employees.

Cordell Pearson: Okay if we could have your attention; we're going to get started. We'd like to welcome you all to the Southern RAC meeting. And I will let you know how things are going to go . . .

by the way my name's Cordell Pearson. I'm the acting chair tonight because Steve Flinders has a broken leg. First I'd like to introduce the people on the RAC, and I'll start to my left.

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

Steve Dalton: Yes, my name is Steve Dalton. I'm from Teasdale. I'm an at-large representative.

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

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

Douglas Messerly: My name's Doug Messerly. I'm the regional supervisor for the Division of Wildlife. Myself and my staff act as executive secretary to this committee but we don't vote on the issues.

Paul Briggs: Paul Briggs, I represent the BLM. I'm with the Color Country District out of Cedar City.

Mack Morrell: Mack Morrell from Bicknell, representing agriculture.

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

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

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and again I'd like to welcome you all here; and we'll proceed with the meeting. We'll have a review and acceptance of the RAC agenda and minutes from our last meeting. I'd ascertain a motion if we're ready.

Steve Dalton: I'll make a motion we accept the RAC agenda and the last meeting's minutes.

Layne Torgerson: Second.

Sam Carpenter: Okay we have motion that's been seconded by Layne Torgerson. All in favor raise your right hand. Any opposed? Motion carries.

Dale Bagley made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as listed. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, we'll now have a Wildlife Board update and I'll let Doug Messerly handle that.

Wildlife Board Update: -Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The last regularly scheduled Wildlife Board meeting that occurred subsequent to this RAC's meeting had to do with fishing regulations and the fishing contest regulations, if you'll recall.

- Ultimately the Wildlife Board passed the fishing regulations as presented by the Division with the exception of a largemouth bass limit issue at Utah Lake. They made some minor changes there.
- Secondly they considered the proposal regarding the fishing contest rule that was presented to this RAC, which this RAC recommended passing, and it was passed without change.
- They approved the calendar for the RAC and Board meetings in 2011, which I've distributed to the RAC members, or at least to the RAC chair.
- That was the only business that was conducted of much consequence to this committee. There were some other issues with variances etc.. But those were the items that this committee discussed that that was the outcome.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, thank you Doug. We'll go ahead and proceed with our Statewide Deer Management plan amendment but before we do that I'd just like to make a couple of comments and tell you how this meeting will be run tonight. After the presentation from DWR we will have questions from the public. We'll then have questions from the RAC. We'll then have comments from the public, and if you'd like to comment you have to fill out a comment card, give it to one of the officers and they will bring it up to the bench. If you are an individual you will have three minutes to talk. If you are representing a group you will have five minutes and we're going to be pretty sticky and we're going to hold you to those time limits. Okay I'd like everybody in this audience to be professional. I know that there's a lot of you and a lot of different ideas out there. This is your time to voice your opinion but do it in a good manner. Don't yell and scream. All right? We'll now proceed with the Statewide Deer Management plan. Go ahead Anis.

Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment 9:57 to 27:25 of 4:58:23
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator
 (See Attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:
 (Dell LeFevre arrived during Questions from the RAC)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you Anis. We'll now have questions from the public, or excuse me, questions from the RAC; and then we'll have questions from the public. When you come up from the public please state your name so that we can get it on the record. Thank you. Okay, go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: I've got a question for you Anis, why do we have to cut thirteen thousand permits if we go to option 2?

Anis Aoude: All those that are in yellow are below objective if we go to if we go to eighteen bucks per one hundred does objective. Those would have to be permit cuts to come up to that eighteen bucks per one hundred does. So all the units in yellow, currently, would have to have a permit cut to bring it up to eighteen bucks per one hundred does. So you know that's quite a few units; about eight or nine units.

Steve Dalton: I thought the eighteen bucks per one hundred does was with option 1.

Anis Aoude: It's in both options.

Steve Dalton: Option 2 as well?

Anis Aoude: Option 2 it's on all units. Option 1 it's just on a regional basis.

Steve Dalton: What's the difference between Option 1 and Option 2 then for the additional cuts in permits?

Anis Aoude: Good question. Basically in Option 1 if there are units that are below fifteen they can be below fifteen, I mean below eighteen, as long as the regional average is eighteen or above. Under Option 2 all the units have to be eighteen or above. Does that make sense?

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead Rex, or Sam, I'm sorry.

Sam Carpenter: I hope that didn't insult you Rex. If Option 2 is to fly, you talk about the 2011, I mean it can't happen until 2012, so what would you do in 2011?

Anis Aoude: We'd probably just run as status quo, what we have in place today.

Sam Carpenter: So you'd still have the same length of hunts on all the units? It would just be a ditto of what we did this year?

Anis Aoude: Correct. Well we would recommend a 9-day hunt but other than that yeah, it would be a ditto.

Sam Carpenter: The unit to unit classification that we do, in Option 1, beside data what good does that do you to do all the classification that you do unit to unit wise, I mean you hunt as a region What management strategy does that follow to take all the time to do that research and then just hunt it as a big unit?

Anis Aoude: It basically lets you manage those as herd units and then if there is a unit that falls below that you can deal with it. Uh, you know like those units we said if they fall below twelve we would pull them out. Otherwise you wouldn't know those units have fallen below if you did it on a region wide basis.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. I'll buy that. We had a deer committee form. I know we voted on it. I know that people actually traveled and met on several occasions to come up with a strategy on our hunting. I don't see that mentioned anywhere. What happened to that committee and is there any of their input a part of this or is this something we just went to?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, these three hunt strategies did not have the input of the statewide deer committee. We didn't have time to reconvene them in the time we were given to come up with these proposals.

Sam Carpenter: So all that time was for not?

Anis Aoude: Well the majority of the plan is still intact. We're just making some modifications to the way we hunt.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, let me ask you about . . . last year we had a presentation made by a gentleman from Richfield. On that presentation I know we voted on it. We actually added it to the agenda. We voted on whether or not that should go to the board for a presentation, and voted unanimously that it would. They went up there . . . This was involving the Southeastern and the Southern Region being unit by unit managed as opposed to the rest of the state, and to possibly give that a try. What ever happened to that? I've never heard anything else about that. I know the Board made the recommendation to the state to follow up on that and to look into putting that into action.

Anis Aoude: This is part of that. They decided to do it statewide though.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. And then the one that really bothers me about the plan and what you've presented here tonight is we know for a fact that we have a declining deer herd and have had for forty years. Is that fair, seventies, sixties? It's been at least thirty years. And why are we not doing something for the deer? Why did we not adapt something that is going to put a little emphasis on increasing that population and turn it around? Why did we just let that go?

Anis Aoude: The nineties. I would argue that we are doing what (pause for clapping). I'm not sure what people are clapping about. I would argue that we are doing a whole lot. I mean I mentioned all the things we have done. Sixty million dollars of habitat work, three million dollars worth of predator control, probably almost forty million dollars worth of structures on highways to mitigate for losses. All those things are nothing? Is that what you're saying?

Sam Carpenter: No. I didn't say anything. I said there's nothing in this plan to address the fact that we have a declining population.

Anis Aoude: There's a lot in this plan and if you would have read the plan you would realize that there's a lot in this plan to deal with populations. This is a hunting strategy presentation.

Sam Carpenter: I agree.

Anis Aoude: And we have done a lot in this state to try to increase deer populations. For you to say that we have not is really undermining what we have done.

Sam Carpenter: Well I apologize if that's the way it's being construed by you, but I don't think the public construes it that way. I think they understand that we need to do something with our hunts that has a positive effect on increasing the numbers of deer in this state. All I'm saying is it's just not addressed in this. I know what we've done habitat wise.

Anis Aoude: Right, but hunting, the way we hunt bucks does nothing to increase or decrease populations. So that needs to be understood, first of all. The way we hunt bucks does nothing to increase or decrease populations.

Sam Carpenter: So if we cut the tags in half it wouldn't help the population?

Anis Aoude: No it may actually decrease the population because there would be more bucks out there competing with does on critical ranges.

Sam Carpenter: I don't know that I can buy that. But that's fine.

Anis Aoude: Well you don't have to buy it. That's the biology of deer management.

Sam Carpenter: Right and I think that's probably (unintelligible).

Anis Aoude: I would appreciate if people would be quiet because this is not a comment period.

Cordell Pearson: Hey, hold it just a minute, everybody here, okay. We're going to keep this meeting civil, all right? And I'm not going to hear an argument from anybody, okay? Let's keep it civil. Let's ask our questions. I don't want to hear clapping and yelling from the public. Okay? Let's get on with this. This is not where we argue. This is where you present your ideas. Okay? This board up here will then vote on your ideas. So let's proceed with the meeting.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, first I apologize that Cordell had to even say anything. That was not my intent. So you've answered my questions and I thank you.

Anis Aoude: You're welcome.

Cordell Pearson: Dale did you have a question?

Dale Bagley: First off I guess, I mean I understand what you're saying with bucks competing with does on winter range but that only applies if we're at objective. I mean I'm looking at a graph here that shows the plan objective is four hundred eleven thousand and you're showing we're at three hundred eighteen thousand. Some units are at objective some are not. I think what Sam's getting at is I think something needs to be incorporated in there maybe to get us up to objective and then work on rations. Maybe, I don't know, I don't want to put words in his mouth. But how accurate is the three hundred eighteen thousand, is that models, is that ground counts, or where do we come up with that number?

Anis Aoude: There's no such thing as ground counts for mule deer, its all modeled and it's all based on . . . models that are based on ground counts for both classifications of bucks and does, and does and fawns, and then the harvest data , and then survival data, overwinter survival data.

Dale Bagley: Okay, and then one other thing on a law enforcement standpoint, one of the drawbacks to Option 2 would be a law enforcement standpoint of what, more people, because we do it on elk units and we seem to do okay. Is it just the number of hunters (inaudible) the problem?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, it's the number of hunters, yeah. Yeah, you have three thousand limited entry elk hunters, you'll have ninety-seven thousand, or roughly there about. Well on the general deer season it's only about seventy thousand, but still it's a whole lot more.

Cordell Pearson: Yes, go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: Anis, how are you?

Anis Aoude: Good, how are you doing?

Rex Stanworth: I'm doing great. Not to beleaguer because I realize this is a hunting strategy but I just need to ask the question of what do we have to do, is it money, what is it we've got to do to really determine where our deer population has gone? Because we haven't hunted does for thirty years in a general sense and we should have does all over us. We don't, we don't have them.

Anis Aoude: Yeah.

Rex Stanworth: So is it money? Has anybody been successful in studying these things and coming up and saying, you know, this is what the cause of that may be?

Anis Aoude: Well there are a lot of research projects that are ongoing currently, that we've started within the last couple of years, looking at a lot of different things. I mean every western state has a declining deer population so it's not just Utah. And every western state has studied it. And by and far the limiting factor for every western state is habitat, period. Not just winter range, not just summer range, but habitat in general. In some areas it's summer range, in some areas it's winter range, and in some areas it's both. So by and far the limiting factor for mule deer, west wide, is habitat. And that's what's causing either stagnant or declining population.

Rex Stanworth: I've asked this question when I was on the elk committee and I've asked it of a lot of the DWR people, and so I'm going to ask it one more time and see if I can get it through my head. But I'm going to take from Scipio pass to Cedar City. We used to have a sign here in Beaver that said this is the home of the largest mule deer herd in the world. I remember that from a small boy. And I look at what's happened between those two points and I really don't see some of those, the habitat change over that period of time. In this full stack of comments that I've got from folks who e-mailed me thoughts have been well we could tag it to an increase in elk, definitely an increase in predators. Paul Neimeyer told me one time he thought that the freeway had something to do with it. It could have. But it seems to me that there's got to be two or three points that can be identified that changed in the last thirty years between then and now in that same area. And use that as a model area, and say based upon that this is the three things that we've come up and now we're going to go in and research those three things.

Anis Aoude: Sure.

Rex Stanworth: And that's why I was asking, is it, I understand that you're short on money and most people here they don't understand that, but we don't receive any money from the general fund. We have to ask for it and hope that we can get it. But I guess there are other sources by which getting some of that money and I think that there is a, well we've got ninety-seven permit now, we used to sell three hundred thousand permits, and let's say at fifty bucks a piece, that's a huge investment that we're losing each year.

Anis Aoude: True. I can answer your question on the habitat front. Although things don't look different or there's not less of it, the habitat quality has declined dramatically. I mean we do range trend studies on an a five year rotation and every five years we visit each unit. And if you look at that data it's definitely declining. And although maybe the amount of habitat looks the same and the over story may look the same but the vegetative understory is totally different. We've got invasive species of grasses, things like cheat grass. We've got cheat grass actually invading sagebrush and causing die offs of sagebrush. And not only that on summer ranges we don't have the logging any disturbance we used to have that opened up the forest and made production on the high summer ranges. So there's a whole lot

that's changed and the person looking at it day in and day out doesn't see the change but the data does show it. All our range trend data shows a decline in habitat quality. So that's definitely a real thing. It's not a perceived thing. People can't quantify it by looking at it but when you take the measurements on the ground it actually has declined and is continuing to decline. So highways I'm sure have caused, the increased speeds since, you know, those days and straightened highways and all that has caused a lot more mortality. We're dealing with that. As I mentioned UDOT in the past five to seven years has spent over forty million dollars on overpasses and fencing and things like that. So we're dealing with all these things but all these things are not a short term fix; they all take a long time to come to fruition. So we're not going to see a rebound. The only thing you see rebound quickly from is when we get prolonged periods of good moisture because population growth increases because the forage is more palatable. A plant, a brush plant that grows a leader this long on a dry year could triple it, which triples the amount of forage. So that we do see when we get a flush of precipitation. But we've been in a long-term drought so that's not happening. I mean we are doing all the things that a division could do to increase populations,; it's just not something, I mean the habitat work we've done in the last five years, especially if you're talking shrub species, isn't going to pay off this year or next year, it may pay off ten or fifteen years down the road. So I guess what we're trying to do here is we're trying to put together a hunt strategy that will allow to be there a few more bucks. It is going to decrease opportunity, which is something the Division does not like to do because we understand that people like to hunt and they want to go out and hunt. But again, the things that we do to increase populations are often not related to hunting.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Any other questions from the RAC? Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Anis, I've got one question, has the Division or has anybody done any research . . . and don't get me wrong I'm an elk hunter from hell; I love to hunt elk . . . But has any research been done in the state of Utah to look at what our increase in elk numbers has done to the mule deer?

Anis Aoude: There hasn't been anything done in Utah, there have been studies throughout the west done; none of them have been very conclusive. I mean they say yeah on this part of the range they may be competition on this part of the range. I mean clearly, if you have a limited amount of forage and more mouths they is going to be competition. To what length is really hard to quantify. We're looking at trying to get a study together. The hardest part about studying those interactions is they're hard to quantify to get numbers. And you know, it would be a really expensive study that may not lead you right to the cause and that's why other states have done them and not really come up with one thing or another. I mean, clearly, if there's two things eating the same thing they're going to compete at some point. So yeah, having more elk is not going to lead to more deer, obviously. They don't complement each other; they are eating the same things in a lot of time of the year.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: Yeah. I'm confused. I'm having a real hard time with this whole scenario here. It seems to me that a lot of the comments I got are concerning population, overall population of our deer in Utah. And what I'm hearing from you, the recommendation from the DWR is keep the same number of hunting permits going. That's your recommendation to?

Anis Aoude: No. Our recommendation is to cut seven thousand.

Steve Dalton: You were going to cut three thousand . . . Seven thousand.

Anis Aoude: Uh huh.

Steve Dalton: From ninety-seven thousand.

Anis Aoude: From, well currently it's ninety-four thousand.

Steve Dalton: Ninety-four. And why are you cutting these permits?

Anis Aoude: Basically to bring buck to doe ratios up on a regional basis to (unintelligible).

Steve Dalton: For hunter experience then is what you're after?

Anis Aoude: Basically yeah, so hunters can see more bucks in the field.

Steve Dalton: Okay, and you're not making any recommendations that will deal with population at all.

Anis Aoude: We've made . . . I mean those recommendations are ongoing; they're in the plan. I think they go step by step on how to increase populations, what we need to deal with, and we are doing all those things and we are very vigilant in doing all those things.

Steve Dalton: So are you in agreeance that we are in a situation where the mule deer population is declining in the state of Utah?

Anis Aoude: In some areas it's declining, in some areas it's stagnant, and in some areas it actually is increasing. I mean overall, yeah, it's about stable.

Steve Dalton: Well I think most of these people that are here in this meeting are here because they feel like the population is declining and declining drastically.

Anis Aoude: Well I think there's some misconception there; I don't think it is declining drastically. The data we have shows probably stable populations. On some years it declines, on some years it improves; but overall all long-term it's been about stable.

Steve Dalton: Well I guess what I'm leading up to here is management strategies. There appear to be no management strategies in place to help recover the populations where we have a real issue. You say there are but I see nothing being implemented. You say well there's a provision here if we're below twelve or thirteen bucks per hundred does then we reduce the hunter impact on that unit for a year or two or three or whatever it takes to get the buck doe ratio back but never any consideration for the overall deer population. How do you intend to manage the deer population when you can't even manage the hunter control that is a real issue and a real problem taking place right now? That's what this unit-by-unit management was I think intended to do is exactly that, so that we have an opportunity to take an individual unit and just shut down the hunting on that unit. Well if you do that then you've got to go somewhere with those hunters that traditionally hunt that unit.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. The thing is, shutting down the hunt on a unit does not improve the overall

population. Does produce fawns. Bucks do not produce fawns. By not hunting bucks you are not increasing overall populations. All you are is saving bucks for a couple of years so they can be hunted later. You're not increasing overall populations. You know that's where everybody gets, like if we're shutting down a unit we're not helping the population.

Steve Dalton: Well I guess what I'm hearing from you is . . . I'm not trying to make an agreement about it, it's just a different philosophy.

Anis Aoude: It's not a philosophy; it's a biological fact. It's not a philosophy.

Steve Dalton: I guess when you go out and hunt mule deer bucks and you kill bucks on a unit that has an impact on the buck doe ration and also on the overall population.

Anis Aoude: Yes. Not on the overall population growth rate because the bucks needed to reproduce are still in the population after you're done hunting. They will reproduce and those does will have offspring for the next year. You're basically harvesting the surplus.

Steve Dalton: I understand that. I understand it fine. That's not the only impact that hunting has. That's not the only impact that takes place on the overall population is just the fact that a buck gets killed, all of these other uses of the resource out there, people out there hunting antlers, all of the hunts you have that start in August and run clear through the end of the year, all of these factors also have an impact on that overall population.

Anis Aoude: They do.

Steve Dalton: Well the stresses that are involved, I feel like, may have a major impact on the overall population of the deer in this state and it's catching up with us. Something's got to be done to change this; and that's where I think this twenty-nine units came from. And what was suggested with last year when this presentation was made here at this RAC and the southeastern RAC was to try it on the southern region and the southeastern region because these two units are the ones that have so much diversity and that we have a really hard time managing that unit with one set of regulations and rules governing the entire unit. And so it seems like a really good idea that didn't even get off the ground before it got to Salt Lake and it became a state-wide unit so that you've got a whole bunch of contention created that didn't need to happen. If this would have stayed at a southern and southeastern experiment and see how it worked I think there might have been an opportunity to help. Anyway my question has turned into comments. I'll shut up.

Cordell Pearson: Okay Steve. All right Clair.

Clair Woodbury: A couple of questions Anis, on these hearing we've got the three options. Is there any provision of hybridizing some of these options through the comments and through our votes on the RACs? Or is it an either or situation?

Anis Aoude: I mean you know as well as I do that these RACs and Boards hybridize things all the time, so . . . certainly.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, because a lot of the comments and e-mails I got had lots of ideas, suggestions,

venting. Some of them are pretty good ideas that actually aren't in these three options.

Anis Aoude: Sure. I mean we can't have an option for everything that you could possibly do; we'd be here all night just presenting.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, so it could turn out a little different than some of these it would seem.

Anis Aoude: Sure.

Clair Woodbury: Okay. One other question I have, I agree with you the, it seems like most of the heat that I'm hearing is deer numbers. I think we need to make a disconnect. This meeting is about buck numbers and buck ratio. Deer numbers is for another meeting. On these habitat improvements did you say sixty million dollars we've done in habitat improvements?

Anis Aoude: Correct.

Clair Woodbury: Are, and you said it could take a few years, but are we staying, catching up, staying ahead, making progress putting this much money into it or are we still falling behind? In your opinion.

Anis Aoude: As far as improving habitats?

Clair Woodbury: Improving the overall state deer herd and elk herd habitats. Or do we need to put more in to get ahead?

Anis Aoude: I think we're probably to the point where we're starting to catch up. I think, you know we've been behind for so long on what the habitat has been it's going to take a while to even get up to . . . Well yeah, every acre we do is headway.

Clair Woodbury: By making headway I mean the habitat that continues to deteriorate plus what we improve.

Anis Aoude: No, no, obviously not. I mean a lot of it is conversion, it's not you know, so from one habitat type to another and going back in and doing it. No, basically right now we're just doing as much as we can.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, thank you.

Douglas Messerly: Let me add something to that too Anis and Mr. Chairman. What we did Clair, if you recall and we've given presentations to this Board about it, is I identified priority areas when the habitat initiative first was established. And we focused on those areas that, the original habitat initiative focused on deer range improvement, sagebrush (unintelligible). And so the answer to your question is yes, we've done some good. We've focused our efforts and more than our fair share of the money in the southern region to improve deer range and habitat. And you know as someone who's been to many of these projects I can tell you that we have made a lot of progress.

Clair Woodbury: Thank you Doug, I appreciate that. And that will be my last comment on deer herd numbers tonight. It will be only the buck to doe ratios.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, Paul you had a question.

Paul Briggs: Yeah, Anis, do you know what the numbers are, population, overall population now, an estimate and what the plan calls for?

Anis Aoude: The statewide estimate is right around 302, 303 somewhere in that ballpark. The five-year goal is 350.

Paul Briggs: Okay and then a follow-up to that would is how far are we into the planning cycle with the mule deer management plan?

Anis Aoude: We're on the second year.

Paul Briggs: Out of five, right?

Anis Aoude: Five, yep

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Any other questions? Go ahead Dell.

Dell LeFevre: Do you know how that snow on the Boulder Escalante area affected your deer? I lost sixty head of cows. We got pictures of most of them. Coyotes got into our calves this spring. I had about twenty bobtailed calves. We knew of probably another ten, twelve cows to come in on the feedlot without calves because we was feeding on the desert. Have you got any idea what that done to your deer herd?

Anis Aoude: Personally I don't, maybe the regional folks can shed some light to that.

Teresa Bonzo: Vance, I don't know if you want to address this. We've got the radio collar study going on right now that gives us a really good idea of what our overwinter survival was, what we lost, it was a harsh winter, what we're losing to predation. Vance is over the study on the Monroe. That's probably the closest that we've got that we could equate to the Boulder if you want to touch on that.

Vance Mumford: Yeah thanks. Um, we put some radio collars on both adult does and female fawns last year on the Monroe. And the Monroe is adjacent to part of the Boulder and I think the winter was probably equally severe there. What we found is our adult deer survived better than I thought. Probably around fifteen percent mortality on the adult does. Whereas the fawns on the Monroe we lost about seventy percent of the fawns on Monroe which is a pretty heavy loss. And I would say we could probably maybe stretch that out to part of the Boulder, part of the Fish Lake and some of the other units around that. So I think our units around the Monroe took a hit on our overall deer population this year. But the good news is that a lot of the does pulled through okay and they should be reproducing to hopefully full capacity this year.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, Mack.

Mack Morrell: Yeah, I have just a comment. In our area in the Boulder- Plateau, Thousand Lake Plateau, there's been three main species of wildlife, the elk, antelope and deer. And deer by far is the

most fragile species. They get kicked out when it comes to habitat or anything else. And most of them are living in town now because of being kicked out. And we stand riding out there the last thirty days and I can count the number of does I saw on one hand. And prior to that we used to see a lot. So I think in that region the population is definitely on the decrease.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions from the RAC? Dale. You guys on the RAC, let's keep this to the questions right now, comments will be later.

Dale Bagley: On your permit cuts you've got some numbers cut for the regular general hunters, but has there been any discussion on cutting the cap on the dedicated hunters by the same percentage or something? So I mean so we're not favoring one group and taking away from another group.

Anis Aoude: The dedicated hunters come out of the cap. And we haven't, the last year we didn't reach the dedicated hunter cap. So they are already below by probably more than the percentage that we would cut.

Dale Bagley: Okay, then one other question, you said you've spent about three million a year on a coyote predator control.

Anis Aoude: Three million in the last 5 years.

Dale Bagley: Oh, five years. Is there, I mean as part of this plan, has there been any discussion on ways that we could raise that amount that could be spent on that? I mean I don't understand your budget. (Unintelligible) and things like that, but is there, could there be something as a permit increase or a voluntary contribution, you know when we do our draws, you know something that way? Is there any discussion about that?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, that's certainly something that could be. The money we use now is appropriated through the legislature for control, so . . . and it goes through the Department of Agriculture. But, yeah, I mean certainly. One thing we run into is capacity of wildlife services to be able to do more work. So they would have to ramp up as well and I don't know what their capacity is to get more ships and more gunners and all that. So, I mean there's logistical problems but nothing that can't be overcome.

Dale Bagley: Okay, thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll now have questions from the public. Please state your name.

DeLoss Christensen: Thanks Mr. Chairman. My name is DeLoss Christensen from Glenwood, Utah. I have a number of questions. I'll just read each one and then Anis can address them as we go. From 1983 to 1993, the year before the cap, we lost eighty-eight thousand hunters in the state of Utah. Yet in 1993 we still had approximately six hundred thousand deer. Why do you think those hunters quit hunting? That's one question. Second question is, how many fawns per one hundred does do we need to

grow the deer herd across the state? Not average but specific. How many of the three hundred thousand plus deer that you believe we have live during the deer hunt on private property? And last but most importantly, with the deer herd as healthy as you believe it is, on average, at carrying capacity where we can't have more, why are we seeing so many more spotted fawns during October and November? If they're being born in June why are they still on milk late in the year? Thank you. I'll just take my seat.

Anis Aoude: I hope I can remember them all. Okay. So I should have wrote them down. Okay so the first one dealt with what would we need to have (question repeated off mic). Okay, yeah. Well we lost those hunters because basically what's going on now happened back then; people wanted to see more bucks in the field so they cut the permits from, they created the cap in 1994. (Comments being made off mic). Right, populations were declining even back then, yeah. So in 1993 . . . (Comments being made off mic). Correct. And I'll correct you though; it was not six hundred thousand deer in '93. There was probably maybe three fifty. Now as far as under current survival rates for does and fawns statewide, this is a statewide average, we need to be above forty-three fawns per one hundred does in December to increase. So forty-three, survival rates forty-three fawns per one hundred does in December is break even. (Comments made off mic). Uh, depends on the unit but we're above that currently. (Comments made off mic.). Slightly growing, yep. Okay. (Comments made off mic). About sixty percent of Utah is public land so sixty percent of them live on public land and forty percent. (Comments made off mic). It may be slightly . . .

Cordell Pearson: Hold on just minute Anis. In order for you to get on the records you need to come up here when you ask the question. And let's do one at a time and go through it and let him answer it.

DeLoss Christensen: Why are there so many more young fawns in the late fall than there used to be?

Anis Aoude: I would argue that there are not. There are some and there are some every year and that's due to some of the, some yearlings on occasion will breed and they usually drop a later fawn because they're breeding later in the year when they come into heat, when they come into condition. So none of our surveys have indicated a larger than average number of fawns that are born late.

DeLoss Christensen: Mr. Chairman, I think that's the questions that I had. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you DeLoss. Okay, any more questions from the public? Please state your name.

Todd Abelhouzen: I'm Todd Abelhouzen from St. George, Utah. I also represent the SFW Dixie Wildlife Chapter. I'll focus my questions mainly on two different subjects, number one is changing the criteria to make us look successful and number two is predator management. So the first question is, on the Thousand Lake scenario that you brought up, why if the Thousand Lake unit doesn't meet the objective for the buck to doe ratio would we lower the objective or change the criteria just to make us look successful? It seems like we do that, not only on that unit, but that's my example tonight

Anis Aoude: Well the reason we would change it is because it's not like all the others. You cannot manage it as a limited entry or as a general season. So if you would like to go the other way and make it all limited entry that would be just fine with us. But to manage it for both, what happens is those bucks come off the forest onto private land and they're harvested during the general season. So it makes it really hard for us to achieve a limited entry buck to doe ration on a unit that's hunted both general

season and limited entry. That is why. If it was like every other unit we could manage it for limited entry only or general season only but it has been one that is hard to manage for both; almost impossible.

Todd Abelhouzen: Thank you. I just see some concern with changing the rules to make us look like we are winning the game. The second thing is, we had not heard a lot about predator control tonight. And you know we talked about three million dollars going into the fund and we've done six hundred thousand acres of habitat. And we've contributed, the sportsman, and the sportsman's groups have contributed a lot to that. What is the aggressive management plan for predators? And specifically, I know we're not talking about mountain lion numbers tonight, but if we have three hundred and ten thousand deer how many mountain lions do we have in the state and how many mountain lions or how many deer average are killed by mountain lions per year? And then I'll talk about coyotes. Go ahead.

Anis Aoude: I'll deal with mountain lion predation. Basically mountain lion predation is usually mostly on adults. And uh, at least from this first year of the radio collar study our adult doe survival is actually higher than we anticipated. So we don't, just from that one year, and I agree it's not a whole lot and we'll learn more in the future, it doesn't seem to be that at least adult predation is an issue. We're not having very many does getting eaten to the point where it's reducing their survival. That survival rate includes everything other than hunting. So mountain lions are included in that. So if mountain lions are having an effect on the adult deer you would see a lower survival rate from one year to the next and we haven't seen that. So although we do have predator management plans on deer units that are below objective where we try to harvest more lions, getting more aggressive on that, at least from the preliminary data, doesn't seem like it's going to help a whole lot on the adult front.

Todd Abelhouzen: You didn't answer how many lions are in the state and how many they kill a year.

Anis Aoude: I don't know and I don't know.

Todd Abelhouzen: I've got a really good comment; I'll hold it until later. Really, really good comment. You're probably going to be really mad at me. Um, why is predator coyote control managed by the Department of Agriculture when the sportsman dollars and the hunting budget is put, why isn't it handled by the Division of Wildlife Resources?

Anis Aoude: Because coyotes are not under the Division of Wildlife's management. They are basically a non-protected species. So we don't manage coyotes. They fall under the Department of Agriculture. And it makes more sense to go through them when we do our coyote control because there's already coyote control taking place to protect livestock. So it makes more sense to do it all at once than to pay them separately out of separate coffers and do things separately. It's just a synergy there that we get more accomplished by doing it that way.

Cordell Pearson: Okay thanks. Now does someone else have a question from the audience?

Joe B Venutti: I'm Joe B Venutti. I grew up in Escalante. I live in St. George now. And in line with what Clair was talking about I won't even touch the elk to deer thing and all that because I think that's a whole separate issue for another night. I do think it's important to state that the cervidae species are changing and that's a whole different study. But tonight when we're talking about buck numbers, specifically, the one question I have and it is a pretty simple thing, we get a lot of different hunters coming into the state, especially the southern part of the state, and the thing that's most simple to me

with the populations declining and the thing I wonder is have studies been done or have people, why haven't we considered like so many other states to go to three point or better? If we're killing off all the two points, which a lot of people, I mean people can argue it but guys know a lot of us will pass up two points, and probably most of the people here tonight are the guys that are passing them up, but you're talking about ninety-seven thousand different hunters that are coming in and a lot of them are honestly just driving the roads and shooting what they see. And it's not a hunt for the meat thing. It's just they're not . . . you know. Anyways I'll let him talk. But I just want to know why we're not looking at three point or better.

Anis Aoude: Three point or better, if I had a nickel for every time I've heard that one I'd be a rich man. It was tried in Utah and probably every western state in the mid '80's early '90's. And every western state including Utah went away from it. Multiple reasons, one yeah it saves yearlings but we actually want yearlings harvested. If you concentrate the majority of the harvest on yearlings some of those older age class bucks go unharvested and then they go on to breed. That's exactly what we do with our elk. We have basically a spike season where we harvest yearlings and then when they mature we harvest them as adults. So actually yearling harvest, and a lot of yearling harvest is not a bad thing. And about probably fifty percent of our harvest is yearlings on the buck hunt. And that's a good thing because it still maintains those older age classes. By going a three point or better what you do is you put the hunting pressure on the older age class. So what you end up with is younger bucks going into the rut and the majority of the older bucks are getting harvested. This showed up in the data when we did our, we actually did a really good study back in the '80's when this took place when we had three point or better on some units. So what ended up happening is the buck to doe ratio did not increase. Harvest success decreased a little bit but you ended up just having instead of shooting yearlings you just delayed the inevitable one year; you shot them as two year olds. It didn't really improve a whole lot, the population actually suffered. We had some declines in some populations because of it. Illegal take went through the roof. We did a study that as well. People were shooting illegal bucks and leaving them in the field. CO's had pickup trucks full of them by the end of the season. So it was a total disaster when we tried it. And I don't agree that we should try it again. It does seem like a good idea on the face of it but when you get into the biology of it and the illegal take and all the other things that go along with it . . . Again, I mentioned how almost every western state has tried it and almost every western state has gone away from it for those exact reasons that I mentioned.

Joe B Venutti: Aren't there multiple units in Colorado still that are that with phenomenal deer populations?

Anis Aoude: No there aren't. They do use it for elk but not for mule deer.

Joe B Venutti: Okay. All right. That answers that. One other question I had, and I didn't think of this until tonight and this is just pure curiosity but why is the radio collars, why are those only being put on does? How would you know if your lions and stuff are killing the bucks if they don't have the collars? And your hunters too, how do you know if they're shooting them with that?

Anis Aoude: Okay, again, it goes back to bucks only contributing very little to the population. So if you want to know if your population is growing you need to concentrate on the does and fawns, because the does are producing the fawns and the fawns are the future of the deer herd. And that's the reason we do. If a lion does take a buck, I mean we are doing post-season classifications so we know the buck to doe ration and we can tie it back into the population and know how many bucks we have. So I guess it

doesn't make that much of a difference if mountain lions are targeting bucks only. And I wish they would that way all the does would be still left over to rear fawns.

Cordell Pearson: Any other question from the public?

Chad Nowers: Yeah, Chad Nowers. I'm just here representing myself. I remember back when they quit hunting does; quit slaughtering all the deer. It was about three years. I know the first year they quit hunting does we found dead does everywhere. People would shoot em; if it wasn't a buck so they'd leave it. The next year we found fewer and by the third year we didn't find so many does left. Now you hardly ever see a doe shot. Hunters have a little thick head and have a hard time learning I guess. What I'm saying is when you did the studies, when they did these studies on four point or better, three point or better, whatever, multiple point, you guys did it one year.

Anis Aoude: No, it was a ten-year study.

Chad Nowers: It was a ten-year study? It wasn't around here. They did it on the Monroe. They did one year.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, there were some units that came into it late but the bulk of the units (inaudible).

Chad Nowers: I know the Monroe they did it a four year, four point or better one year and then they dropped it.

Anis Aoude: Right it was at the tail end of the study.

Chad Nowers: I still wonder why it wouldn't work.

Cordell Pearson: I see you holding your hand up back there. If you want to say something we need you to come up to the mic, please.

Anis Aoude: And there's multiple reasons not just the illegal take against three point or better. The illegal take is just one aspect of it; biologically it's a bad idea as well.

Curtis Barney: My name's Curtis Barney. If our goal is to reach 18 bucks per 100 does, and that's our goal here tonight with the options you have presented, the one option, Option 2, calls for thirteen thousand cut in tags. And if I remember right you said the reason that is more is because you can cut the eighteen bucks per one hundred does has to be in each unit causing more cuts in tags, versus the one, Option 1 where a unit may not be eighteen bucks per one hundred but the region may fit within that causing less tag numbers to be cut. My question to you is, if that is your goal why would you choose the least effective option in all of this?

Anis Aoude: Because the reason for that is the option that increases a regional objective to eighteen but reduces the fewest permits. So basically we still have more opportunity but we have a few more bucks out there as well. So it's, yeah, I mean if, if our goal is to cut permits then yeah, the twenty-nine units is the way to go; but that's not the Division's goal. The Division's goal is to have as much opportunity as possible but still provide a few additional bucks out there.

Kenny Davis: My name's Kenny Davis from Cedar City, Utah. I have the study that Anis was talking about. And I do have a comment that I'm going to make; it's a five-year study not a ten year.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, if you have a comment I want you to hold it until comments. Just ask a question please.

Kenny Davis: I am going to ask my question but I do want to point that out. That was a five-year study not a ten year. And then was illegal harvest so much that we didn't have a net gain?

Anis Aoude: Net gain in bucks?

Kenny Davis: In the number of bucks.

Anis Aoude: Not just illegal harvest but the harvest success didn't decrease enough to have a net gain. It wasn't just one thing.

Kenny Davis: Okay, the same study does shows that buck to doe ratios on those units were about three to four bucks per hundred does higher. Thanks.

Garth Jensen: Garth Jensen, Cedar City, Utah. I just had a couple questions. When you said that by closing units it doesn't help the overall population . . . It seems like it helped the Henrys and the Paunsagaunt and the other units that we currently have as limited entries now. I was just curious.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, on those units it did not help the population. It saved bucks for a few years so when we opened it they were bigger bucks. And at that point we limited the number of permits; they were no longer general season units. So yeah they were bigger bucks when you opened it and that's what will happen again if you close it, but the overall population did not increase at all.

Garth Jensen: Okay, I guess I can take that. I disagree but . . . Uh, and then in Option 2 you never address the lifetime license holders and how those would play into effect. I was just curious on that.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we did actually. The lifetime license holders get to choose a unit.

Garth Jensen: And if the lifetime license holders fill up the whole unit then there's no tags available to the public, correct?

Anis Aoude: Correct. We looked at where they're distributed currently and they don't, they spread themselves fairly evenly throughout the state so we didn't feel that we needed to limit them. If we find in the future that they are doing that then we could start limiting them to a percentage of each unit. But currently the way they are spread out there's only about forty-five hundred lifetime license holders and of those only about three thousand to thirty-five hundred actually hunt. So, and they spread themselves fairly evenly across the state. So initially we don't see the need to limit them to a unit.

Garth Jensen: And the last question I have, I had heard this but I don't know it for a fact, on your buck to doe ratio when you get your counts, I'd heard that half the fawns are counted as bucks, but that's not true?

Anis Aoude: That's not true. We only classify yearling and older bucks. So they actually have to have antlers.

Brian Tavoian: Brian Tavoian, Cedar City. I appreciate the scientific methods that you are using to get these different studies and stuff like that; and that's what I think we need. There is a difference between the perceptions of the public of how that is done. So that's probably some discontent of what was going on here. I would like to see a study on adultI'm asking a question.

Cordell Pearson: (Unintelligible). Just one second. When you all come up to the mic please just ask the question. We don't want to hear, comments will be later and you'll have a chance to comment, okay?

Brian Tavoian: Okay. Why isn't there a study done with cougars, lets say, adult males and the quality of the herds that we have and the quality of the bucks we have instead of just the sheer numbers. Everybody's talking about sheer numbers, you know you go to other states and there's high, high quality of bucks. So we, I'm just questioning you about can we have more cougar permits? Because in my mind, since there's no study done, in my mind we need more cougars removed because they're removing the bucks that increase the quality of the herd, not the number, because that's what you've already said, but the quality.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, I guess there's been multiple studies done removing cougars and all of that, even in Utah on the Monroe Mountain. Basically there was a study done where they had really really high cougar harvest, got the cougar population down to levels that were almost nonexistent. And now they've brought them back and there was no change in the deer population. Now as far as studies about specifically what they eat, there is actually a study out there, it hasn't been published yet, that looks at the diet of cougar and the proportions of bucks to does. I don't have that data off of the top of my head but that was done in Utah. We could get that. But from what I remember there was no disproportionate numbers of bucks being taken versus does. They took them pretty much equally. Maybe a little bit higher because bucks tend to live in a little bit more rugged country. Now as far as quality goes if you add, if you have more bucks the chances of you having older bucks, which tend to have the bigger antlers is going to increase. So that's kind of one leads to the other. A case in point is the Henry Mountains; we've got a population between fifteen hundred and two thousand deer. We harvest forty animals; we have lots of big bucks. I mean that's the extreme. We don't want to go to that end of it but that's kind of what reducing harvest does. It lets there be more mature bucks out there, those tend to have bigger antlers.

Brian Tavoian: Thank you. Not on the draw areas but say regional areas, one, why isn't there a priority for the people that live in that region to have a possibility of getting that tag more than say someone who lives in northern Utah? One, and two I'm an archer and a rifle hunter, why isn't the archery the same as the rifle; meaning that it's not statewide, that it's done either by unit or by region? not by region or unit specific.

Anis Aoude: Why don't the people that live in an area get the first draw at it? Well that's a good question. That's a social question. I think if you put it up to a vote you would lose because there's more people that live in the northern part of the state than the southern. That's a social question and I can't really answer that. The second part, I don't know if I remember the second part. What was the other question? Archery, yeah. The reason archery is statewide is basically we're trying to maintain; we're trying to make sure we sell those sixteen thousand permits. And the only way we were able to sell them,

initially, was to make the archery statewide. We want people to be in the archery sport because they are less, they harvest fewer animals. Their success rate is much lower. And we feel if we go away from statewide archery we will start losing archers which in turn may turn to be rifle hunters with higher success rates so there would be fewer hunters overall.

Brian Tavioan: Interesting. I don't know if a study has been done but it seems like most of the archery hunters are down here in the southern region. So that would change all of the numbers that we have in the unit and possibly decrease it. Have you guys thought of that? Thank you.

Anis Aoude: We presented our data last year exactly showing that there are actually not, proportionally to habitat there are not more archers in the southern region. There are more archers in numbers but in proportions to the habitat that exists down here it's not higher. Archers per acre is not, the density is not higher. So yeah, there are more archers that come to the southern region but there's more public land with deer habitat in the southern region as well.

Alan Wood: My name's Alan Wood. I'm a lifetime license holder plus I'm a dedicated hunter because I do like archery and rifle. But the same with the gentleman, he took my first question, have you considered the impact that it has on the deer herds with the thirty-day-long archery hunt, not just the kill ratio but out there pursuing and harassing and chasing the animal around, has that been taken into account?

Anis Aoude: I guess, deer are a prey animal they're always being chased, whether humans are chasing them or other predators. I agree, I mean we do put a lot of pressure on them throughout the year. But in almost every state they're hunted from about September 1st to about when we stop hunting them. So as far as the effect on them we should see that in the survival rates. And thus far, I mean it's still early in the study, we haven't seen survival rates decrease more than normal.

Alan Wood: Second question I have, we're data driven this, data driven that. We've got all these studies we've done them ten, twenty years whatever. With all the organizations, the DWR, the public, the mule deer federation, SFW, millions of dollars have been put into habitat change or increasing the habitat, all this data we've got supposedly been keeping, my still question is where's our deer herd?

Anis Aoude: That's a good question. I mean those are the questions we're trying to answer. I don't have an answer for you right now.

DeLoss Christensen: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question?

Cordell Pearson: One more, go ahead.

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen. The question I have is in regard to a comment you made answering a question earlier, and that is that we have three hundred and two thousand deer, give or take, in the state now. You state that we had three hundred and fifty thousand deer in 1983.

Anis Aoude: No, 93.

DeLoss Christensen: I said '83 when I came up. Okay. How many deer do you think we had in '83? And the reason I'm asking this question Anis is we took eighty-two thousand bucks in '83 based on your data

reports. We only took twenty-two thousand bucks last year. So if we've only taken twenty-two thousand bucks last year how many deer overall have we lost since we could harvest eighty-two thousand bucks?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, here were really no good population estimates back in the 80's. We didn't start doing population estimates until the mid 90's. So I don't have a good estimate for you. I would venture to say if buck harvest was any consideration and back (unintelligible) into a number it was probably between four and five hundred thousand.

Dane Stephenson: I'm Dane Stephenson. I'm from Holden, Utah. Do you think the statewide bow hunt and the dedicated hunter program made a decline in the deer numbers in the southern unit?

Anis Aoude: No.

Dane Stephenson: Does anybody agree with me on that? No? Have you ever thought with all these trail cameras, every water hole I go to on the mountain, we run cows east of Holden, every water hole has a trail camera. I mean don't you think that's declined the deer herd? They've got pictures of em, the time of day, the time of night. They have cameras; they can take em at two o'clock in the morning. I think there needs to be something done with that. The deer don't have a chance, whether they're in the dark or in the day.

Anis Aoude: No I don't think that cameras by them selves have an effect on the deer population. Again, if buck harvest increases, buck to doe ratio decreases; and we would do something about it. This region has the highest buck to doe ratio in the state. So I don't, I don't think the cameras themselves have an effect. And I don't think the harvest success that comes from having those cameras has a population level effect. Yeah they may harvest a few more bucks but that does not have a population level effect. We are still above the number of bucks needed to service all the does.

Dane Stephenson: Do you not need bucks to breed does? Does that, you say . . .

Anis Aoude: You do. We do post season buck doe ratios and in this region they average between seventeen and eighteen. You need about ten bucks per one hundred does to breed all the does. We have almost double that. So we have a sufficient number of bucks to breed all the does.

Dane Stephenson: Just one more question. We had a fire above Holden one year and then that winter they had a fifty doe hunt, they killed fifty does. What was their reason for that?

Anis Aoude: I guess I'm not familiar with that hunt. Usually when, and I can say in generalities, I don't know about that one specifically, but usually when habitat is lost and deer are going to come to winter ranges that are non-existent we try to kill them before they starve to death. So we may have tried to control that population before they come to winter ranges and die on those winter ranges.

Dane Stephenson: Okay, one more question. My dad's been running cows there his whole life, and there's more feed there across that whole Pahavant range now than there ever has been, more browse, and there's less deer. You say there's less habitat for the deer but I don't know where you're getting your . . . I mean we go up there and ride every day in the summer and there's ten times more feed up there than there was forty years ago.

Anis Aoude: Again, that's what you see; the data doesn't show that.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, again, we're getting a little carried away. Let's start asking questions here. This is a period for questions not comments. You'll have a chance to comment later.

Jordan Mecham: Okay, I'm Jordan Mecham. I'm from Delta, Utah. The only question I have is how many deer were there in 1994 when they started counting? You said three thousand, three hundred and twenty thousand deer, correct?

Anis Aoude: It was between three fifty and three sixty around '94.

Jordan Mecham: Okay, so my question is so right now we have three hundred two thousand deer. So roughly in sixteen years we've only lost thirty thousand, forty thousand deer. I guess my question is if we've only lost that many deer I doubt you'd have this many people at a RAC meeting. And then the second question I have is who. . . .

Cordell Pearson: Okay hold on just one second. That's not a question. That's a comment. Keep them to a question here, okay. I'm going to start cutting you off.

Jordan Mecham: Who comes up with these buck to doe ratios? Who specifically is responsible for the southwest desert for Bumble Bee, for Cedar Mountain? For these numbers here who specifically is over going and counting the bucks per doe?

Anis Aoude: Basically we have biologists in every region that have specific units that are assigned to them. They do the surveys with the help of the conservation officers.

Jordan Mecham: Would it ever be possible to go for a ride along? Because I spend hundreds of hours in the southwest desert; my family has a ranch out there. We go out there. And I personally this year did not count twenty-nine bucks per all the does I saw out there.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, you certainly could. Contact the manager, that's Teresa Bonzo, and she'll hook you up with the right biologist.

Jordan Mecham: Okay. The third question I have is how can we with the regions the way there are now get a specific count on how many deer are killed? For example the southern region is huge, how was that a specific count? Because not every year do I get a phone call from the Division asking me if I killed a deer when I killed a deer.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, basically it's a stratified sample; it's statistically sound for each region. What they do is they call a sample of hunters. Not every hunter is called. And basically that's how we get the numbers. We have to have so many in each unit to be able to say that that many hunters were in each unit. I mean basically it's statistics and it's a little bit hard to explain but they can tell you who's going to win the race from polling forty people. So you know, it's basically the same. Yeah, it's stats. They call a subsample of hunters..

Jordan Mecham: My last question. Is Option 1 and Option 3 is basically the same thing we've been

doing for a lot of years now. Option 2 is the different option. It's different; it's something new. So the question I have to end is how can we keep doing the same things with Option 1 and Option 3 and expect different results?

Anis Aoude: Again, it's buck hunting. We can expect the same results. We would expect about the same results if we manage for eighteen bucks per hundred does we'll have eighteen bucks per hundred does. Again, everybody wants to tie buck harvest to population increases and the two are not tied together and I can't stress that enough. What increases population is doe survival and fawn survival and fawn production. When we have good range conditions out there you're fawn production is higher. If you lose a few more fawns you can absorb it. And the inverse is true. So it's not about buck harvest. All of these, any of these recommendations we're doing are increasing by two or three per hundred the number of bucks. They are not doing anything on a population level.

Jeff Albrecht: My name is Jeff Albrecht. I'm from Richfield. I have 2 questions. If Option 2 were implemented how do you determine how many tags are allocated for each of the units whether it's by acreage or population if we have a number for that?

Anis Aoude: Basically the way it would be done is the way it's done now. We have a buck to doe ratio objective if it goes above it we know how many permits we need to get it to reach a certain buck to doe ratio. It's a fairly complex calculation but basically you can almost even do it by trial and error. You decrease permits and if buck to doe ratio goes up and it gets to the level where you need it you leave it there. It's basically if you fall below eighteen bucks per one hundred does you reduce permits. If you go above twenty-five you would increase permits, proportionally to get the result you need based on the number that already exists there.

Jeff Albrecht: Would the statewide archery wouldn't that go against what you were just saying? If you can have the whole state hunt one unit regardless with archery then?

Anis Aoude: I don't think the whole state, sixteen thousand archers, are going to hunt one unit. I guess it could happen but I highly doubt it.

Jeff Albrecht: All right, my last question. If this Option 2 is implemented could the management strategies for each of these units differ from each other in the future?

Anis Aoude: I guess anything is possible, that would not be in the Division's recommendation.

Kody Smith: Kody Smith, Cedar City, Utah. My question is on your buck to doe ratio numbers on your counts how do you for units that have deer that migrate off of that unit how do you compensate for that count?

Anis: We try to start the counts right after the season ends so we catch the majority of those before they migrate. Again, if a certain biologist knows the migration routes of the animals they may consolidate two units and try to get a buck to doe ratio on both of those units combined. Again, it's unit by unit. Most, a lot of units they move in range but they're still on the unit. There are some migrations where they go between two units. So it's based on the knowledge of the biologist for each unit.

Kody Smith: Yeah, I know in southern Utah we deal a lot with that. My second question, due to the

lack of confidence that I personally have, would it be possible for the Division to use a private company to make those counts; somebody that didn't have an interest in what those counts came out to be?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. You would be surprised what the cost would be to have a private company do it. It's not cost effective at all. We don't have an interest. Basically we gather the data, we make recommendations. We make no decisions at all. So I don't see where our interest comes into it. Our only interest is to grow the deer herds. We don't have any interest. We make recommendations based on biology and then leave the decision making to the RACs and the Boards.

Greg Higgins: Hi, Greg Higgins from Richfield. In previous RAC meetings it was discussed on having a combined elk and deer hunt statewide. I didn't see that in any of the recommendations. Is that still on the table, or it is still a possibility? Or what is the Division's outlook on that?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we were asked to table that for at least the short term. So I do imagine it may come back but for the short term it's not on the table.

Nolan Gardner: Nolan Gardner, St. George. Question, where did all the does go? If the lions aren't killing them and there's not that many winter kill where did they all go?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, good question. They're out there somewhere.

Brian Tavoian: Brian Tavoian, Cedar. One more question. It would seem like everybody would be happy if there were a bigger deer herds. And if on the one that you stated, fifteen percent of the adults died on the Monroe, seventy percent of the fawns and you needed forty-three percent of the born fawns that year to survive since December, what can we do, what can you do as a DNR and what can we do as sportsman as a hunter, besides helping with dedicated hunter program that Blain's in charge of lately, what can we do to increase the number of fawns? Because that's what the question is; that's what the whole question is, not how many bucks or regions or whatever, how do we increase the fawns? How do we do that together?

Anis Aoude: Okay, basically there's two things that influence fawn survival, one is the shape they're born in, whether they're high birth weight or whatever, and then the other is the number of predators out there. So you could have lots of fawns and overcome the number of predators but if you have few fawns you cannot overcome. So our part is maybe try to improve the habitat as well as we can. Your part is, you know, coyotes are probably the ones that are responsible for most of the predation. Do a decrease in coyote numbers is one that would help. So go coyote hunting as much as you can.

David Lundt: I'm David Lundt, Cedar City. Two questions, first involves the number of permit cuts. You have thirteen thousand, I think, in plan two. How many of those cuts are in state tags and how many are out of state? What's the ration on that?

Anis Aoude: They would be equal. Right now we only issue ten percent of the total permits to nonresidents. So it would be ten percent of that would be cut out of nonresidents.

David Lundt: Okay, so it would be an equal cut. You're not . . .

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we can't issue more than ten percent to nonresidents.

David Lundt: And then my other question still involves with the three point or better. Have you ever looked into maybe doing, because I saw where they did in the hunt down, well in the southern regions and other ones where certain age groups were allowed, you know, only a five day instead of the nine day. Where from twelve years I think it was to eighteen year olds were allowed the full nine-day hunt. Have you ever looked into doing a hunt where three point or better for eighteen or older and then the younger kids that are out there learning to hunt can harvest those younger ones? That way you don't have necessarily the poaching of the two points and left on the side of the road and it might also help maintain that.

Anis Aoude: There's a lot of complexity to that as well and a lot law enforcement issues that come along with that. There may be somebody that shot a two point and had his son tag it. There's a whole lot of stuff that comes along with it. So yeah, they weren't left on the field but they were still harvested. No it's not something we've considered because of the complexity that comes along with it and the potential for misuse.

David Lundt: Well I mean it's the same involvement with the five day, you know, switch to a five day instead of a nine day. You've got somebody going out with a kid, you know, taking them out on the nine day hunt, he's going to shoot the deer and tag it with his son's tag. Well now why was that implemented?

Cordell Pearson: Okay, let's keep it to a question not a comment okay please.

Anis Aoude: That wasn't our recommendation either. That was something that the Board decided last minute. So that was not the Division's recommendation.

David Lundt: Was that effective this year? Did that help?

Anis Aoude: We don't have the harvest data for this year yet.

Chad Nowers: I got a question. Chad Nowers, Beaver. Are you still planning that doe hunt down by Cedar this winter on the winter range?

Anis Aoude: Yes.

Chad Nowers: Why?

Anis Aoude: We're over objective on that herd.

Chad Nowers: I personally don't think you're over objective anywhere in this whole state. Doug and I's had this argument before.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond from Beaver, Utah. I just have a question that I'm unclear about and I've never been able to get a good answer on. We talked about coyotes and that's probably the biggest thing we can do to help. If coyotes are a nongame animal, why is the Division enforcing trapping rules targeted towards coyotes?

Anis Aoude: Because if traps set for coyotes catch other animals that are protected then we need to protect those animals as well.

Brayden Richmond: Okay my understanding is studies show that if we're targeting coyotes in our traps it's a pretty minimal loss to other animals, is that true or not true?

Anis Aoude: It's not actually true. Actually the number one animal that gets caught in a lot of the snares set for coyotes in fences are usually fawns. So you may be shooting yourself in the foot by not doing it., So there is a lot of, you can set, you can set to try to catch only coyotes but chances are you're not going to every time. I mean if you've trapped a lot you can set to try to catch only coyotes but there will be other things caught; there's just no two ways about it.

Brayden Richmond: A couple more coyote questions and then I'll ask another one. My current understanding is that there's a big game hunt going on that is considered a game management reserve, so you aren't supposed to coyote hunt at the same time. You can most effectively kill coyotes, in my experience, calling them in August or September, which according to some conservation officers we shouldn't be out doing. How do we get around that?

Anis Aoude: Actually Boyd's going to present part of the rule that takes that hunting preserve language out of the rule.

Brayden Richmond: Great, perfect. And the last question on coyotes, now I forgot my question. I'll move on to my other question about deer. Okay, you stated that the five-year plan for deer, we're hoping in five years to have three hundred fifty thousand deer, is that correct?

Anis Aoude: That was the optimistic estimate when we put the deer plan together; given good conditions we could get to that. Yeah, that is what we would hope to get to.

Brayden Richmond: And I apologize, this is kind of a sensitive question so I'll apologize before hand, but in my job, educated job, went to college and so we're going to hear a bunch of different opinions tonight about how to do it and what we should do. We trust the Division, the educated people over this so we're kind of putting the deer in your hands ultimately. Who's accountable if we don't get to this three hundred and fifty thousand dollar mark?

Anis Aoude: I don't know if there's accountability. A lot of the things that keep us from getting there are not in our control. Again, that was a goal put together given best-case scenario we could get to three fifty; and that's why we put that objective there. So that's given, you know, if production stays high, if precipitation stays normal and all those other things. Uh, it's a hard question to answer on accountability. I don't know who you would hold accountable if all the pieces don't fall into place. Many of them are not in our control. We are doing all the things that we can do in the plan to get to that, the rest is really out of our control.

Mike Ross: When I began hunting I had to take a hunters safety course and a shooting test. Oh, Mike Ross, sorry. I'm wondering if you've ever considered having archery hunters do an ethics course, shooting?

Anis Aoude: Yeah that was bounced around. And again, that's not in my program that falls under hunter

education portion. They decided it would not be a good thing to mandate that people have a proficiency test because basically what they would do is practice, shoot well during that test and then if you don't practice as we know as archers all the time you're not going to be proficient at it. So having a false proficiency test where people could pass it and then if they don't practice the rest of the year be just as bad of a shot as they were before they took the test wasn't really that effective. So there wasn't really, the direction they want to go is to promote good sportsmanship and have more archery clinics and things like that where people get to practice more. They didn't feel mandating it would help a whole lot because it's just one time that they have to shoot well.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I just want to say one thing okay; we've been this now for two hours. Okay, I'd like you to just please to make your questions short. We haven't even got into the comments, which is probably going to take about three or four more hours. So make your questions short, to the point and just as soon as the questions are over we're going to take a short break and then we'll go into comments.

Craig White: Craig White from Beaver. We've got approximately 60 acres within one mile of this building and we have a real problem with deer in it. It's a non hunting area, non-shooting. What is being done about those areas? We would like to see the deer up on the hill and not down here year round.

Anis Aoude: I'm not sure why it's a non-hunting area, is it because it's with city limits? Yeah. Again, the only thing we could do with those is have cities change their ordinances so that people could maybe archery hunt or something in those. And sometimes the Division does removal of those deer but really the only tool we have as a Division is hunting. So unless ordinances allow us to do that there's really not another tool to remove those deer.

Steve Nielson: Steve Nielson. I've got a question on the habitat on the Monroe Mountain. It's seems like we've had more habitat done on the Monroe, the Dixie harrow projects, the seeking common grounds, elk federation has put a bunch of time and money into it. Probably the best habitat in I would say the state of Utah. Would you agree?

Anis Aoude: Well I'm not that familiar. I would have to ask somebody who's over that unit specifically.

Vance Mumford: Good question. This is Vance Mumford, biologist over the Monroe Mountain area. He's correct, we've done, between us, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, we have done a lot of habitat projects on the winter range and the summer range on Monroe. We've put a lot of work into it and I think it has helped. But what we find is that still, I don't think we've been able to keep up with the change in the habitat; through what we've talked about before, cheat grass invasion, pinion juniper encroachment. And so we still have not seen, like the last two years on Monroe Mountain we've had pretty low fawn rations when we do our counts in December. And that is an indicator of the quality of the habitat very often. And so I think we've helped things. I think without those projects our reproduction, our deer herd would be worse. But I don't think those projects have been enough to make the difference that we would all like to see on it..

Clark Carver: Clark Carver, Monroe. You answered the first question on who does the count of the deer. My second question if you cut the permits on the three proposals how are you going to renew your losses on your permits?

Anis Aoude: Depending on which option, if it's the most extreme one we would probably ask for a permit increase.

Clark Carver: How much?

Anis Aoude: Roughly to cover that it would probably be around a five dollar, about five dollars a permit is what it would take to make up that difference.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we're going to take a short break right now. Ten minutes and then we'll come back and proceed.

(20 minute break)

Cordell Pearson: We will start where we left off. And remember, this is questions not comments. Do we have any more questions?

Ken Broadhead: I'm Ken Broadhead. I'm out of Beaver. I was just wondering about the Option 2 and the dedicated hunter, why do we have to take away the dedicated hunter in that and is there a possibility to if we did end up choosing Option number 2 if the dedicated hunter could go on somewhat of a draw system or something like that?

Anis Aoude: Sure. And we thought of that idea of doing it that way. But that ultimately ends up almost making it the same way as a one-year program. Say someone signs up for three-years but are not able to draw the unit they wanted or even second or third option, then they would opt out and basically won't hunt that year and that ultimately makes it a one-year program just by the fact that they didn't get the unit they wanted. Certainly we could do it. We'd have to put a percentage of permits on each unit. It makes it a lot more complicated. This way is basically the simplest way to do it. They would have to draw a unit first; they would opt into the program if they still chose to hunt all three seasons. And basically for simplicity's sake we chose this method of going. Certainly we could get more complicated and have a draw for each unit. That's not out of the question.

Austin Schuppe: Austin Schuppe, Richfield. You said the statewide bow hunt, you said you know more people come into the southern regions to bow hunt and you said it spreads out equally over all the acres. Do you really think the bow hunters hunt all the acreage?

Anis Aoude: No I didn't say the spread out. But I said the density per, and in other regions they don't spread out either. So even if you put the same number, I guess what I'm saying is the number per huntable acres is not higher than any other region. They don't spread out. They're not equally distributed. But they're not equally distributed in any other region either. There are areas that people like to hunt and that's where they concentrate. (Inaudible comment). It's not because if the hunting is crappy why would you hunt there? So if people like to go somewhere that it's not good hunting more power to them.

Steve Nielson: Steve Nielson. What is the minimum number of deer counted on a unit to get your buck doe ratio?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, per unit we try to get a sample size of at least four hundred does and then the

associated bucks and fawns. So usually it ends up being between seven hundred and one thousand classified.

Dennis Gibson: I'm Dennis Gibson from southern Utah. You say by closing a unit it didn't help the buck doe ratio?

Anis Aoude: That's not what I said. I said it doesn't help the population increase.

Dennis Gibson: Well I know Bumblebee and Browse, they was both closed units and they had a better deer herd once you guys opened them after five years. And they had some nice bucks in there. Can you tell me why them were there?

Anis Aoude: I mean you are making my point exactly. Yeah, the bucks were there but the population did not increase. You need to disassociate the two. Sure you didn't hunt bucks therefore they're still there. But the population didn't increase any more. There were no more does and no additional fawns. The bucks that didn't get killed lived to be another year older so when you opened it there were more bucks there. Yeah, of course there was; you didn't kill them. That doesn't improve the herd I guess is what I'm saying. Herd health is not improved by saving bucks.

Dennis Gibson: So now you opened it back up to anyone to go there. I walked from New Harmony to the Browse and I seen a doe and a fawn, a doe and two fawns and that's about ten miles. So now your killing . . . But I want to ask these ranchers up here that herd cows, I want to ask you guys a question. Would you guys kill off your heifers and your yearling bulls to better your herds?

Cordell Pearson: Let's keep this to what we're here for tonight. Okay? The deer.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Okay we'll go to comments from the public. And I want to give you all an opportunity to talk, that's what you're here for. But I don't want you coming up six of you and beating the same dead horse, okay. You come up, you can talk. We understand, everybody's frustrated right now. Everybody wants an answer to this thing, okay. Okay, we have thirty comment cards; we'll take number one. Kim Hansen. Okay, Brayden Gardner you're next; why don't you come up here and take a seat.

Kim Hansen: I guess I got lucky to be number one tonight. Thanks. Kim Hansen, Salem, Utah. I think the proposals we got here tonight are a Band-Aid over a severed artery. I think from some of the comments that I've heard tonight we're looking at hunters want deer population to increase. And I know for a fact that if we have more deer numbers we're going to have more bucks. I think that would satisfy what Anis is trying to accomplish as well. Well, I think we've got a serious predator problem. That's one of the problems that I see that we have. I think we've got a way where we could increase tags and still achieve our goal, and I think the way we do that is capitalize on killing predators. Now Anis didn't know how many predators there were, how many cougars there were in the state of Utah but the stats that I have out of their book is between two and three thousand cougars in the state of Utah. And from every information that I can gather a cougar will typically kill between fifty deer per year to survive. If you take the low number of two thousand cougars that's one hundred thousand deer per year we're losing just to cougars. So, my proposal is here this, let's kill two hundred more cougars per year.

Two hundred more, that's going to save approximately eight to ten thousand deer going off the Division's numbers of about a twenty-five percent harvest that should allow another thirty-two to forty thousand deer permits available to sell. That's deer being utilized at that point. So I also feel that predators bring very little monetary value to the state where deer bring thousands and thousands of dollars to the state. An example that I like to site is the San Juan Elk Ridge story, that's a story that we know of in the late '60's cougars became protected. In 1972 or '73 somewhere in there Nixon banned 10-80, predators began to increase. But the Jan Juan Elk Ridge had a predator problem. Back in the '60's, 70's and even the '50's they were killing about twenty-five hundred deer on the San Juan, fifteen hundred bucks, one thousand does. That translates according to those numbers again to about ten thousand hunters on the San Juan Elk Ridge. So if we've got that many hunters hunting there back then killing twenty-five hundred head of deer, we shut the unit down in 1983, or '80 to '83. In 1984 we open it up as a limited entry. The deer herds continue to decline. There's not been a new Wal-Mart, there's not been a new McDonalds, there's not been a new subdivisions or anything build down there. So it's not new roads, it's not habitat. I'm proposing that we've got a serious predator problem. So they being a problem I don't believe that they are the major problem. I believe that we've got other problems as well. I think we've got an elk study that we need to do. We've got to see why the elk are impacting the deer, and they are. Elk were introduced down on the San Juan at about the same time. I feel they are a problem.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we need you to just, you've got three minutes. Okay, your time's up. (Inaudible comments from the audience) Who are you? Okay.

Kim Hansen: Thank you. Okay, so anyway if we did something like Idaho does, Idaho sells deer tags up there, they allow a hunter to take a deer, a bear, or a cougar on one tag. There's an option. We can also look at the, the other things, like if we cut the tags as proposed in all of these options we've got over here we're looking at cutting the tags in every option. We lose federal money as well. We also lose enthusiasm by young hunters and some of us old guys as well. I think we've got to do something different. What we've done in the past is not working. For the last thirty or forty years the deer herds have been on a steady decline and I think we've got to really get after it. We've got to try something different. I'm not sure if predators is the only answer, but I believe along with SFW we need to increase our deer herd to four hundred and twenty-five thousand and by doing so and going with Option number 2, it will allow us to maximize the studies that are going on currently in the twenty-nine units that they say they're managing as units; and by doing that perhaps we can do a study where we have no cougars, no predators. Another study where we get rid of the elk. Another unit where we have nothing but deer. Let's see what happens. What we've been doing isn't working. So I believe we've all got to forget our personal agenda. All of us need to get together on the same bandwagon and we've got to get our deer herd numbers up and this is a way I think we can do it. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you for your comment.

Brayden Gardner (See Attachment 2): Brayden Gardner, Richfield, Utah. About midday yesterday at work I started inviting some of my friends to ride with me to come to this meeting and found out a lot of my colleagues, friends, family wasn't going to be able to make it. So at five o'clock last night I threw together a quick little letter. I wanted to get a hand full of our associates, friends, and family to sign a letter that just stated how they felt on the three options that are proposed. Nobody feels that the three options any of them are a perfect fit, at least the people I talked to. In eighteen hours from five o'clock yesterday through three o'clock today I gathered almost three hundred letters from Sevier County

surrounding area. Every one of these supports Option 2 with many other changes. It's not just an Option 2, there's a lot more that needs to be done. Predators are an issue. But there's a lot of different things but I'd like to present this to you Mr. Chairman and the board. I've also got another pack I'm going to send off to the Wildlife Board as well. But I feel that's a pretty substantial amount from eighteen hours worth of work in Sevier County and surrounding areas just through e-mail and fax. So three hundred of us do support Option 2.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you very much. Todd Abelhouzen is next. Aren't you the one that just gave up your five minutes?

Todd Abelhouzen: Yeah, how many minutes did I lose?

Cordell Pearson: Five.

Todd Abelhouzen: No I didn't.

Cordell Pearson: You've got two minutes.

Todd Abelhouzen: Okay thank you. I have a concern about the accountability issue that Mr. Anis dodged very gingerly. A, SFW Dixie Chapter: I have a concern about the accountability issue that Anis dodged very gingerly. There is accountability. You work for us. You work for the governor. You work for the natural resource director. You work for the legislature. And your customers are not happy right now. So let's work together. Let's not get attack oriented to one another if possible. There's several things, population objective must be increased before we kill any more antlerless animals, deer or elk. Predators must be aggressively managed. Control criteria within our control. You can't control the weather, you can't control the highways, you can try to control poaching, but you can control habitat and predators. We need to focus on those things. Killing does to increase your buck to doe ratio is ridiculous. And the last comment I have, and I love these guys, they work their tails off a lot of the year, but you conservation officers and biologists that save your vacation until November and December when we need you out counting deer you should reevaluate things next year. SFW Dixie Chapter is going to work our butts off to go out and help you guys count between Thanksgiving and the first of the year. And if you guys aren't on call when we're finding poachers or when we have concerns and issues that's going to be a problem. So I'm not going to name any names, I named all your job titles so that fits all of you in the middle. If you guys have two, or three or four weeks or one week please use them when you're not needed the most and that's right now when we're trying to get these deer figured out. Thank you. .

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Lee Bracken, you're up next. And on deck is Mike Twitchell. Lee Bracken, are you here? Mike Twitchell here? And on deck is Dane Stephenson.

Mike Twitchell (See Attachment 3): Okay, Mike Twitchell. I'm here to represent the Utah Bowman's Association for the southern chapter and also for the state. I had a letter here that I'd just like to read which basically shares our sentiments on the idea. The Utah Bowman's Association supports the Division of Wildlife Resources preferred option, Option 1. We recognize that none of these options will do anything to increase the size of deer herds. Option 1 however does provide for increased quality that many continue to ask for, while still providing reasonable opportunity that the majority of Utah's deer hunters enjoy and want to see continues. Other benefits of Option 1 include the following: the added

ability to restrict numbers of hunters in under objective units. The past efforts of decreasing the number of hunter days has simply not been effective and we believe that the new strategy will give the DWR an effective option to allow objective units to recover. In addition the strategy allows these individual units to return to the region-wide hunt after they have recovered and to avoid becoming a continuous limited entry unit. Number two: maintain the ability to continue the dedicated hunter program as is. We recognize that the importance and value of this program and do not want to see the DWR lose thousands of hours of free labor that they currently receive from this program. Number three: allow bow hunters to continue to hunt statewide, as was determined by the archery committee last year along with the DWR biologists there is no reason to disallow bow hunters from hunting statewide under Option 1. And last, allow families to continue their traditional family hunts. While many have complained that the five regions have contributed to ending traditional family hunts many continue that family hunting tradition. However, splitting the state up into twenty-nine units would absolutely devastate the family hunting tradition in Utah. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah, thank you. Could we get a copy of that letter please? Okay, Dane Stephenson, you're up. Next is Donnie Hunter.

Dane Stephenson: Chairman, RAC, appreciate the opportunity. I'm representing Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife, Iron County chapter. We're interested in Option 2. We need a little more control on how we manage our deer and we think this will help. In fact we've needed it for a long time. We are also interested in a three point or better hunt for a couple of years to maybe give our bucks a little bit of a jump start. And there are a lot of aggravated people here tonight but I think if we all jump on this Option 2 and roll our sleeves up and work together we can get our deer back. We've got some units that we manage this way and those units are very healthy. And I'm not just talking about bucks; we've got a healthy deer herd in those few units that we manage. The fawns are healthy; they're in good shape every year. We've got coyotes, we've got lions on those units but we've still got a healthy deer herd and we only limit the hunters. And we'd like to see some more of these units where we can all go out and enjoy our deer herd. Our deer's our cash crop and we need to take care of it, and we need to do all we can to get those deer back where we can all enjoy them and our families and our youth can go out and have a good successful hunt. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Kody Smith. And on deck will be Greg Higgins if you'd come up here and sit in front please just to save us a little time.

Kody Smith: I'd just like to state my support for Option 2. If we look at the states around us and what they're doing it seems that they're successful. I think a number of us in here are people that go to different states and that's how they are managing their deer herd. It seems they are successful both for the hunter and financially and that's what I support. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. And on deck will be Garth Jenson.

Greg Higgins: Hi, Greg Higgins from Richfield. I grew up in Sevier Valley. And I remember through the '60's and '70's riding up on the mountain by myself and with dad in the evenings the meadows in the mountains would be full of does, deer, sometimes you couldn't count the amount. You don't see that any more. So I'm sure regardless of what the counts have been, and I know that it was stated that they didn't have counts then, but I know the deer populations are down dramatically now from what they were in the '60's, '70's. I had an opportunity to live in Colorado between 1981 and 1993. Their hunting

statutes that they have out there not only have smaller units statewide but they also had combined buck bull, or buck deer, deer-elk seasons to where you have the choice and you can hunt both at the same time. I think that's a very good possibility and it worked out very well for the state of Colorado. I've thought that the state of Utah should emulate what Colorado has done in that. The smaller units, the proposal for number two, I believe that the smaller units get, will get much better management for each unit than what you can do as a whole on one large unit. The cost, the cost of buck permits, regardless of which option is taken, costs are going to go up to buy a permit so I don't think that's going to be an option or an issue. So we know we're going to have to pay more for a deer permit in years to come. One of the downsides that the DWR says is they'll have a little bit more difficulty in enforcing the laws in the smaller units. I don't fully understand why. They are managing and they're enforcing very well in the southern as a whole unit, but, and I won't say that I know everything, but I still think that it can happen. As hunters if we change, no matter what changes happen we as hunters are going to have to adapt, likewise the DWR will also have to adapt to how they operate. As a dedicated hunter I myself am willing to sacrifice a couple of years of inconvenience for future greater quality in our hunting experience. As a dedicated hunter we pay a higher premium for our permits and we also provide a lot of service. The DWR would have a difficult time going without the service that the dedicated hunters throughout the state provide to the DWR. As such I think they in their decisions need to take extra of the dedicated hunters in making sure that they are compensated for the time that they spend in providing their service and their time to them. As an individual I enthusiastically support proposal number 2. It may not be the answer to all the problems; I think it's a good start. And I think there will be many things that will have to change and more things that will have to be done in years to come but this is a good start. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you very much. Garth. And on deck is Brayden Richmond.

Garth Jenson: I'd just like to support Option 2. It seems to me that most of the pros in Option 2 are kind of a necessity to manage your deer herd. And the cons are Option 2 are more or less the luxury item that the current state of our deer herd really can't afford to have any more. The statewide permits just seem to me like they've, they're not really working. If they can't sell out the permits if it wasn't a statewide, I'm pretty sure they'd still sell out the southern region so that's kind of telling me that the northern region's wanting to hunt the southern region. And it just kind of (unintelligible). And also, they stated that they really don't have control over some of the issues, or most of the issues that affect the overall deer numbers and the deer population in the state and that by hunting bucks that really doesn't improve or hurt the overall deer population. But if they don't have control over those issues I don't know really what we're paying them to do. I mean that's kind of what they're supposed to be able to do is control or maybe help or improve the population. So that's my opinion.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Can we get Brayden Richmond to come up here?

Brayden Richmond: Breyden Richmond from Beaver, Utah, representing the Beaver SFW chapter. In the interest of time Byron Bateman I think is going to stand up in a minutes and present the SFW's recommendations. We just want to stank behind that and support that with our voice. Our other concern with our chapter was, which I kind of brought up in my question section, is we believe that we need to have some accountability. We understand there's a lot of other factors. We understand there's a lot of things that we don't know what's going on out there. We also understand that under our committee we're accountable to those that come to our banquets and who we take money from. If we don't produce, if we aren't doing what we say we're going to do we lose our money. I would suggest that the

proof of burden is upon the DWR to show us that they're doing everything possible to get to that three hundred and fifty thousand. There may be outside factors, if there is then the proof of burden is on them to show us that. That's what I had to say for the SFW committee. Mr. Chairman, I also have a personal comment card in there.

Would you like me to address that right now while I'm up or wait?

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead because I saw you had two cards. So go ahead and address that now.

Brayden Richmond: I just wanted to make it clear that this is my personal and not coming from the committee. So once again, Brayden Richmond from Beaver, Utah. A couple of things, the question that I forgot on the coyotes is I'd also like to suggest we do believe it is the public interest to go out and kill coyotes. We think that that's one of the biggest things that we as a general public, or I think that's one of the biggest things we as a general public can do to help with our deer herds. In order to do that we want to do it legally. There's some laws right now that make it difficult. The other comment that I was going to bring up earlier is spotlighting. That rule seems real vague right now, real hard to interpret, left to a lot of interpretation and other problems. And I think that would be another key factor if we could get rid of the spotlighting bans on spotlighting coyotes I think we could kill a lot more coyotes. I think we could kill a lot more coyotes, it would help, it won't hurt to try that. And one other thing that I'd like to bring up and this year more than other years it seems like I just hear a lot of stories of people, and since we're talking about how to kill bucks, we hear a lot of stories of people wounding animals; and then they go wound another one, and then they go and wound another one. I understand it will be difficult to enforce, I understand that, what I'd like to see is I'd like to see a law that you wound it your tag's done. And it's going to be the honest people are going to be enforcing themselves, I realize that. The Division has a lot of stuff to enforce but I'd sure would like to see that on the books. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay thank you for your comment. Byron Bateman. And next will be Jordan Mecham.

Byron Bateman (See Attachment 4): Thank you Mr. Chairman and RAC members. And everybody in the audience tonight that's got up and asked you a question or made a comment so far. There's no question about the passion that goes with mule deer and mule deer hunters. What's come out in the consensus tonight is that we have a problem with our deer herd. I don't think anybody is happy with the way it's going; what's been happening in the past. We have an opportunity tonight; you do as a RAC, to start some real change, make some real benefits to our deer herd. It's been talked about the population that hopefully the Division's vision is three hundred fifty thousand in five years. SFW's vision is four hundred twenty-five thousand as soon as possible. I gave you all a handout tonight, I put it on your table before you arrived with some lists of things that we feel are really important to get us to that population. It's been talked about over and over tonight; even Anis mentioned the fact that we need to kill more coyotes. We have six hundred thousand dollars a year that goes, part of the goes into aerial gunning, the other part of that goes into the county bounty system, which we participate in as an organization by matching and taking the money that our chapters raise and putting it back into the county bounty system. But we need to look at coyotes. We need to manage predators, which would be the cougars, and the bears based on what the actual population is of the pay base. We're doing a lot of work like Anis said; we were part of getting the watershed initiative put together in this state. We've spent sixty million dollars; we've improved six hundred thousand acres of habitat. Based on some meetings I attended just lately we've actually increased the forage in the state of Utah to support one hundred eighty six thousand more mouths. That mouth might be a deer, it might be an elk, it might be a cow, it might be a sheep; but we have increased the forage statewide to support that many more animals.

And the Division supported that number; and that is a very conservative number. We're going to continue the watershed initiative and reach our million-acre mark here within the next four years. We're going to raise money to put money there. The other things, the fencing the highways, right here on I-15, Beaver, the three underpasses that were put in, the work it took to get them money to do that, SFW was behind that all the way. The mortality went down ninety-five percent on the deer crossing the freeways as soon as those three underpasses went in. We need to do more of that. It's being done throughout the state. Every time they do a new highway project they ought to involve the DWR to work on fencing, underpasses and overpasses because elk do not use underpasses, that's been proven. Winter-feeding, we need to feed deer when we have severe winters. We had some major die offs like Dale mentioned here in the southern region. Southern region doesn't get the kind of snows like the northern part of the state does very often but when we do we need to step up and feed deer. They have to feed their cows; we need to take care of the deer and the elk. The other option we talked about tonight is our board, and you've heard our guys here in southern Utah talk about it because they're very passionate and that's to jump start this thing to increase our buck to doe ratio we're asking you to give us a three point or better hunt for two years. This doesn't include the youth. The youth represent seventeen and under are twenty percent of the total number of deer hunters. The only people that we're talking about that the three point antler restriction would apply to is those people eighteen and older. So with the reduced numbers, because we support Option 2 one hundred percent. Option 2 is the only option that is going to give us change and move us forward and move us in the right direction. The other two options nullify each other. It should be no consideration. The consideration should be for deer. It's not for the hunters but it's for the deer and it's for the resource. The other thing we ask is that we don't hunt deer or elk after December 1st. We've got these extended late cow hunts that go all the way into the end of January and February. We need to give these animals a rest. If we need to harvest cow elk let's get it done by the end of November. Give the deer a break. You heard talk tonight about the fawns, we're not getting as big a fawns as we used to, that's because we interrupt the breeding cycles, we're out chasing cow elk during the deer rut. Everything we do now days because our population has increased we affect the deer population and all the other wildlife on the mountain. The other thing you can do tonight which would make a real change and doesn't cost anything, there's no money attached to it, is for an unprotected which is the coyote . . .

Cordell Pearson: You need to wrap it up in just a second, okay.

Byron Bateman: Thank you Chairman. We can change the trap check law on coyotes which is unprotected with the Division says they don't manage from forty-eight hours to seven days. That alone would help a lot of deer and start and help the change that I've mentioned by following the other options that we've outlined tonight. I ask you to vote for these options. It's the change; it's time to move forward. You've heard the people speak, the public. I just ask for your support. Thank you very much.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you.

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman, could I ask Byron a question?

Cordell Pearson: Sure, go ahead.

Rex Stanworth: Byron I guess one of the questions I've got is that the mule deer committee met and put together a plan where they recommended basically number one, is what we've been told; and I know that your organization was represented on that mule deer committee, probably by several people. The

question I have for you is your own people have made recommendation of number one and now the organization is coming down and asking us to accept number two. I guess I'm a little bit confused in regards to that.

Byron Bateman: There's no confusion on it. The plans change. Things change, times change. I've been on a lot of these committees and I've been serving, you know, on different committees for over forty years in this state, you got to make change. It's just like the Titanic, they had a great plan on the Titanic it was indestructible; but look what happened to the Titanic, it sunk on it's maiden voyage. Change has to happen when change needs to occur and what we're saying right now is we need to make these changes. Everybody that went deer hunting this year had a terrible deer hunt that I've talked to, or e-mailed me, or called me on the phone in the morning, call me late at night. But it's time for change. Things change. We need to make these changes.

Rex Stanworth: I guess my concern is that this exact same scenario happened to the elk committee only eight months after the plan was addressed. In fact Don Peay sat on that committee, agreed to everything and within eight months SFW was back here and actually got passed to where we had to go back in and change the elk plan. This plan is only in its first year and it is a five-year plan. I guess my concern is that we have people and we try to get a diverse amount of people to sit on these committees and they take the very best information that they can get, and being on two of those committees, know that you never get exactly, everybody doesn't get exactly what they want. But how in one year can we make a big change from the plan that that mule deer put together?

Byron Bateman: Well Rex the answer to that question is you know your RAC and the southeastern RAC are the ones that instigated this change last year. It was a big proposal on the table that just got tabled from multiple hunting scenarios. But the Wildlife Board is the ones that asked everybody here tonight to comment and support one of those three options. That's why the change has occurred, because the Wildlife Board has got so many questions from the constituents and stuff like that and ask them we need to do something different. That's why we need to make the change. It's, regardless if it's a year, or if it's five years, if it's a bad plan I don't want to stay with it five years. I want to move forward and get our deer back for our people in the state.

Rex Stanworth: I could agree with that if it was into the third year but we haven't even given it a chance to even work at this point in time. And I realize it has been a bad year and I realize that everybody's frustrated of that loss of deer. But I guess my concern is, is do we change a plan every single time that there's a change in a number?

Byron Bateman: Well I was going to quote what Anis said tonight. Anis said that we're still following the majority of the plan. The only thing we're talking about tonight is how we hunt bucks. That's all we're changing. But we've added a few other improvements to get our population back, which is a major issue, which was not part of this original program.

Rex Stanworth: Okay thanks. Steve, can I ask you a question because you sat on the elk committee? Was, did the mule deer committee, did they recommend three point or better?

Steve Dalton: No, there wasn't a discussion topic on that committee. And neither were any of these proposals that are in front of us tonight. We discussed a lot of different options but we didn't discuss any of these individually on that committee.

Cordell Pearson: Okay Jordan. Hold on just one minutes Jordan. We'd have Brian. Okay, go ahead.

Jordan Mecham: Jordan Mecham, Delta, Utah. I live in Cedar right now. I and myself and a whole lot of other people are in support of Option 2. I know people say a lot of Option 1 gives you more opportunity for people to draw. But how many people this year and their families drew out? I know four or five families who have been waiting three years to draw out for deer. And when they did they didn't see hardly any bucks and the quality was way down. So what I'm saying is Option 2, where you give smaller units, it may take longer to draw out but with less pressure your quality bucks rise; so when you do draw out the quality of your hunt and the interest in hunting grows. Because whether you have a tag or not if there's big deer you're going to go chasing. That's just the bottom line. So enthusiasm for hunting is when young kids go out with their dads and they see big deer. Maybe not a lot of deer but big deer, they will go hunting more. Okay, and so and also with winter kill on the Boulder Mountain, with smaller units instead of measuring the Monroe all the way to the Boulder Plateau, with smaller units you can actually specifically measure how bad the winter was on each unit allowing you to know the numbers of how many deer were killed on that unit. Okay, that's why businesses have different managers, and assistant managers, so they can better manage what they are running. Okay? Also, with smaller units you bring more money into the state of Utah. Thousand and thousands of dollars are put into Colorado, Nevada and Arizona to draw a tag, draw a quality tag. Same thing, if you want to talk politics you go to the BCS. A lot of people want a playoff, NCA would make so much more money instead of giving it out to Tostitos, the Fiesta Bowl, the Orange Bowl; they're giving their money away instead of taking it for themselves. You manage the deer herd you will have much more money put into the state of Utah instead of leaving to Colorado, Nevada and Arizona. That's the just bottom line. Thank you

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Brian you're up. Okay, next one will be Michael King.

Brian Tavoian: Brian Tavoian, Cedar. Most of what I wanted to say has been said. The first man who talked, talked about predation. I think another one said about spotlighting. I think that that would help quite a bit with killing cougar, or coyotes. I do believe that the twenty-nine units is the best way to go, because you know, here we are in southern, we've got Cedar, we have Pine Valley, we have Parowan Front, we have Panguitch Lake, they're all different and how do you manage all that stuff in one thing. No, twenty-nine would be better. So I vote for 2. And without belaboring all the other things that people have said, thank you for your time.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Michael, Michael King? Okay he's not here; we'll go to Nathan Yorganson. Nathan. Okay we'll go to the next one, Jeremy Chamberlain. And on deck will be Lance Roberts.

Jeremy Chamberlain: Jeremy Chamberlain from Glendale, Utah. I'm actually here in support of SFW, the Garfield and Kane County chapter, and then also the , Friends of Paunsaugunt committee. Along with Mr. Bateman we're in support of Option 2. I would like to address a question that Rex brought up if I might. One of the reasons why I think we want to go to this twenty-nine unit option is some of the sportsman that live there around the Paunsaugunt unit took initiative and organized a group so that we could manage, so that we could help the fish and game with their input and with strategies in order to manage that. If the Paunsaugunt was the southern region we couldn't have done that. With the help of Dustin and the fish and game we're able to go in there in make suggestions and work together to where

in the last two years I think we've made tremendous strides. The Paunsagaunt hunt this year, I personally was involved in guiding and the close friends that I guide know of four bucks over 220 that were killed this year. Many more bucks in the 195 to 205 were killed on the Paunsagaunt where in two years ago there wasn't one deer over 200 inches killed on the rifle hunt. So just in the short amount of time that we have had to work with the fish and game with this little subcommittee that we call the Friends of the Paunsagaunt we have seen tremendous strides. We can't do that with the southern region with it so vast and so big; there's just too many deer herds and too many complications that Anis has mentioned. If we can break it into twenty-nine separate units, convene committees for each one of those units with sportsman that are involved, that live close to the Boulder, that live close to the Pine Valley that have a passion for those units. If we can work with the fish and game, the fish and game they want to work with us. It seems like sometimes in these meetings that they get bashed pretty hard but when we sit with them in these meetings, it's actually been a good experience. And I think we can get with these committees if we can get sportsman involved in it . . . It takes a lot of time, I'm not going to lie to ya. I've been on the phone for probably two or three hours a day for the last two weeks. It takes a lot of time. I hope the sportsman are willing to get on committees so that they can help manage and have a say in what goes on in their prospective units. But um, anyway I think that's all I've got to say. I appreciate it. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Lance you're up. On deck will be Allen Wood.

Lance Roberts: My name is Lance Roberts. I'm from Monroe. I'm here basically supporting myself along with everyone else in the crowd, it feels like. I'd just like to first off tell the RAC thank you for your time. I know decisions like this aren't easy, so we do appreciate the time that's put into it, all the e-mails and phone calls. Manny of you may remember last year, I guess I was the one that was responsible for bringing up this smaller units and micromanaging. I presented it in the southern RAC, the southeastern and also Utah Wildlife Board. I just want to make note that none of this was done by special interest groups. It was by concerned citizens and sportsman. Guys that want to see our deer herd back to where it should be. So this shouldn't be a decision about hunting. This should be bottom line about our deer herd, as many people have mentioned tonight. I'm not going to beat a dead horse. But to do this we definitely have to go to the smaller units so we can properly manage each area to its specific needs; and they've all been talked about tonight. And this won't happen with our current system. Just for an example according to the Division's data, last year in 2009 just over eighty thousand tags were sold. The cap, I thought it was ninety-seven but Anis said it's ninety-four. So there's about fourteen thousand tags that we were undercut this year that we didn't even sell. So if we go with Option 2, let's say, and the tags are cut thirteen thousand, we're no further ahead than what happened this year. That's just a good example I thought. So the bottom line is our intended outcome from micromanaging can be what everyone has mentioned here tonight but most of all it needs to be where we can improve our herds and our fawn recruitment, that's where we start. That in turn will increase our bucks; and everybody wants bigger bucks to hunt, at least the majority of people do I would think. This will improve DWR and sportsman's relations if we can increase the deer and we can get our deer back to where it needs to be, I think relationships will improve and therefore hunter satisfaction will improve as well. You bring in more people that want to hunt Utah. Just as some gentleman said a minute ago, you'll bring in more revenue. So I just want to say, please go with Option 2 and I think this is what we definitely have to do. It's just a starting point, it's not all but it's definitely a starting point in the right direction.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Alan Wood you're up next. Alan Wood, are you here? Okay, Curtis

Barney, you're up. And on deck is Rick Roberts.

Curtis Barney: I'm Curtis Barney and represent several sportsmen on the Beaver unit. And we also are for Option 2. We do however feel that if you use three-year averages we're going to be doomed. Take an area like Mt. Dutton where you show twenty bucks per one hundred does the last two years. Say it falls to six bucks per hundred does this year. You still have an average of twenty, twenty and six which gives you a three-year average of fifteen bucks per one hundred does and the hunt goes on as usual. We cannot continue to look at past numbers. We've had a terrible winter that your biologist says killed up to seventy percent of our younger deer. We do not have the time or numbers of deer to be average at this point. Something needs to be done now with the deer herd that we have now not with what we had in the past. It is time to make very precise counts in these units and make sure that we protect our deer herds the best we can. Let our dedicated hunters get hours helping you make these counts. And I'm sure many of the sportsman would just volunteer to help you do this. Last year in a RAC meeting in central Utah Anis made this statement, he said Colorado tried a five-day hunt, then went to a three-day hunt and they were not able to decrease the harvest. That is when they went to unit-by-unit management. All of our other neighboring states around us are on unit-by-unit management. We cannot afford to allow hunters to over hunt and pressure specific areas. In Option 2 you claim more tags will be cut, and you are right they should be. But again, you cannot already have a predetermined number as the last guy just said on a three year average. I would think you would use a common sense approach and count the deer we have now to come up with those figures. One last statement by Anis at a RAC meeting a year ago said that you can limit harvest by limiting the number of permits. We agree with that statement, and let me add a few more words to it, however many permits it takes. The sportsmen I represent in this Beaver Unit are not here to find the option that will most easily get them a deer tag. We are concerned about the deer herd and understand the drastic measures that need to take place to fix it. Common sense tells us the deer herd is low. Common sense tells us the buck herd is even lower. We just had a bad winterkill so we need to make adjustments to our deer herd. Let's not look at past numbers and averages on how we're going to deal with the future. If we need smaller units let's do it. If we need to close areas let's do it. If we need to quit hunting from August through October let's do it. If we need to cut tags and pressure on hunters let's do it. The sportsmen out here in the audience are stepping up, we hope that you guys will step up too on Option 2., Beaver Unit Sportsmen: favor option 2.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you Curtis. Rick you're up. And on deck is Kay Kimball.

Rick Roberts: Thank you Chairman and members of the board. It's a pleasure to be here tonight. I've heard a lot of these comments in other years and I just want to refresh your memories now as you listen to everybody speak; almost every individual that's stood up there except the bowman have opted for Option 2. And I think that the bowmen need to take another look at what's been said here. I think there may be a little selfishness there in them wanting to continue to hunt the whole state for thirty days; where most of the sportsman are willing to sacrifice hunts and sacrifice numbers. I think we need to go to Option 2 as a beginning as most of the sportsmen who have stood up here and given their comments. That would be a start, a good start. So please, please follow the recommendations of those who are here and go with Option 2. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thanks Rick.

Kay Kimball: Kay Kimball from Richfield. The only reason I am here is that I care about deer. I was a little alarmed this year as I went into them hills and the mountains and I couldn't find any. I mean our

deer herd is way down. I just don't think we can continue with the status quo. I think we've got to go with Option 2, which I fully support, which will give us a chance to manage not only bucks but does. And we can make a difference if we will. The other thing is I think there are a lot of people in the audience today who don't have confidence in your buck doe ratios. It seems like when we had five to ten bucks per one hundred does we set an objective at fifteen and all of a sudden we had it. So I think it's important that you get the sportsmen involved in your counts so that you can restore that credibility. Because I think a lot of us just question whether we have that many bucks per one hundred does. The other thing I think, and I don't want to correct Anis, but I was here during the '80's when we had three point or better on the Fish Lake Units. The buck doe ration did increase. We had two to three bucks per one hundred does and it went up to a high between twenty and twenty-five. And we have a study to support that, no one want to see it but that was the case. The other states have all gone to limited entry except Utah. I think we need to go with these twenty-nine units and we need to manage. And the sportsmen are more than willing to help and get involved. And I just hope you as a RAC will listen to what's said here today and support Option 2. We really need to do it. I just see our deer herd going down and it may be the demise of our herd if we don't do something different. It's just been going down for the past several years and I'm afraid to where it might end up if we don't make a change. So I hope you'll support Option 2. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you Kay. DeLoss you're up. And on deck is Tim Garner.

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen, representing myself and a whole bunch of other timid folks who won't come to a meeting or speak when they come. I want to start out by thanking you RAC members from the bottom of my heart for bringing this to the Wildlife Board last year. Without your courage this would not be a discussion tonight. Thank you from all sportsmen for what you've done. Now I wasn't expecting this kind of meeting. I went to the meeting in Springville because I'd heard from people who went to the meeting in Brigham City, and I heard this proposal before we came tonight. I was not expecting this kind of a representation. I was understanding the Board told the Division to prepare for implementing herd unit management. Now here's what I thought I would hear, which is why I think you ought to throw all recommendations out and ask them to do what you ask them to do; and that was to develop a system whereby we would use herd unit management. That system could look like this. It may look some other way. But it may be modeled after the Friends of Paunsagaunt who spoke a moment ago. A committee could be formed. A biologist from the Division of Wildlife Resources could sit on that committee for each unit. There may be one biologist sit on three, four or five committees depending on how small the units are. Along with the biologist from the Division a Forest Service and BLM biologist, a scientist there, should participate. Then there should be some landowner participation, people whose personal lives are affected by deer populations. There should be sportsmen on that committee. What would that committee do? They would make determinations about how many deer were on the unit, not an estimate. I'm a computer technician I understand computer models. I have the Division's model. Mr. Grandison from the Division gave it to me. I know how that works. I push numbers through it all the time. But, on that committee these people would determine for real how many we have. Then they would determine if there is adequate habitat. If not where isn't there and what could be done to improve that habitat in that pasture like these cattlemen do. Then we would decide is there a predator issue on this unit. Is it the same predator issue on that unit over there? Is it a bear predator or is it cougars? I realize I'm out of time. Thirty seconds please. All of these issues, highways, extra roads, ATVs, all of the issues that we know affect sportsmen and deer herd numbers could be addressed by those committees. And if we had enough units and enough committees we could grow the herd. I don't need to teach you folks what's out there. You individually

care enough to know what the public has been saying tonight it true or what the agency people are representing as true. You know that individually. Thank you again for your support. I do not support any of these recommendations because they're all wrong. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Thanks DeLoss. Tim. And on deck is Chad Nowers.

Tim Garner: Thank you members of the RAC and Chairman. I appreciate the time and effort you guys put into these meetings. Oh, my name is Tim Garner. I'm from Parowan. My uh, just supporting local interests in there. Through the years the DWR has put the sportsman through many changes. I can remember as a young kid going hunting with my grandpa. We'd just go up to Ace Hardware and buy a license over the counter. And then as time progressed the deer hunt started to change, numbers would go down. I can remember standing in line and waiting outside for the chance to buy a permit of some of the local areas, even so far as sleeping on the ground at Pine View High School waiting for my ticket number to be called so that I could go in and pick up a tag. I think a lot of people are kind of tired of the changes. It seem like every year the prices go up, fees go up, changes in licensing, changes in permits, changes in boundaries. The things are so much different from when I first started hunting that it's hard to include my children because there's so many guidelines, so many rules we have to follow now. Although I do put my support out for Option 1, I think what would be without causing a big stir the mot agreeable to that. You are cutting out seven permits but we're making it possible for others to still hunt. I think a bigger concept is something that we're missing here tonight, and it's something that the wildlife may not understand or doesn't have the research yet to find out why the deer numbers are continuing to go down. I myself had success on the deer hunt this year. It wasn't as big a deer as I'd killed before but it was one that I was happy to find. But in years previous I've, we've located bucks. They're harder to find, they're up in the hills. I think they're getting a little more intelligent or maybe the hunters are getting a little more lazy, you know, riding our 4-wheelers and horses and not getting out on foot and finding out where they are. I can't say, I haven't done the research. But that's what we pay these guys for. That's what I'm hoping is that this meeting will, we'll be able to figure out what's causing the deer numbers to go down and the sportsman like we've heard earlier, are behind the efforts to get the deer herds up, get the bigger bucks out there so that we can have trophies to hang on our wall plus supply food for our families. And I thank you for your time.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Chad. And on deck will be Nolan Gardner.

Chad Nowers: Thanks Mr. Chairman. I represent myself; I'm a former chapter chairman of the Beaver chapter of SFW. I do seriously think that we do have a very serious predator problem. I was born and raised in Beaver. Grew up here all my life. I didn't play sports, didn't play football. I broke horses when I got home from school every night. I rode horses in the hills. In the summer I spent a lot of time in the hills. And when I wasn't hunting deer I was riding horses. I was seventeen years old when I saw my first live lion. And I saw three this year and I wasn't in the hills that much. I saw them on the main roads. So I think we've got a lion problem, especially on this mountain. I think we've got a severe coyote problem; they're what's keeping our herd down. I think they're nailing our fawns. Last year we had a more severe winter and they were able to get to all the fawns a lot easier. Therefore last spring we had less fawns than we've had in a long time. I think we need to focus a little more on the summer habitat. I think we need to go into these forage areas and maybe plant some deer specific plots like they do in the Midwest for the whitetail. All you guys that's my age or older got a little grey, you remember that there weren't no whitetail back east when they was kids. All they had was little puny things that didn't hardly have any horns. Now they've got lots of big whitetail, and they farm for them. They raise

for them, they plant specific food to help them grow bigger, bigger antlers. And maybe we could look at some of those kings of things. I'm not saying do the whole mountain but maybe do just a few areas and just see what it will do. And I also support Option 2, and a three point or better. I think we should try it and see what it will do, at least in a few areas. Thank you for your time.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Nolan. And on deck is Steve Nielson.

Nolan Gardner: I'm Nolan Gardner, St. George, representing myself. I too support the SFW plan. Also, I would like to see us continue with that extended youth hunt, the nine-day youth, five-day adult. I think that was a great success. I would hate to see us go even with the twenty-nine units with a nine-day hunt. I think we're cutting our throats if we do. I'd also like to propose that, and I think they do this in Arizona, propose that if a parent draws a tag and their youth doesn't, youth seventeen and under, doesn't draw a tag, is unsuccessful, we made it to where that parent can sign that tag over to the youth so that youth can get the experience. And also take that one step further lifetime license hunter if he wants to sign his tag over, if there's a youth that doesn't want to draw and wants to sign his tag over for a year for that youth, maybe allow that too. But somehow, you know somebody said something about our resources. Our resource is our deer number one and our youth. And all of us old people, we've been there and whether we come or go it doesn't matter but if we don't keep our youth coming we're all in trouble. So anyway, I'd like to see us do whatever we can to keep the youth going. And anybody that hunted that extended youth hunt, that was a good experience. I heard lots of good comments about it. There wasn't the pressure out there and I think it was a great thing. Also, no statewide archery. I think we need to get rid of it. It's time to move on. I liked the gentleman's comment a few minutes ago about he thought that was kind of greedy; I think so too. Let's shorten the archery hunt. You know we're all trying to do cuts. We're trying to get this deer herd back. It kind of needs to be across the board. We need to increase lion tags, more money for coyotes. Lengthen the trap check on coyotes to seven days, I agree fully. We need to manage the deer first and then the hunters. And I still want to know where n the heck all the does went. That question I asked that I didn't get answered; I wonder where the does went. And I also agree that I don't think that, the one thing I don't agree on these is that three-year management, the average. I don't think that's going to work. I think we've got to go year to year to get it back. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Steve you're up. And Gary Olsen is on deck.

Steve Nielson (See Attachment 5): Steve Nielson. I work in retail, and if I don't have the product available, if I don't have my tables full and I don't have it our there for somebody to buy I don't get the customers in. Obviously what's going on right now with the deer herd . . . I'm accountable in my business. I'm the boss yet I'm accountable. There has to be accountability through the Division. I don't know where the accountability needs to be, whether it's at the top, that's where it should be. Accountability should be right at the top if they ain't getting it done they shouldn't be there. The sad part about that situation is if I'm not getting my job done I don't get the hours to supply the people that are below me and it's the low end that gets cut, the ones that are doing the majority of the work. And that's the sad part of the whole deal; because if I'm not doing it I should be gone. So, accountability has to be a factor with the Division. Where it lies I don't know. Whether it's at the top, whether it's down the line a little ways; the accountability has to be there. I questioned earlier on the Monroe Mountain. It has the most habitat of any unit, Vance agreed with me on that. Then why, if it's got the best habitat, probably the best in the state, did it have the worst buck doe ratio? I don't have that answer, but why? We've talked about habitat, habitat, habitat. My personal feeling is it's over hunting. It's easily

accessible. Not going into the elk deal but it's the same situation there. That's my comments and thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Gary. And on deck will be Kayden Gardner.

Gary Olsen: Gary Olsen from Cedar City. My association for the last 6 years has been with the dedicated hunter. I'm a little bit concerned about Option 2 and dealing with a one-year consideration versus three-year. We put a lot of time and effort into that particular program. I think Option 2 may discourage many people, although I hear some advantages about Option 2 that I haven't considered in the past relevant to the deer herds advantage. (Sic). I haven't heard how you're going to manage twenty-nine units. I'm not sure that you can. I think that there's nobody demonstrated the last fifteen or twenty years that we've managed appropriately to improve deer herds. So I'm not sure that twenty-nine units, although it's easier to manage hypothetically, you can accomplish that. Back to dedicated hunter. Put lots of time and effort in. We've changed from twenty-four to forty hours. We've helped a lot with many different projects throughout the state. I don't believe you'll get the support that you've had in the past. Those ten thousand individuals that's been associated with that, although I heard that it was not to the same degree, the success was not at ten thousand. So it's starting to diminish. Some of that might be due to the hours and the commitment involved. But many things to consider. I'm an old-time hunter, most of this change I'm a little concerned about and cautious of. We do not have families affiliated with hunting anymore. It's becoming very very specialized if you will. I would prefer not to deal with drawing, that's why we went with dedicated. I do not do archery. A couple of years ago tried to muzzleloader. I primarily try to get my family out with the rifle hunt. But that's the comments that's basically towards dedicated hunter. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Kayden.

Kayden Gardner: Kayden Gardner, Richfield, Utah. First of all thank you guys for all your time and service, we really appreciate it. Me and about ninety-five percent of the people that I talk to are in overwhelming favor for Option 2, with the other five percent basically having no opinion. I believe that option will give us the chance to explore different routes, you know, all the good ideas that people have come up with whether it's three point or better. You know in Colorado I know that most of the people hold out for big bucks. Generally a lot of the two-points are making it through the season and they seem to be doing just fine. We can try lion hunting. I don't know how many deer they're killing but I know that they do condense deer down into certain areas where it might lower the feed based on the number of mouths that are in one little area. Coyote hunting, we could try spotlighting. Supplemental feeding during harsh winters. The biggest thing I like about specific units is that we could set up specific unit groups with the people that spend all of their time on those mountains. You know I spend all of my time basically on two mountains and I love to watch big mule deer bucks. So I would be more than happy to join one of those communities or committees and go count mule deer, you know. Tell us how many big bucks are out there and how many does are out there. The other advantage is if one factor is working on a specific unit, like cutting the lion's numbers in half then you know we can transfer that to the other units. We don't have to try everything on ten units on one region. I really hope that your proposal supports Option 2 with the stipulation that if the Wildlife Board rejects Option 2 statewide that they would let us do it in the southern and southeastern regions. You know maybe they could follow our footsteps if we have a little bit more success than they're having up north. All the other things, you know good ideas, I like a lot of what I heard tonight, but let's just make sure that we get Option 2 passed and we can work on the rest once we get them listening to us. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. Russell Todd. R

Russell Todd: Russell Todd from St. George, Utah. I'm representing myself as an avid sportsman. I'm in favor of Option 2 tonight. A couple of examples that I have, I spend a lot of time up on the mountains. Typically wear out a pair of boots by the end of archery hunt. Two years ago I spent sixteen days on the archery hunt and since then in the two-year period I've watched the decline not only in does but bucks, mature bucks. And I'm concerned with our future right now and with our long-term future. And my main concern for that is not necessarily myself but I have two young boys. I don't want to get to the point where they don't have a future in this. So I strongly support that we keep the five-day adult and nine-day youth. I had a wonderful experience with a young man this year. He did a really good job, got a mature buck. And I'm in full support of Option 2. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you. That's all of our comment cards. What is your name? Stan Nielson? That's the next agenda item. You put bucks and bulls on it. Do you want it on this? Do you want to talk now or do you want to talk then? Okay, go ahead.

Stan Nielson: My name is Stan Nielson. I live in Richfield, Utah. Uh, dedicated hunter. I'm totally in favor of keeping dedicated hunter even though I'm recommending Option 2. I think dedicated hunter gives a lot of service hours to the state and I'm totally in favor of that. In order to qualify for the dedicated hunter program the hunters have to take a dedicated hunter program conservation ethics course. I don't know whether any of you have gone through that but part of that, when it very first starts out it says that years of over hunting and habitat loss decrease wildlife population from what was once thought to be countless numbers of species to the extinct and severely depleted species. This acknowledgment was by hunters who began a revolution in which the need to protect the rapidly disappearing wildlife became a priority. They organized a sportsman group and they formed, it was called the North American Wildlife Conservation model. They have two things in that: number one, well the one thing was that wildlife belongs to the citizens for noncommercial use, and number two, it says there that and that these herds are managed in such a way that their populations will be sustained at optimum levels forever. That is in the dedicated hunter ethics course. And we have to answer questions to that. And my concern is the number of animals that I'm seeing, I have property on Monroe Mountain and I spend every weekend up there. And I have a sheet here that I'll pass out on a survey, which I did all summer, the trips I made on the mountain and the amount of deer an elk which I saw and the bull/cow ratio, the cow/calf ratio. And I want to pass that out when I'm done. I for several years have been an active voice on this southern Utah region RAC. I've been standing up here talking about the depletion of the herds specifically the elk and the deer on Monroe Mountain. That's what I'm familiar with. We're losing the numbers. The Division however recommended to increase the numbers by still giving hunter opportunity. You can't have all the hunter opportunity and still have the herds that we have. You take an animal you lose an animal. You take several years ago we did a little thing all over on Monroe Mountain; about two thousand does were taken off on a regular basis off Monroe Mountain. That is all the way around from Monroe to Kingston to Greenwich and thereabouts. Just one more second, I'm about done. So my recommendation, I sent e-mails to the RAC. Many, some of you are on the RAC and I sent an e-mail out. I received one e-mail back from the RAC, from the Division of Wildlife, and the state organization. And the man said to me, I go strictly by data. I do not go by hunter feelings. I said, what are these guys here for if they're not representing me and all the hunters that are up here we have a problem. My feeling is the buck/doe ratio is typically insufficient when we don't have a herd. And you'll see that by my count that I did. One hundred and forty-nine does to four bucks.

I seen all summer on the mountain. To me that's not acceptable. I support Option 2, especially if it mentions that the overall deer and elk herd needs to be increased in southern Utah. And we need to maintain the dedicated hunter program because it gets thousands and thousands of hours and takes thousands of dollars out of what the Division would have to produce. Thank you so much.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you sir. Okay, that's the end of our comment cards.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: We will now take comments from the RAC. Okay, Layne go ahead.

Layne Torgerson: I just have one comment. Over the last ninety days I've spent a lot of time on the mountain hunting different things and every time I've seen a sportsman I've stopped him and talked to him. Every time I go to the grocery store I talk to somebody that has had a concern about wildlife and about the deer herds. And the consensus of I think the majority in this room tonight and the consensus of every sportsman that I've talked to over the last ninety days is the sportsmen of southern Utah are willing to do whatever it takes, whether it's not hunt for two or three years, whether it's raise our fees, they're willing to do whatever it takes to get our deer herd back. And I know as a sportsman's representative sitting up behind this table right now I'm in full agreement with that; that whatever it takes for us to, whatever sacrifices we have to make as sportsmen I think we're willing to do that. And this whole meeting tonight is a step in the right direction as far as I'm concerned. But we've got to take little steps to make big progresses. And I appreciate all of you being here tonight and I appreciate your support of the RAC and the RAC process and what we have to go through. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other comments from the RAC Okay, go ahead Mack?

Dell LeFevre: Two things have to happen. I spend a lot of time on the mountain. I'm not a sportsman. I hate your damn deer, but they are going away. I hate your elk worse. And the thing you got, you've got these deer in Boulder, Salt Gulch coming down in the farms. And we're shooting them, where they're getting depredation permits. Give them a buck; get them out of shooting their doe because that's the only place they got to go. All the land south what hasn't grew up in pines and cedars the elk get it now so the deer just range right down in them farms. And you can almost count that deer herd in Boulder and Salt Gulch in the spring of the year and the fall, what comes in the fields. I think you're going to have to do some real soul searching to get some habitat for the deer to go to. And the Forest Service has been promising now since '71, they was going to burn. The went up there and burned and I could have done more on a windy day and one match than they done in, all they done. But the deer is in trouble. We rode a lot this fall, we was gathering our cows at the same time the hunt was on. Very seldom did you hear a shot . . . very, very seldom, maybe one or two a day; and for you sportsman that's bad. I mean something has to give. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you Dell. I didn't mean to call you Mack. I didn't mean to offend you Mack. I'm sorry. That's okay? All right. Okay, any other comments from the RAC? Go ahead Sam. Dale, go ahead.

Dale Bagley: I just want to kind of add to Layne's sentiment. I spent a lot of time this year on the mountain. I have the same consensus as most of these sportsmen out there. These numbers that I've got in front of me showing we have three hundred and two thousand deer. I mean I understand it's a

modeling but there's somewhere in between we're not seeing something. I agree with Anis that raising buck rations is probably not the answer to it but I guess it's a step in the right direction. I think the things we can control are predators and habitat. And like he says, they've been doing a lot for that. I think we need to continue with that. I'd like to see somewhat that we can raise some more funds for some more predator control. Kevin Dustin was here and he said his guys can take on more work. How much more I don't know but that's something that could be worked out. Whether it's a donation when we apply, I don't know. I work in a motor vehicle division, you get your renewal packet and it's done through the state. It has a check off box if you want to donate, something like that I don't know. The SFW, I mean, maybe we ought to take some of that habitat money and put it toward predator control. If we got habitat and there's no deer out there to utilize it because of predators then we're defeating some of the purpose. I don't know. But somewhere along the lines we've got to come up with a way to get some of these areas under control. Monroe Mountain was brought up that the lions haven't had an effect on that unit. I've seen it, I've watched it, I live there, and I've got a farm ground on one side of it. I've seen more lions in the last five years up there than I've probably seen in fifteen. We've tried to address that in the last RAC and I did think we make a step in the right direction, it wasn't totally where we wanted to be with it but I understand there's got to be concessions also. I think the things that we can control are predators and habitat and the hunters and that's part of what we're addressing here tonight. So I cannot believe, I mean, I got a lot of e-mails. I had seventy-four e-mails. I had fifty percent for Option 2; the other two were split. I mean the support here for Option 2 tonight is overwhelming and I think that's great. And I think it's great that you guys would come out and voice your opinion and make us listen. I mean without the knowledge of what you all want and have to say then, I mean, we're kind of in the dark. So that's all I have to say. Thanks.. .

Rex Stanworth: Mr. Chairman.

Cordell Pearson: Yes, go ahead Rex.

Rex Stanworth: I'd like to go back to Steve but I think Sam you were the alternative on the mule deer committee. Steve you said none of these points were discussed, I mean, per say?

Steve Dalton: No, not specifically. None of them were hit on specifically, no. We agreed to the fifteen bucks per one hundred does again. This eighteen is I think a Division response when we started talking about the unit-by-unit management. But the unit-by-unit went from what was proposed initially to be a southern and southeastern proposition to a statewide. And instantly that created a whole lot of controversy with the northern half of the state because they don't have the same issues we do down here. And it seemed like a really good idea to me to try it on the southern region and the southeastern and I think it would have worked well, and I still think it will work well. And maybe we can get some more support on the rest of the state when they see what kind of results we have. But they don't want to jeopardize their opportunity to come down to the southern half of the state to hunt deer because that's where the deer, what deer we've got left are at, the majority of them. So I don't know why it's so hard to get the concept tried. I really think it would help. At least give us an opportunity to try and manage what deer we've got left before we lose the rest of them. Whatever is being done is not being done effectively; it's not giving us the results we're after with our deer herd. It's going down every year. So something pretty dramatic has to take place. More questions for me Rex?

Rex Stanworth: Well I just was wondering as to why, especially the smaller units were not discussed. I know it was discussed here last year.

Steve Dalton: Well I tried to bring it up in the committee and they wouldn't even, they didn't want to discuss it. They didn't want to bring it up as a discussion topic. And I was only one voice and I couldn't get any support. So it never even got discussed. I'm still in favor of it and I was in favor of it then. I think it's the only opportunity we've got to try to get some management with the deer. It surely worked with our elk. Everybody's seen the results there. And now we're in a position where it looks like we've over harvested the mature bulls on our elk units so everybody's screaming we need to quit killing so many bulls. But at least we've got a strategy in place where we can go back and quit killing so many bulls. But with the deer we really don't have a management strategy in place to manage them properly. And I think this unit-by-unit management is something we need to do.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions, comments from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I, like everyone here, I believe was inundated with e-mails. The majority making the statement that they could not make the RAC for one reason or another. In total I responded to over seventy e-mails. I can tell you that the comments that have been here tonight pretty much mirror the e-mails that I got. The passion and desire that is out there to make the change that, Byron you're mentioning, and it keeps coming up are statewide. I did get e-mails from all over the state. They were not restrictive at all into the southern area or any particular part of the state. And based on what I've heard here tonight dealing with population, antler restriction, dedicated hunters, the predator problem, archery, and these are in no particular order, spotlighting, the ratios and trying to put together a plan that will involve committees that can work with the department to better each and every area. I don't see how any of this and all of this can be addressed without a unit-to-unit management plan. I just do not think we can do a good job of managing our deer herd under the current management philosophies and strategies. Although some of these I think are going to require a different venue to address, the spotlighting, the coyote issue and predator issues, lion tags, shouldn't really fall into this structure that we're trying to build here tonight and address. As far as making a recommendation I don't know if we're to the point that we are ready to accept one. Are we ready to do anything along those lines? Have you got something to say first? Okay, well I will just close by saying that I really appreciate all of the people that have shown their desire to do something here. And I do believe that this RAC will do their part in addressing your issues.

Cordell Pearson: Thanks Sam. Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I too would like to thank all of you many that have gone out of their way to come and express their concerns and their opinions and their hopes and dreams for the deer herd of Utah.. As a representative of the general public I'm going to take a different tact. I pretty much agree with one statement that DeLoss Christensen said, I don't agree with any of these three plans. And I'll give my opinion at the end but I would like to represent and respond to the e-mails, the phone calls, the people that have stopped and talked to me and what their opinions are. I made a real effort to talk to people. I went to Sportsman's Warehouse in St. George and did a, and just struck up conversations without people knowing that I was on the RAC. I didn't want them to know. I wanted to find out their real opinion, both employees, customers there shopping. With the e-mails and the comments that I got there were ninety-seven of them. Seventeen I put in Option 4, which was none of the above, either venting frustrations, a couple of them talking about elk, some of them about when they were young and hunting. Actually some pretty good opinions and ideas. But the people that I represent that talked to me and e-mailed me many of them said Option 1 or Option 3, one or the other, if not 3 than 1, or if not 1 then 3.

Forty-nine against thirty-one for Option 2. Those are the people that I represent that have made the effort to contact me. Many of them were adamant, no Option 2, that will destroy the Utah deer hunt as we know it, the culture, the family hunt. It will make it a limited entry statewide is basically what we're addressing. The family groups are gone. Hunting a single unit, especially in the south there where we have many options and many different areas to go to. So that's the opinion of the people that I represent. And I would hope that the Wildlife Board would not go with Option 2, at least as far as the people that I represent. I've heard several people say they'll do whatever it takes to get the deer herds back. And I think much of what I heard tonight had nothing to do with bucks, how many bucks we want to shoot. And that's what we're talking about; how many bucks do we want to shoot? Most of it was about the deer herds. There's two ways as far as, and I'm getting into my opinion here, there's two ways that we can get to that eighteen, we can either limit the tags or we can limit the, I would call it the technology. How many here or how many of your hunting partners, parties, or family, or neighbors rode into the country this year on the deer hunt? How many of us on trails on ATVs that we not there twenty years ago? We've talked a lot about the pressure on our deer herds. They can't get away any more folks. How many are willing to park those to walk? How many use tact driving rifles with optics not dreamed of a generation ago? My opinion is we don't need to cut tags. I would like to see us increase tags, decrease, or increase the difficulty in getting one of these bucks. If, I lived in Oregon as a young man, just married and moved from Utah to Oregon for three or four years. They had something I thought was marvelous; they before the deer and elk hunt for basically the month of October they would do temporary road closures. The boys down at the state prison would make the signs. They'd put a t-post in every spur road and road that wasn't in active use. It was closed for a month. You had to walk it unless it was being logged or livestock operators were using that road. If our bucks get below fifteen we don't need to close these units, let's increase the difficulty. Go to a primitive weapon. You can hunt that unit but you better take a muzzleloader or a bow. If it gets to twelve or thirteen okay you use a flintlock or you use a recurve. But the more we restrict the more we're going to lose what for generations has been a great thing in Utah. Anyway I do appreciate everybody's comments; they've been wonderful. And it has been a great experience to be up here and listen to them. And that's all I have.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thanks Clair. Anybody else got anything?

Rex Stanworth: I wanted to make one last comment to Mr. Nielson. I'm like Clair, I received probably seventy or eighty and Mr. Nielson I never got yours. I apologize but I never received your e-mail. I too am very grateful for everybody that has come and had the courage to come down and stand at the mic. It's not easy, I can tell you that. I guess these e-mails that I got, it's nice to be able to hear from people but it's also nice to have people come to the meetings and invest their time and effort to get here. The numbers that I've got here equal about what Clair's got; with the majority if you took 1 and 3 and put them together overwhelmingly over number 2. Number 1 was the most popular. The uh, I did have several requests from some of these folks about coming up with additional opportunities for primitive weapons, not muzzleloaders and not bows but primitive weapons, recurve archery and flintlock or the old ball muzzleloaders. And I told them, that was something we had discussed many times and we still had not been able to come up with anything to date. I'm also of the opinion that statewide archery is not such a good deal for the southern part of the state. I don't want to say that I do not want those people to come down because the worm could turn to where we may need to go north at some point in time. But presently I don't believe that the statewide archery is a great thing. So anyway, I would just say those comments, and I guess the one thing that I'm not excited about at all because I remember going through that three point or better fiasco and I'm just telling you I saw way too many kills of bucks that did not qualify and they just left them. So unless somebody's got some alternatives of what we can do there I

would not be in favor of a three point or better hunt.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: Yes, I wanted to comment a little about Clair's comment. Sixty percent of the respondents I had voted for Option 2. Clair said several things that I didn't agree with but I'll just let him have his comments. I can't remember and it was burning me up. Anyway are we ready for a proposal no?

Cordell Pearson: No. I'd like to say something for a minute. Again I'd just like to reiterate what everybody on this board's already said about you people that are dedicated to come out here and spend your time, voice your opinion. We're kind of sorry that we have to cut you short sometimes but we don't want to be here for two or three days. I lived in a state for twenty-seven years. I was born and raised in Utah. I was one of the guys that came through in the '60's where we had deer that you wouldn't believe. Whenever I was a kid . . . And I've seen them dwindle. I've hunted in Utah every year even as a nonresident until I moved back twenty years ago. I saw Nevada go through this same thing. Where you go hunting you'd hunt for a week and maybe see two does. When they went to units, small units and draw your tags, a lot of people were hot, a lot of people were mad about it. But let me tell you what, within three years . . . Even in Nevada now you can only draw a tag about . . . I still have friends that go hunting one every three years. But when you go out there, trust me, if you will hunt a little bit you will kill a nice mature buck. No, I think that everybody like to go hunt. And my family hunted together forever. You hate to break tradition. We hate to do things that we haven't always done. You know me I'm from the old school, I'm not an Internet person, but trust me I had to use the damn Internet so I could even focus in this life, okay. People have got to change. We can't have what we've always had. We have a real problem with our deer herd. I mean I hunted for nine days on the Beaver, I saw two bucks. I walked into places where nobody had been. I rode horses on there. And I'll tell you what it's scary. I don't have the right answer. But I do appreciate all you people coming out and that's my opinion. And now I will ascertain a motion. Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. In light of what you just said and the comments that I've heard tonight I don't see any other way to address the issues we're facing as a state without doing something to allow us to break this down and get into manageable sized managing philosophy. And with that being said I would like to make the motion that we go with Option 2. And I just don't think it's the time or the place to add any luggage to that because I feel if indeed we can get this option to be enacted and are able to do it I think we will be able to address the rest of the things, the rest of the problems, the rest of the issues that have been brought up tonight. So simply put I would like to go with Option 2..

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that motion.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion by Sam and a second by Dell. Okay we will now . . . Has anybody else got anything to say before we take a vote?

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman.

Cordell Pearson: Yes.

Layne Torgerson: I'd like to amend the option please.

Cordell Pearson: Okay.

Layne Torgerson: I'd like to add that Option 2 with the archers required to pick a unit.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second it.

Cordell Pearson: Who seconded it? Sam? Okay, we have an amendment to the motion by Layne, seconded by Sam that the archers have to pick a unit. Okay, all in favor? Okay, let's vote on the amendment first. All in favor of the amendment raise your right hand. Hold on, does anybody have anything to say? Do you want to discuss it? Okay, no discussion. Now we'll take a vote on the amendment. Everybody in favor raise your right hand. Seven, right? Okay, did you get them? All opposed? Okay, two opposed. The amendment passed. Now we will have a discussion on the motion. I see no discussion.

Rex Stanworth: Just a minute Mr. Chairman. In regards to discussion on that, Sam is anybody on the board concerned about length of time of the hunts?

Sam Carpenter: Isn't that going to be, don't we have that coming up the different hunts, their dates and?

Rex Stanworth: I don't know. I just wanted to ask before we. . .

Sam Carpenter: No, this is for simply the Options that are being presented.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Cordell Pearson: Right. And this is also the year 2012. Clair go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, I realize I might be the lone ranger on this but I must represent the constituents that have contacted me and reiterate that this is not about a herd management, increasing the herds, this is about a buck doe ration. There's been much brought up about Nevada, Arizona, Colorado and in reading the e-mails and the figures that I've gotten they are also down drastically in deer numbers this year; even though they are managing on a unit by unit basis. If the e-mail I got is correct Wyoming manages by area like we do by region. They have a great hunt there. I still think we're approaching this wrong. We do not have to be this drastic. I hope you all realize you will draw every third year. We don't have to go this route. We can increase the difficulty level. We can park those ATVs; we can close the roads and still have a great hunt. You know that nobody will go past one mile past where they can drive to. And that's all I have to say.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other discussion on the motion? Okay if not we'll take a vote. All in favor raise your right hand. How many? Six? Okay, all opposed? Okay, three opposed. Six for, three against. Motion passes.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept option 2 as presented by the Division with the amendment below. Dell LeFevre Seconded. Motion carried 6 in favor, 3 opposed. (Clair Woodbury, Paul Briggs, Rex Stanworth opposed)

Layne Torgerson proposed an amendment that archery hunters must choose a unit. Sam

Carpenter seconded. Amendment carried 7 in favor, 2 opposed. (Clair Woodbury, Paul Briggs opposed)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we will continue on with our agenda. We will go to Bucks and Bulls, 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline. Anis will do the presentation. For all you people that are leaving, thanks again for your time. Thanks for coming and we appreciate it. And thanks for being good and not unruly.

**Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline 3:52:46 to 3:59:31 of 4:58:23
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator
(See Attachment 1)**

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Thanks anis. We'll have questions from the RAC.

Rex Stanworth: Anis, I had to phone calls on the way down from archers who had drawn limited entry permits, and this is the same issue that we had a year ago, these guys go in and they spend an immense amount of time looking and trying to find out where these bulls are at. And they go in and set up tree stands and blinds in and around the waterholes. And then the spike hunters come in and the gentleman today told me that the stand that he put up down on the Pahavant there was actually a spike hunter in it. And he said the gentleman was nice, he got out of it. But he said that literally when those spike hunters come in the entire mountain is changed as far as where the elk are at and where they're contained. He indicated, I told him, I said well they've changed, we put the last week so you've got a chance. He said, well that's great the only problem you've got it's the week before is when the rifle hunters come in and they set up camp and they start to sight their rifles in. So he said it is, on limited entries for these limited entry bull permits this guy had put in seventeen points is what he gave to get it. He said they literally, there were no elk to be found. They drove them into the very bottom of the canyon. He said in fact the last few days of the spike these guys were formulating drives to go down in and drive these elk out to supposedly people sitting there that were the spikers. So I guess my issue is do we have any option that can give some sort of relief for these folks? Because they are, I've had three passionate people that have called me and they are just beside themselves.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the recommendation we have was based on meetings we had with archery groups and they are the ones who proposed this. So uh, we have heard from similar disgruntled archers but there haven't been . . . it's not a high enough number to you know, make us change our recommendation. The groups we meet with are archery-affiliated groups; they represent the gamete from those who are spike hunters to those who are limited entry hunters. And you know, year in and year out they say this should be sufficient because there are those in those groups that just want to go hunt and then those that are the limited entry hunters. So I don't know how to fix it. Sure you could, you know, make the spike hunt shorter, or make it half and half. There's lots of ways to do it but both of them want to hunt the whole season so we're making the best of a potentially bad situation.

Rex Stanworth: I know that you've had issues and I know that you've had a lot of comments in regards to the length of the bow hunt and I think this board every year has come back with a recommendation to limit the length of the bow hunt from thirty days down to fourteen days or something like that.

Anis Aoude: Sure, yeah, it's currently twenty-eight days but yeah.

Rex Stanworth: I mean, in your opinion don't you believe that twenty-eight days is too long?

Anis Aoude: No, I don't. Harvest success is lower than any other weapon types, even with twenty-eight days. Harvest success on spike and any bull units is sixteen percent. And on limited entry it's high because they're getting close to the rut, near the end of it. But on spike and any bull units they're really low, on elk. On mule deer it's similar, it's in the eighteen to twenty percent success rate, over twenty-eight days. If you cut them shorter I'm sure it would decrease the success rate but they're still almost half of rifle hunters success rate.

Rex Stanworth: I guess I wasn't thinking so much of the killing as I was the stress.

Anis Aoude: I don't subscribe to that notion that animals are that stressed. I mean they are prey animals. This is what they are on the landscape. They are chased by things all the time. They deal with stress differently than we deal with stress. So I guess I don't think it's that big of an issue that being out there on the landscape.

Rex Stanworth: One last question for ya, as I mentioned I've got some e-mails that folks were looking at wanting to have a primitive hunt, recurve and non-inline muzzleloaders. Have you guys looked at any opportunities like that?

Anis Aoude: We've looked at it. Whenever we consider anything like that we get the backlash of those that want to hunt with a recurve or want to have a scope. We actually get more comment from those who would like a powered scope on the muzzleloader than we get from those who want to be more limited. So I mean, yeah, I mean you could probably issue more permits. You may limit success slightly with a recurve and an inline or not using an inline. But the overwhelming comment from those who are archers and are muzzleloaders is the opposite direction.

Rex Stanworth: Well I promised these folks I would mention it. I personally think it would be good if we could give them a four or five day advance in and then let the rest come in but just strictly for primitive weapons.

Anis Aoude: Yeah and those groups specifically have not approached us to do that. We hear it here and there from specific publics but the groups that are archers and muzzleloaders have not specifically asked us to look at that.

Rex Stanworth: All right, thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah I just have one comment towards Rex, the deer hunt, and archery is going on at that same time too. Do those elk and deer know who's being hunted? I don't know that we could limit the spike archery hunt and not limit also the bow hunters in there, which would probably be a lot more. As far as the length of the season, I have no problem with that. I hunt archery, kind of, you know with my boys, waiting for the real hunts to start. But we hunt the same amount of days, whether if it was a fourteen-day hunt or a thirty-day hunt. I know like a couple of years ago you mentioned on the

difference on the rifle hunt between a nine-day and a five-day hunt. A nine-day hunt the average hunter days was four. On a five-day hunt it was three and a half, basically the same with actually slightly more deer killed on a five-day hunt. Do you have any statistics like that on the archery (unintelligible) length?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, they basically on average hunt about nine to eleven days. And we haven't looked at different, because the season's always been that long so we haven't looked at different shortening or uh . . . I imagine if we shortened it to fourteen they would probably still hunt nine days; but I don't know. That's probably what it takes to be successful.

Clair Woodbury: I'm in favor of longer seasons for the chance for people to get out. It also spreads out the pressure. I think that's a real thing that we've missed on the nine-day rifle hunt, is cramming everybody into five-days. It's made that a really bad hunt for everybody and I think that's what would happen with the archery hunt if, which is the epitome of trying to get out there alone. And if they're going to hunt those nine to eleven days on a fourteen or a twenty-eight, let's leave it at twenty-eight.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions? Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: I don't know so much if it's a question or a comment. It'll probably work into a question if I work on it a little. We're already talking about making them choose a region instead of statewide so maybe at this point this is a good opportunity to discuss how long they're going to hunt while they're choosing that particular region. If we go to this unit-by-unit management I think it's going to work right into limiting the number, the amount of time they can be hunting as well. I mean you're going to have to address each of these issues on the unit by unit, it seems to me. So I don't know.

Anis Aoude: Our recommendation would be twenty-eight day archery regardless of how many units we have. We're not going to manage every specific unit with different dates and different things. I mean talk about complications. It just takes it to a whole other level..

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, questions from the public? State your name please.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond from Beaver, Utah. I'm assuming we're still talking about this includes limited entry hunts as well, these dates, and my question is why are we hunting elk with rifles during the rut?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, the limited entry dates are in the, there was a handout out there and they are, they're not exactly the same as these but we do hunt the rifle in the rut. And that's basically, you know, goes back to the elk unit plan committee and you know, we hashed it out and what it came out is the majority of hunters are rifle hunters and they've been putting in for I don't know how many years and when they draw they want to be able to have a high success and the only way to assure that is to hunt during the rut.

Brayden Richmond: Okay, so with that, and that was my understanding is that's where the information

came from, people with rifles wanted to hunt during the rut. Currently we hear a lot of feedback that the elk quality is declining, not quantity but quality. And lots of people contribute that to we have twenty people out for every one tag finding the biggest five-year old bull.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, and what is your question?

Brayden Richmond: I'm getting to my question. This does pertain to the question. So my question is if we got the elk hunt out of the rut would we see our quality increase according to your information?

Anis Aoude: Not if we continue to manage to the current age objectives. Because we would just issue more permits to get more bulls harvested to get to where we need to on the age objective. So as long as we're managing to our current age objectives the quality will be set by that age objective.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, next.

Kenny Davis: Kenny Davis, Cedar City. What is the date for application or drawing results now?

Anis Aoude: Right now you put in the whole month of February. It was May 31st I think.

Kenny Davis: That's the proposal now but what was it last year?

(Comment off mic, inaudible)

Anis Aoude: Oh, there you go.

Kenny Davis: Why move it back?

Anis Aoude: Good question. The reason we're moving it back is we're consolidating all of the bucks and bulls and the antlerless so we had better harvest data when we make our recommendation. And basically that gives us the best data to make recommendations so we are pushing back the drawing a little bit.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions from the public?

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll take comments from the public. And we have, it looks like three of them. Laurie Mueller? Is Laurie Mueller here? Okay we'll move to Michael Ross. Is Michael Ross here? Okay we'll go to Brayden Richmond.

Brayden Richmond: Once again Brayden Richmond from Beaver, Utah. I'm a little concerned I didn't ask my last question well enough. If I misstate what Anis answered there, if Anis would maybe comment after my comment. My concern is I do think our elk herd's quality is declining. I think that's pretty universal concern. I think there's better ways to manage our elk hunt, primarily getting the hunt out of the rut. By what Anis said, and this is why I hope I don't put words in his mouth, we could increase quantity of tags by getting it out of the rut and maintain our current quality. To me that seems like a win win. I would also suggest that if we get the elk hunt out of the rut some of those old bulls that

are smart are going to go back into the trees so they grow up a few more years and then we'd actually have maybe bigger bulls that are harder to hunt. Maybe we wouldn't kill bigger bulls every year because they're smarter but at least we could hunt them where now it's getting kind of difficult to even hunt those big bulls. I think we could increase our tags significantly and increase our quality by changing that elk date out of the rut. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Comments from the RAC. What's your name? Yeah you're right here. I just called your name a few minutes ago. I thought I did.

Jim Terry: Well basically what I'm representing is three angry bull hunters at Indian Peaks right now. There was a limited entry late season and I don't know how many permits there was for that, but I do know the fish and game added, put on one hundred and seventy-five cow permits opening the same day. One person from California had been putting in for twenty-one years for the late, well for the Southwest Desert and he gets stuck with one hundred and seventy-five cow hunters. Now I don't see any reason why they can't put that cow hunt back nine days so the guys who have been putting in for, I talked to one elderly gentleman older than I was, he'd been putting in for twelve years and finally put in for late season and got drawn. And he was mad at me because I said I was out there scouting looking for cows for a friend of mine. And he was irate with me because I was there. And it's not my fault. But you know, I just don't know why somebody would put in for all those years and you get stuck with the cow hunters that are just driving around. That's you know basically it's just a shame for the guys that put in so many years and so much time. But that's, you know about it. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Okay, Kenny Davis you're up right now.

Kenny Davis: Thanks for the comments and the chance to address ya. First of all that draw notification date I think shouldn't be moved back, if anything it should be moved forward. Some of those hunts are once in a lifetime hunts and even the ones that aren't are turning into once in a lifetime hunts. I would be nice to draw that and have time to make arrangements, you know with your vacation at work and all the different things. With technology I mean they could have that notification out in a couple of weeks. I do understand that they want to make them together but it's two different issues and I don't think it's that necessary for it to be together. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Okay Todd.

Todd Abelhouzen: I brought I gentleman here with me tonight. I was really surprised with his interest in coming with the level of frustration that he has. And I have spoken to several Division officers and employees and sportsmen and outfitters. And Larry Cox who is in the audience with me, turned back his late season Beaver elk tag after several days on the mountain, barely even saw a track let alone an elk. And I really am impressed to say that we've got to figure out whether we're going to focus on opportunity or quality because you can't have both until the numbers increase. And I'll put it in layman's terms, if you ranchers killed all your heifers and culled all your female cattle you wouldn't have a herd. If you coaches killed all your freshman and killed all your seniors you wouldn't be able to win a state championship. And you can either have one or the other but you can't have both until your unit increases in quality. If you're shooting your spikes, you're shooting your mature bulls and you're chasing them from August 15th was it Anis? From August 20th to November 20th. And you're overlapping hunts, you're managing people and the wildlife has got to be managed. And our objective at SFW Dixie Chapter is putting the resource first. And our resource is our wildlife and our recruitment of

hunters. And you cannot do both with the quality and quantity unless you increase the herd size. And so our objective is to work with the cattleman, to work with the Division of Wildlife, to work with the different organizations whether they're bowman or muzzleloader hunters, or rifle hunters, or youth groups, to figure out an objective to increase the herds by creating more AUMs on the mountain, by creating better quality winter and summer range, by creating better opportunities and funding for Division of Wildlife and rancher projects including ranchers that have grazing allotments on public land. You've done a lot to manage the predators, you've done a lot to manage the habitat, you've done a lot to manage the water and the water projects and the fencing and the proper grazing techniques. You guys ought to be in the game. You guys ought to be part of the equation. We've talked about that significantly. I served on the board for the governor on wildlife and grazing. It was pretty heated there for the first several meetings and we worked out some really good opportunities to show how sportsman, ranchers and everybody can get along. But you've got to figure out one way or the other. And we've got a great opportunity to turn it around because the elk management plan allows you to work with age objective but you can't have both. Thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Thank you.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Okay that was the last comment. Well now have comments from the RAC. Go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, Jim that's leaving over here, had a great question; are we really running the cow hunt on top of the limited entry elk and why?

Teresa Bonzo: Yes we are. And it was brought to my attention last week by a late rifle permit holder. And it absolutely is a mistake. I don't know what to do to rectify that.

Clair Woodbury: Good I hope we didn't do that on purpose.

Teresa Bonzo: No, no me and Jason talked about it and we're, I'm not sure how to solve . . .

Clair Woodbury: Can we issue them another tag for next year if they don't get one?

Teresa Bonzo: I'm don't know for sure how to solve it.

Clair Woodbury: Because when you wait that long for this premium of thing.

Teresa Bonzo: I absolutely, we're sick about it.

Clair Woodbury: Thank you Teresa. One other comment I had, I've been hunting elk in this state since the 70s when there were none to speak of. And I think we've done a marvelous here, the Division since 1970 whatever when I started. I don't see an issue with the quality of bulls we've had out there. I think, how many 400 bulls do we kill every year in this state? The complaint I get is broken antlers. We have too many bulls. And there are from guides that I know. I think we're doing a marvelous job on that and I commend the Division.

Cordell Pearson: Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: Yeah, unit-by-unit management is what's allowed that to happen

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other comments? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I guess I have a comment and a question here in addressing some of the stuff that has been brought up. And one of the things that happened to me is I drew a limited entry archery bull tag several years back. And it's like you say, it is a once in a lifetime opportunity for you. You do have a little better odds I guess in archery than you do the any weapons hunt. But one of the things that happened to me, and it's partially my fault because I'm kind of a poor shot or I made a couple of poor shots, but the last three days of my archery hunt I was inundated by rifle hunters scouting, bugling and trying to find their elk. And it looks to me like the problem I experienced could be addressed along with some of the concerns that we're hearing from the public. And I don't know the logistics of this but the early rifle hunts that are during the rut, what would it hurt to if we moved those forward five days? Started them on a Wednesday as opposed to a Saturday. You know and have a little break there that would cut a little bit of the rut out with the rifle hunt. Logistically is that an acceptable practice? Is it something that could happen?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Well every time we move a hunt all the other hunts have to move around it. And I mean we could certainly look at it and see how we could shift it. Without shortening one hunt you can't really move it too much. I guess . . .

Sam Carpenter: Well you wouldn't need to shorten it per say.

Anis Aoude: So make it late . . .

Sam Carpenter: On the 25th of September is going to be, uh, we'd also follow the start date.

Anis Aoude: So you're saying start the rifle hunt later . . .

Sam Carpenter: The early rifle hunt. The late rifle hunt I don't think is a problem.

Anis Aoude: Right, later . . .Right.

Sam Carpenter: But start it on say a Wednesday as opposed to a Saturday that would also address the problem with archers. I can't believe that there's not more of them, you know, that experience the same experience that I had.

Anis Aoude: If you maintain it as a nine or a whatever day hunt then the other hunt would be bumped and then the hunt after that would be bumped and then you'll end up having your general season deer hunt going into probably the first week of November which is something we try to avoid. But we can certainly; if you make a proposal to do something like that we could certainly look at it.

Sam Carpenter: Well I would like to propose that we look into that. That addresses the issue of hunting during the rut and at the same time addresses another issue that these archers are faced with as far as being inundated with the scouting techniques and everything that goes on during the last three days of

their once in a lifetime hunt as well. Is that a motion?

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more comments from the RAC? Okay, I'll ascertain a motion.

Clair Woodbury: I make a motion that we accept the Buck Bulls and Once In A Lifetime 2011 season dates as proposed by the Division.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Okay it was seconded by Paul Briggs and the motion was by Clair.

Rex Stanworth: One question for you Clair, are you not sympathetic to what Sam was talking about in asking to make a recommendation to the DWR to look at any way they can to minimize impact between hunts?

Clair Woodbury: I'm sympathetic but I also understand what Anis is saying. I just don't think there's any wiggle room. We've squeezed in the youth elk hunt there that I'd like to see done away with. Other than that I don't see anywhere to do it. And maybe you could make an amendment to my motion.

Rex Stanworth: Well I'd like to make an amendment to Clair's motion that we make a recommendation to the DWR that they look at every way they can to minimize the impact on these limited entry hunt, bow specifically.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, there's been a motion by Rex, an amendment to the motion. Do we have a second? Okay, seconded by Dale Bagley. Okay, any discussion on the amendment.

Sam Carpenter: Question for Rex. Are you addressing what I asked for specifically or are you just? I mean now that's so vague in detail that I'm not sure what you're asking.

Rex Stanworth: Well what I'm asking is that they look at trying to minimize the impact on specifically the archery hunt. I can tell you being on the elk committee for two different times, you know, Todd's got a wonderful plan and I only recommended it at least, how many times Anis that we take the rifle hunt out of the rut. Because we have all of these guys that are out here and they're telling us we want to protect the resource but by damn don't take that elk hunt out of the rut, and so I didn't even put that in there because you are just wasting your time and your breath in regards to that. So I would just like to make sure that somebody up there realizes that there are impacts going on with those archers who have limited entry permits that they're not able to have a quality hunt because of all of the interruptions that they have.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, are you susceptible to including the wording that I asked for, along with your recommendation as this motion? As part of this motion and that is to try to move that early limited entry rifle hunt forward five days?

Rex Stanworth: Hey, if that will, absolutely.

Sam Carpenter: Can we just get that verbiage in there?

Rex Stanworth: Oh sure, absolutely.

Sam Carpenter: Move it from. Instead of it being a Saturday start we a Wednesday start. So you would be moving it from the 17th forward, you'd add five days to that it would be the 22nd, and it would end five days latter the 30th, on this particular proposal.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, Sam, if we get a calendar let's have specific dates that you would like to move that to.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I can do that. It would start on the 22nd of September. These are the early hunt on the any legal weapon limited entry elk permits. They are scheduled now to start on the 17th and end the 25th. Have those moved to start the 22nd and end the 30th. And that would put it in the rut but towards the end as opposed to the, and it would break up the archery hunt, it ends the 16th, the other one starts the 17th. I mean it ends on a Friday and the other one starts on a Saturday. And I'm telling you the rifle hunters are in there two or three days early doing their scouting and it's a mess up there if you're still trying to chase your elk. Okay, it looks like they start the 29th so it would impact that.

Anis Aoude: It impacts everything. Everything will have to be

Sam Carpenter: I see what you're saying. I think I stepped in something here without doing a whole lot of research on it but I am sympathizing with what we're doing. Uh, I'll withdraw what I'm trying to add to it and go with what your wording is on that to minimize impact.

Rex Stanworth: Okay.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any more discussion on the amendment? Okay, have we got it cleared now, we're not going to put specific dates in it correct? Okay. All right. We'll now vote. All in favor raise your right hand. This is the amendment. Okay, could you please restate the amendment and then we will have a vote.

Giani Julander: That the DWR look at any way they can minimize the impact to the limited entry hunts, especially the archery hunt?

Cordell Pearson: Okay; now we'll have a vote. All in favor on the amendment raise their right hand. Okay vote in unanimous.

Cordell Pearson: Now we will vote, before we vote we'll have a discussion on the motion. Anybody have anything to say? Okay, go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: Are we going to leave the archers going 28 days still?

Rex Stanworth: I don't like it, but we've tried it every year.

Steve Dalton: Okay, I was just trying to make clear what the motion is.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other discussion. Okay we'll vote on the motion. All in favor raise your right hand. Okay, any opposed? Okay, motion carries.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept the Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented including the amendment below. Paul Briggs seconded. Motion carried 8 in favor 1 opposed. (Steve Dalton opposed)

Rex Stanworth proposed an amendment that the DWR look at any way they can to minimize impact to limited entry elk hunters especially archery. Dale Bagley seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll carry on to CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011. Boyde Blackwell will be presenting.

CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 4:32:37 to 4:36:30 of 4:58:23

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

(See Attachment 1)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you Boyde.

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Any questions from the RAC? I see none.

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Any questions from the public?

DeLoss Christensen: DeLoss Christensen, Glenwood, Utah. My question is that the operators when they asked for a reduced number of deer permits give you a reason why? Can you tell me why?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes. Well it can vary, for example: Deseret asked for a reduction in deer permits. Three years ago they had a real bad winter so they had what they felt was high winterkill and thus they were asking for almost fifty percent reduction in the deer permits to try to help the deer in their areas. And so it can vary.

DeLoss Christensen: Okay, that's a pretty good reason if you're out of deer isn't it. Thanks.

Cordell Pearson: Okay any more questions from the public?

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: And we have no comment card correct? Doug? No comment cards from the public.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: We'll take comments from the RAC.

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion we accept the CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, there's been a motion that's been seconded that we accept DWR's proposal. The motion was made by Rex and seconded by Mack Morrell. Okay, any discussion on the motion? Okay, we'll vote on the motion. All in favor raise your hand. It looks to me like it's unanimous.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011. Mack Morrell seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 4:38:34 to 4:40:02 of 4:58:23

-Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

(See Attachment 1)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you.

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I'm just seeing this man deer, I'm assuming that's management hunt?

Boyd Blackwell: Management buck, yes. Yeah.

Sam Carpenter: Is this new?

Boyd Blackwell: Well, um, it's a brand new permit that this RAC approved; management buck permits. And so this year they qualify for management buck permits.

Sam Carpenter: And is this taken out of their normal allotment then?

Boyd Blackwell: No, no this is. . .

Sam Carpenter: Okay, this is above and beyond.

Boyd Blackwell: Yep, total addition.

Sam Carpenter: And the season dates of course correspond with the other management hunts. So it just adds to those hunts?

Boyd Blackwell: Yeah, yeah.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, thank you.

Cordell Pearson: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Questions from the public?

None.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the public?

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the RAC?

None.

Cordell Pearson: I'd ascertain a motion.

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman I'd make a motion that we accept the Landowner Permit Numbers as presented by the DWR.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second that.

Cordell Pearson: Who seconded it? Sam? Okay, we have a motion by Layne, seconded by Sam that we approve DWRs proposal. Discussion on the motion? Okay, we'll vote. All in favor? Unanimous, right?

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, precede sir.

**Taking Big Game Amendment Rule R657-5 4:41:36 to 4:43:36 of 4:58:23
-Boyd Blackwell Wildlife Program Coordinator
(See Attachment 1)**

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, questions from the RAC? Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: Yes Boyd, I have a question on landowner permits for bison. Have you put that, have you come up with a program to accommodate that?

Boyd Blackwell: Not at this point. Not with the once in a lifetime species for landowner permits as yet.

Steve Dalton: How come?

Boyd Blackwell: Well I can understand your interest in that.

Steve Dalton: Yeah, we've been impacted for years.

Boyde Blackwell: Yeah, yeah and I understand that. And that's just something that I haven't been asked to do. And I could do it if we're asked to do it.

Steve Dalton: I'd like to make that recommendation.

Boyde Blackwell: Okay, well I'm sure we'll to that point.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Questions from the public?

None.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the public?

None.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the RAC?

Rex Stanworth: Steve, did you want to make that motion?

Boyde Blackwell: What we ought to go back to do that at the landowner association things if that's what you're interested in. Is that what you're interested in?

Steve Dalton: Yes, yes. I would sure like to have that included somewhere along the line here.

Boyde Blackwell: Because this rule doesn't deal with that. Anything that we're doing from here forward doesn't deal with that opportunity. Or you can address it at the very end and just add that in. Does that meet with your approval Mr. Chairman?

Steve Dalton: Just treat that as new business at the end of the meeting here?

Steve Dalton: Okay, I'd like to make a motion that we accept the, what you presented as presented then.

Sam Carpenter: I'll second it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, could you repeat that? Repeat what was said.

Steve Dalton: We'll wait and talk about the bison at the end of this, of his presentation here.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I thought you said we had to go back to the last one that we just approved to do it.

Boyde Blackwell: I don't think you have to Mr. Chairman. I think you can do that at the very end, you can add that in at the end.

Cordell Pearson: Under other business?

Boyde Blackwell: Yes.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you.

Steve Dalton: I'm just making a motion to accept what he just presented.

Cordell Pearson: Do we have a second?

Sam Carpenter: I second.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a second by Sam. Discussion? All in favor? Okay, all right. Go ahead.

Clair Woodbury: We need to clarify that motion by Steve that it is Rule R657-5)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, let's stop right here. Let's restate the motion with the rule in and then we'll vote.

Steve Dalton: I make a motion to accept R0657-5 as presented.

Sam Carpenter: I second it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion by Steve and a second by Sam. Any discussion? No discussion? We'll vote. All in favor raise your hand. Okay, motion passes. It looks like it's unanimous.

Steve Dalton made the motion to accept Taking Big Game Amendment (Rule R657-5) as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Cordell Pearson: Precede sir.

Depredation Rule Amendment Rule R657-44 4:47:22 to 4:48:56 of 4:58:23

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

(See Attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Rex Stanworth: Boyde, when would those applications start for this depredation pool?

Boyde Blackwell: They would start, it's online now, you can apply now. However, there isn't a spot for

once in a lifetime species until this goes through the wildlife board and then once that's approved and everything's a go we can add them in it in about five minutes.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Questions from the public?
None.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the public? No comments.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the RAC? I see none. I'll ascertain a motion.

Rex Stanworth: I make a motion that we accept amendment Rule R-657-44 as presented.

Layne Torgerson: I'll second it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay it has been moved and seconded that we accept DWRs proposal on Rule R657-44. Any discussion? Okay, we'll vote. All in favor? Okay, it looks like it's unanimous. Proceed.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to accept Depredation Rule Amendment Rule R657-44 as presented. Layne Torgerson seconded. Motion carried unanimously. (Dell LeFevre was not present for vote)

Depredation Policy Amendment 4:50:13 to 4:50:41 of 4:58:23
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator
(See Attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you sir. Any questions from the RAC?

None.

Questions from the Public:

Cordell Pearson: Questions from the public?

None.

Comments from the public:

Cordell Pearson: No comments from the public.

RAC discussion and vote:

Cordell Pearson: Comments from the RAC? Okay, I'll ascertain a motion.

Layne Torgerson: I make a motion that we accept the changes to policy W5WLD-08 as presented.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, motion made by Layne, seconded by Paul. Any discussion? All in favor raise your hand. Any opposed? Okay, motion carries.

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept Depredation Policy Amendment as presented. Paul Briggs seconded. Motion carried unanimously. (Dell LeFevre not present for vote)

Other Business (contingent)
-Cordell Pearson, Chairman

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we'll now go to other business. And now Mr. Dalton you have the floor.

Steve Dalton: Yes, I'd like to make a proposal that we establish a private landowner hunting association and rule concerning bison use on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit. I guess it would be on any of the private lands with the bison issue.

Rex Stanworth: Steve did you want to make that for just Bison or did we want to put it to limit, once in a lifetime species? I think that's what Boyde would prefer.

Steve Dalton: Uh, yeah, we could do it for . . . what would you prefer Boyde?

Boyde Blackwell: Well to be honest I wouldn't prefer any of it but if you want it done you've got to make a recommendation. See right now by rule once in a lifetime species are not included in landowner associations.

Steve Dalton: What about a cow moose?

Boyde Blackwell: Not even cow moose.

Steve Dalton: Oh they're not . . .

Boyde Blackwell: Not cow moose, not bull moose, not bison, because they're once in a lifetime species and the landowner associations are qualify for only limited entry and so there's a difference there. And so by rule they're not included in that, but we can be requested, the Wildlife Board can request us to take a look at it and see where we would go with it.

Steve Dalton: Okay, that's what I'd like to do. Let's just call in specifically for bison then.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, hold on just a minute Steve.

Douglas Messerly: Just to clarify the process here to make it clearer what the motion is. The motion would be to ask the Wildlife Board to put this on their action log, which would then ask the Division to develop a proposal or some information to present to the RAC and the Wildlife Board next year at this time. So let's make clear what it is that we're doing because the RAC address the Wildlife Board and we have done that on several occasions and it actually seems to be pretty well accepted when the RAC asks the Wildlife Board to consider putting something on their action long. Which then puts them in a position to ask the Division to explore it further. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Steve Dalton: Okay that's what I would like to do, propose that the Wildlife Board look at that option to create a rule for trying to address the issue of bison use on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit. I'll make that in the form of a motion.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, do we have a second?

Rex Stanworth: I'll second it.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any discussion? Okay go ahead

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, I appreciate Steve's concern about those bison over there; he's made it well known his feelings on them. But I think we're going into uncharted territory here as far as the state and other once in a lifetime species that I don't think we want to tackle or create a new program for that.

Steve Dalton: My comment there is that it's not your private land that's being impacted by those bison. We get hit hard every year on our private land with the bison. They go right across it every year. Don't miss a year, sometimes twice a year. And no compensation or attempt for compensation to the private landowners.

Clair Woodbury: I would say that compensation is a different thing that we could address. But I'm just talking about killing them in a depredation type situation is something that, but as far as the compensation we absolutely could address that.

Steve Dalton: Well what I was talking about is a landowner association to accommodate some kind of compensation to the landowners that are impacted, the private landowners. It's not just killing them, it's giving them a permit and an opportunity to regain some of the loss they've had by the impact of the bison on their private land.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, any other discussion?

Douglas Messerly: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to remind the committee a of conflict of interest concerns and that is that if someone can stands to personally gain from an action of this committee, although this committee doesn't make decisions it makes recommendations, that we need to consider how appropriate it is for that person to vote on that issue.

Steve Dalton: Does that preclude me from making a motion? I'll abstain my vote so, but I did make the motion.

Clair Woodbury: In my reading of that rule I think it's very clear that Steve can discuss it with us but as far as making a motion and voting that would be a conflict of interest.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, so we have a conflict with that. Would anybody else like to make that motion?

Rex Stanworth: I'll make the motion that Steve made pertaining to the bison on private land, landowner permits.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, we have a motion by Rex, do we have a second. Seconded by Sam. Discussion. Okay would you clarify that motion please young lady?

Giani Julander: To have the Wildlife Board look at the option to create a rule to address the issue of bison on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you. Any other discussion? Okay, we'll take a vote. All in favor raise your hand. Six, right? Okay, opposed? One. Okay, motion carries.

Rex Stanworth made the motion to propose that the Wildlife Board look at the option to create a rule to address the issue of bison on private lands on the Henry Mountain Unit. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried, 6 in favor, 1 opposed. (Clair Woodbury opposed, Steve Dalton abstained, Dell LeFevre not present for vote)

Cordell Pearson: Okay, I don't think we have any other business. I'd like to thank you all for being here. Our next meeting will be here at Beaver High School on December 7th at 7:00 PM. Everybody drive careful. See you later.

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we adjourn.

Cordell Pearson: Okay, thank you sir. It's been moved and seconded that we adjourn so we're gone.

Layne Torgerson made the motion to adjourn. Several seconds. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 pm.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
November 17, 2010 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

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

Approval of September 8, 2010 minutes

**MOTION: To accept the Sep 8, 2010 minutes as written
Passed unanimously**

Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment

**MOTION: To allow archery hunters to choose regions rather than statewide.
Failed 3-7**

**MOTION: That the Wildlife Board considers allowing blind hunters to use a laser sighting device and companion hunter.
Passed unanimously**

MOTION: To accept Option 2 of the Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment as presented. Passed 7-3

2011 Bucks, Bulls & OIAL Season Dates and Application Timeline

MOTION: To accept the 2011 Bucks & Bulls & OIAL season dates and application timeline as presented with a boundary change in the Nine Mile elk unit, moving the northern boundary of the Nine Mile-Range Creek south sub-unit to the Nine Mile Canyon Road.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: To look at making the area north of Highway 491 a general season open bull unit, if that is what the majority of landowners want.

Passed unanimously

CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011

**MOTION: To exclude section 2 from the Minnie Maud CWMU
Passed unanimously,**

**MOTION: To accept CWMU permit numbers for 2011 as presented.
Passed unanimously, except for one abstention due to conflict of interest**

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011

MOTION: To accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented.

Passed unanimously

Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment

MOTION: To accept the R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment as presented.

Passed unanimously

Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment

MOTION: To accept the R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment as presented.

Passed unanimously

Depredation Policy Amendment

MOTION: To accept the Depredation Policy Amendment as presented.

Passed unanimously

Alternating the Location of the Southeastern RAC meetings throughout the Region

MOTION: To hold the December 2010 RAC meeting in Monticello

Passed unanimously, however due to a comment from a houndsman from the audience, Guy Webster, the motion was rescinded and the meeting was moved back to Green River.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
November 17, 2010 @ 6:30 p.m.**

Members Present

Members Absent

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

**Todd Huntington, At Large
Derris Jones, Sportsmen
Laura Kamala, Non-Consumptive
Darrel Mecham, Sportsman**

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

**Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official
Wayne Hoskisson, Non-consumptive**

Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.

Others Present

Keele Johnson

- 1) **Approval of the Agenda (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, RAC chairman

VOTING

**Motion was made by Laura Kamala to accept the agenda as written
Seconded by Pam Riddle
Motion passed unanimously**

- 2) **Approval of the September 8, 2010 minutes (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, RAC chairman

VOTING

**Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the Sep. 8, 2010 minutes as written
Seconded by Blair Eastman
Motion passed unanimously**

3) Wildlife Board Business (Informational)

-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow-The Wildlife Board went pretty much with everything that we voted for. There was one change on Utah Lake with bass fishing limits. There is now a limit of six with one bass over 12 inches. Panquitch Lake was added to the list of contest waters. We will be hearing about the statewide deer management plan tonight. We will now go to Bill for the regional update.

4) Regional Update (Informational)

-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

The following items were discussed by Bill Bates:

1) An open house was held in Blanding on Sep. 22 at the College of Eastern Utah Activity and Events Center. This was precipitated by comments received from the county commission, asking about those things that the division had been involved in. The commission suggested that there had been a communication problem. Hence, the DWR went down to Blanding, rented a meeting space and invited the public, sportsmen organizations and public leaders to talk to division personnel about anything they wanted to speak about. Twenty eight persons attended. Among the issues brought forward were: deer and elk management and hunting strategies, CWMU operations and regulations, the presence and status of elk on Elk Ridge and the Blue Mountains, big game depredation, and the desire for additional habitat improvement projects. The DWR came away with some good ideas, Especially timely were suggestions about bear management, considering the fact that the bear proclamation meeting will occur in December.

2) The proposal to move RAC meetings throughout the region to provide local residents with better access to specific issues. The suggestion was made to hold the bear meeting in San Juan County, which is something within the purview of the RAC. The prospect of holding RAC meetings at different locations would be an items on the agenda of the November RAC meeting.

3) The deer collaring study occurring throughout the state to assess doe and fawn survival and causes of mortality. In the southeastern region, collared does and fawns occur on the San Juan and Manti units. The collaring study will continue for five years.

4) The accuracy of DWR's deer population estimates. Data from the region's check stations indicate that we have had winter loss in the Blue Mountains and the LaSal Mountains. The Manti unit showed losses as well.

5) Bill emphasized that this meeting was not primary a strategy for increasing deer herds, but rather the preferred strategy for hunting bucks. Bill indicated that the legislature directed that the DWR manage deer with population objectives to the intent that rangeland resource damage be prevented. Buck:doe ratios give an indication of the number of bucks a hunter may see during a hunt and provide a higher objective for DWR herd management objectives.

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones- Asked if fawns were collared when 6 months old, or younger. If when six months old, the survival data does not indicate winter loss.

Anis Aoude-I'm not convinced that the harvest indicated that winter mortality occurred. It indicated that fewer yearling bucks were harvested. It's hard to say. Just because the data showed that fewer yearling bucks were taken doesn't necessarily mean that fewer yearling bucks were available.

Bill Bates—One indicator of winter mortality is the lower number of deer that we checked. Typically there would have been 2-3 times that number of bucks checked on each of those check stations. We were significantly lower.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

- 5) Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment (Action)
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones-Under the three options, you didn't mention what would trigger an increase in permits?

Anis Aoude-To increase permits, we have to go over 25 bucks:100 does.

Travis Pearson-How do you come up with the buck:doe ratio?

Anis Aoude-That is explained in the packet. It's a post-season count.

Travis Pehrson-Can you explain what effect Option 2 would have on the dedicated hunter program?

Anis Aoude-Conceivably, dedicated hunters could take all the permits from a single unit, so the program would have to be changed to prevent that from happening. The program would go to a one year program and dedicated hunters would have to draw a unit before entrance into the program. Once in the program, they could hunt the three weapon types in that unit.

Travis Pehrson-How do you decide how many permits to issue in a certain unit?

Anis Aoude-We would juggle permit numbers to stay above the minimum of 18 bucks:100 does.

Travis Pehrson-Is there a better way to make a better estimate of the deer population in a certain unit. Bill mentioned there was room for error in DWR's population estimates and buck:doe ratios.

Anis Aoude-The buck:doe estimates are the best estimates we have for mule deer. We assess them annually and get a sufficient sample size to reach a 95% confidence level. So if there's anything we'd like to manage by, it would be the buck:doe ratio. It's a good measure of deer in a given population.

Derris Jones-Can we get to the 18 bucks:100 does in one year or will it take several years?

Anis Aoude-Our recommendations for permit numbers are what we believe would be required to reach the minimum buck:doe objective in one or more years.

Terry Sanslow-On the Plateau-Thousand Lakes, every time we try to remove that unit from limited entry, there's been an outcry. By looking at this, I don't know why it still needs to be pulled out.

Anis Aoude-Where we are changing things so drastically, it makes sense that that unit becomes a general season unit rather than a limited entry unit.

Terry Sanslow-So that would be your recommendation under Option 1?

Anis Aoude-No. Under Option 2.

Blair Eastman-(inaudible)

Anis Aoude-The general season tags include archery, muzzleloader and rifle.

Questions from the Public

Deloss Christensen-What triggers a doe hunt on a unit?

Anis Aoude-Several things could trigger a doe hunt. These include habitat damage, population excess, and depredation. If the population is too high we are mandated to bring it back to objective.

Deloss Christensen-Thousands of acres have been improved over the last 15 years. How much longer will we have to wait to see an increase in the doe herd?

Anis Aoude-That's not something I can answer. Hopefully in the next 5-10 years.

Deloss Christensen-I have questions about the computer model that predicts the deer population size. How does that model work?

Anis Aoude-The model is not used to predict buck:doe ratios. That is done on the ground on all units. For the population model, we take the harvest data, buck:doe ratios, fawn:doe ratios, survival rates, baseline population information, and other relevant factors and plug these variables into the model. The model becomes more accurate over time as the factors are fine-tuned.

Eric Luke-I have questions about how you come up with the buck:doe ratios? I know it's an actual field count, but I see DWR biologists doing counts in the fields around town. I am concerned, because I hunt the Manti and have done so for years. I know there's a huge herd that resides in the fields around the towns. I believe there are more deer around towns than on the mountain. Is data from the field herd extrapolated throughout the unit?

Anis Aoude-We urge our biologists not to count field deer. Actually, the buck:doe ratio is generally lower in the fields than in other areas on a given unit. Biologists try to sample the entire unit.

Eric Luke-Bill mentioned that the overall population size is not pertinent for the purpose of this meeting. I think it means a lot for everyone here. When it's difficult to find 100 deer to arrive at the buck:doe ratio, you know that something is wrong.

Anis Aoude-To get to the buck:doe ratio, we try to get a sample of at least 400 does and accompanying bucks and fawns in order to arrive at a statistically valid sample. We often count as many as 1,000 deer on a unit to arrive at the buck:doe ratio. The data we present is valid and statistically sound. If it's not statistically sound, we don't present the data.

James Gilson-I listened to the Executive Board meeting on the Internet. Jim Karpowitz said that he didn't think that the state's deer herds could withstand two rifle hunts. So did Jim or the Board cancel the idea of having two rifle hunts?

Anis Aoude-The Board decided to table that idea at that meeting.

Keele Johnson-Just for clarification on where the Board is, the Board is extremely worried about the deer population in the state. We felt that we wanted to tackle this issue before we proceed to changing seasons, because changing seasons doesn't affect the population. We wanted to address something that will change the population. We are a little concerned about the buck:doe ratio, because we don't believe that affects the population either. The doe:fawn ratio is what we are concerned about and the number of deer on the ground is what we are concerned about, and so we decided to get this other thing out of the way and put it on the table for a while, because we don't feel that is as important an issue as getting our deer herds back. That's what we are concerned about. I don't want to see a lot of fog being created about buck:doe ratios and things like that. We want our deer herd back. We are very serious about that. It's been going down for 30 years. Something has to be done differently.

James Gilson to Anis Aoude-I listened to your radio show with Steve Brown and at the Central RAC you made comments that the deer herds are close to objective and in good shape. Could you expound on that?

Anis Aoude-I never said the herds are close to objective. I stated that our herds have been stable over the last ten years at about 300,000. I never said that the herds were at objective. I don't think we will ever reach the objective, unless we increase and improve the habitat.

James Gilson-The first option included a 7,000 tag cut. Where will those tags be cut?

Anis Aoude-From the northeastern and central regions.

James Gilson-So all the units that are below the buck:doe objective will have reduced tags?

Anis Aoude-There is three units in the state that are below 12:100. They will be pulled out or hunted only lightly. The rest will be handled on a regional basis. The only regions below 15:100 does are the northern, northeastern and the central regions. The majority of the cuts will go to those regions in addition to the three units that were pulled out or hunted lightly.

James Gilson-So everything stays the same in southeast Utah under Option 1. How long will it take for each region to get to the 18:100 figures?

Anis Aoude-The permits in each region will be cut to reduce the total number of hunters in the region. It may take several years. It depends on the success rate and a whole lot of other factors.

James Gilson-So with Option 2, what is the division's recommendation on statewide archery?

Anis Aoude-We will leave that up to the Board to be decided. Our preferred option would be statewide. If the Board asks us to go unit by unit, then that's what we will do.

James Gilson-How many tags are on the Thousand Lakes unit now? If that unit went into a general season unit, would those tags stay the same?

Anis Aoude-I don't have that information in front of me, so I cannot answer your question.

James Gilson-Will the tags increase or decrease?

Anis Aoude-Currently the tags include both general and limited entry, so we would add up the limited entry and general season permits, and that would determine the number of permits.

James Gilson-Why the smoke and mirrors with buck:doe ratios, unit by unit, region by region, this cut or that cut, why all the emphasis on this issue that doesn't change the problem of the deer herd in the state? What if our computer model is off by the example of 5,000 deer in 29 units? That amounts to 75,000 deer statewide. It seems we are only concerned about buck:doe ratios and not the population altogether. It seems we are going backwards.

Anis Aoude-Our population estimates are not off by thousands. There could be smaller errors one way or the other. Having said that, we do care about increasing deer populations. Nothing we do with the buck harvest is going to change that, but there are those who believe that if we hunt by region or by unit, we will increase populations. Hunting of bucks will not help the deer population. Predator control, decreasing highway mortality, and increasing fawn survival will help increase the deer herd. I know there's a lot of confusion out there that one is related to the other, but they are not. Some say that closing a unit will help the deer herd, but doing so only helps the number of bucks. Increasing the number of bucks isn't always the best thing for a deer herd. These options are hunting changes, not population changes. We are doing habitat work on a regular basis. We are doing predator control. We are dealing with highway mortality. These are the things that will help the deer population. How we hunt bucks will not change the population, so long as we have enough bucks to breed all the does.

Bill Bates-Earlier in the meeting, I did not mean to insinuate that we don't care about the number of deer. I meant that the deer population was not what we were concerned about tonight as far as selecting one of the options. The size of the deer herd is something we manipulate when we talk about antlerless deer regulations. We absolutely do care about the overall number of deer in the state and that's where the majority of the time of our wildlife and habitat biologists is spent. We target the entire deer herd, not just on the buck segment of the population. I spoke out of context when I pulled the 5,000 number out of the air. Possible errors in population models are not that big. I apologize for that.

James Gilson-I hope you can see that some concern was raised when you look at the big picture, so I wanted to clear that up. Getting back to the deer herd. I think we would agree that the best way to increase the deer herd is to keep more fawns alive. What's the number one mortality on fawns?

Anis Aoude-It's different everywhere. As far as the leading causes of mortality, cars and coyotes are among them. There's malnutrition and other types of natural mortality too. There are a lot of factors. About 30% of fawn mortality is attributed to predators. Seventy percent of mortality is attributed to disease, malnutrition and other factors.

James Gilson-Jim Karpowitz sent me an email, suggesting that 40% of the fawns die every year. 65% of these losses are attributed to predators. Why is the data always different?

Anis Aoude-(inaudible)

Bill Richards-Why does the DWR provide landowners with permits and allow landowners to kill buck deer?

Anis Aoude-We give very few landowners buck deer permits, so I'm not sure where you are coming from.

Bill Bates-Let me ask Justin Shannon if this may be a 72-hour notification situation.

Justin Shannon-This is a situation with a landowner in Green River where he provided a 72-hour written notice, demanding the removal of deer from his property. These were resident deer, living on his farm, and we allowed him to harvest the animals.

Don Peay-There has been a great deal of effort to try and rebuild our deer herds. This is a big meeting tonight, because people are very concerned. A lot of people wonder how we reverse the trend. I understand the difference between populations and buck:doe ratios, but Garth Carter, a former biologist said that he didn't know why it was, but when you close a unit to hunting, the deer population responds. We have seen this on the Henry's and the Book Cliffs. We aren't just talking about the total number of bucks but the total deer population. If we expand the number of bucks, predators divert their attention, which saves more does and fawns. Hunting has an impact. We've seen deer herds rebound on the Henry's and Book Cliffs, whereas herds elsewhere in the state have been in decline. What has allowed these deer herds to come back?

Anis Aoude-I can address some of that. Basically, on those units they were closed in a time when we had long-term drought, These units were opened after we had a lot of precipitation, so they rebounded due to precipitation, rather than the hunting closure. We have long-term data showing how does and fawns respond to precipitation. You are assuming that predators are the limiting factor. Our data suggests that predation is not a limiting factor on adults. It probably is a factor on fawn survival. If predation is the number one issue, and there are more bucks out there, it is true there would be less pressure on the doe segment of the population. Our collaring study shows that our doe survival is about 88% The percentage seems to be about 85% in other western states. Over several years, our survival will probably shake out at that number. Every biologist out there would tell you that the reason those two units rebounded was due to the precipitation increase. On those units, the populations are still struggling, but there are more bucks in the population, so it gives the false impression that the unit is doing well. The Henrys and Book Cliffs still struggle to get to objective.

Bill Bates-Don, I appreciate your comments and you bring up some good points, but there are a couple of factors that have also contributed to their success. We had a 100,000 acre habitat improvement project on the Book Cliffs and it rained right after it was seeded. We had a 42,000 acre fire on the Henry's and we followed the fire with large scale habitat improvement and seeding projects. Those were the best projects I've ever seen and they were both followed by rain. If that happened everywhere, it would really help.

Verd Byrnes-Can you share the harvest data from the check stations on the LaSal Mountains?

Anis Aoude-That information is available in the region.

Eric Luke-Can you tell me what the fawn recruitment is for the Henry's and Book Cliffs, compared to the other units?

Justin Shannon-Are you talking fawn:doe ratios?

Eric Luke-Yes, and the mortality rate.

Anis Aoude-We don't have collars on the Henry's or the Book Cliffs, because they are limited entry units. We harvest very few bucks and we don't need to know how many fawns are produced. On general season units, we follow that much more closely.

Eric Luke-In past years that data has been given. The fawn recruitment is what I am looking for. The Henry's is over 80% and the Book Cliffs is somewhere near 60-70%. Is that correct?

Justin Shannon-The fawn:doe ratio was 37 fawns per hundred does on the Book Cliffs in 2009. On the Henry's, we were at 71 fawns per hundred does.

Anis Aoude-On some units we still have more than 85 fawns per 100 does because of precipitation. What produces fawns is good forage, which needs a lot of rain. Predators take some fawns, but we can overcome that by producing more fawns. However, we still want to control coyote numbers, so we lose as few fawns as possible.

Deloss Christensen-Several times this evening you have said that factors are different in each situation. It's different if there are freeways and highways and cougars and coyotes and deserts and lush mountains. All of the units are different. You have the responsibility of trying to find out what is different about all these units. If each is different and unique, why are you so opposed to managing the deer herd on a unit by unit basis?

Anis Aoude-We do manage deer on a herd unit basis, but we hunt on a regional basis. We collect and analyze our data on a unit by unit basis though.

Casey Black-I have a question about the Elk Ridge limited entry unit. Over the past 10 years, the number of buck tags has decreased. Why?

Guy Wallace-The Elk Ridge unit has the lowest fawn production of any of the units I work with. Typically it is 40 fawns per 100 does. Some years it has been 20-30 fawns:100 does. With production that low, we can't increase tags. The buck:doe ratio objective is higher for that unit, so we have had to cut down on the tags issued.

Casey Black-What's the problem?

Guy Wallace-The biggest problem is getting the fawns to survive. We've done quite a bit of predator control through Wildlife Services by helicopter. The USFS has done aspen tree regeneration projects on summer range, which should help productivity over time. Now we just have to wait for a response. From '82-'84, fawn production on Elk Ridge was in the '90s, which we have not seen since that time.

Casey Black-Do you believe that predators are largely at fault for the decline?

Guy Wallace-I don't know. Predators have a big impact when a population is attempting to recover, because when the production and population are that low, any negative factor has a big impact.

Casey Black-If we had a massive slaughter of predators, would that bring back the deer population?

Guy Wallace-It's hard to say.

Casey Black-Then why don't we try it. We have nothing to lose except some coyotes, lions and bears.

Justin Shannon-With the cougars and bears, there are management plans in place. We have to stay within the guidelines that are set. A mass slaughter is completely unacceptable.

Casey Black-Okay, but I also think it's unacceptable to see our deer herds go downhill year after year.

Darrell Benson-How many of these permits will go to landowners under any of these options?

Anis Aoude-None. Landowner permits are usually limited entry permits. Statewide, about 600 go to landowners, but it's a very small percentage and that wouldn't change under any of the options.

Ken Hansen-Do the proposed tag cuts come off the 94,000 or 97,000 cap?

Anis Aoude-They would come off the 94,000 cap.

Ken Hansen-Let's try something different. Let's see if eliminating the predators will help the deer herds recover.

Justin Shannon-We always hear comments and suggestions about elimination of the predators, but the majority of the deer units in the southeastern region are already under cougar management plans. The cougar quotas are rarely ever filled. The Elk Ridge cougar quota is never filled. In most of the areas, where predator control is called for, we have issued the tags, but the cougars aren't being harvested. There is room for more cougars to be killed, but the hunters aren't harvesting them.

Kim Ward-Could we do something like Idaho, where a hunter can shoot a cougar or a bear during the hunting season?

Anis Aoude-I can't make decisions on cougars and bears, because they don't fall under my responsibility. Those programs fall under other coordinators. We have constituents that include more than just deer hunters, and can't make those kinds of decisions. Those considerations have to be weighed as well.

Kim Ward-You mentioned collaring fawns in December, so these were fairly large sized fawns. Is there data to showing the causes of fawn mortality up to that time?

Anis Aoude-There is a study in the works to show 0-six month's survival. That's a whole different study with a lot more detail. Basically, you have to follow the fawn almost daily to see what happens.

Rick McElhaney-What is the cost of shooting coyotes from helicopters?

Anis Aoude-I don't have those figures with me, although I could get them at a later time. Aerial gunning is done by Wildlife Services under the Department of Agriculture. Their costs vary from year to year, based on a variety of factors.

Rick McElhaney-I was told it was \$300 or more per dog. My question is why we don't put our money toward a bounty on coyotes. We would kill more dogs with sportsmen enjoying the recreational opportunity at a lower cost per dog.

Guy Webster-Could you comment about the study on Monroe Mountain when you went there to kill every lion on the mountain and didn't come back with any improvement in buck:doe ratio?

Anis Aoude-Yes. There was a period on the Monroe where they did a very aggressive harvest of lions and the deer herds did not rebound. As we know, it's never one factor. You can't always draw cause and effect conclusions. It's a very complicated issue and there are a lot of factors. As Guy mentioned, we did have as many lions on Elk Ridge during times of good precipitation and had good fawn production. You can have a lot of predators and be in a slump and have the same number of predators and have good fawn production. We do have to work on all the factors that combine to bring the deer herd up. It's not all just one predator either.

Derry Jewkes-You've explained that rainfall was involved with the recovery of deer on the Henry's and Book Cliffs. I wonder if you could explain how CWMUs with the same amount of rainfall, and the same predators could have such better hunting opportunity. As far as I can see, the only difference is the number of animals we are taking and how we are managing those areas.

Anis Aoude-Both the Henry's and Book Cliffs are limited entry. They don't have good production. In fact, the Book Cliffs have very poor production at 40 fawns per hundred does, yet year after year we maintain bigger bucks on that unit. The Henry's is the same. It's had lousy production in the past few years but that's more associated with rainfall. If you limit the harvest from a population of 1,500 animals, you are going to grow big bucks, because you are only harvesting the bucks that are in the older age class. It goes back to opportunity vs. quality. If you don't harvest the deer, you will have big bucks, but very few persons can go hunting. So if you want to have a Henry Mountains statewide, we will have 5,000 permits statewide – that's for every unit in the state. These persons will have the greatest hunt of their life. You may want that, but most people want to hunt every year. You cannot run the state's deer herds under that kind of limited hunting opportunity.

Eric Luke-In the fawns that you collared, the ones that did not survive, do you record the size of those fawns to see if they are the smaller animals that may have been born later in the year?

Anis Aoude-We are collecting data on the fawns. They are all doe fawns. I don't have those data right now, but I can get them. This is the first year of a long-term study and one point does not make a trend. We need to have multiple years behind us to figure out what's going on. On the first year, they did take weight and height and that tells you how old they were, but I would have to go back and check that data.

Deloss Christensen-Which is more important, letting a large number of people go hunting every year because they want to or losing our deer herds?

Anis Aoude-I don't think the two are mutually exclusive. That's a philosophical question.

Tim Pilling-You claim the deer herds are around 300,000 statewide. What's the probability of accuracy on that count? 95% or greater?

Anis Aoude-It probably around 80% plus or minus.

Tim Pilling-That brings up the next question. What do you use to validate your population models to assure accuracy? It seems that the accuracy is dependent on the data that are input.

Anis Aoude-Our harvest data and mortality data and other data combined gives you the confidence interval. We use a Pop 2 model and are moving to a modified population model that uses survival data that we are getting now. We are getting better survival data and will have a better model.

Tim Pilling-I guess this is another question. The two units that show declines in 2007—the Central Mountain-Nebo went down 10,000 and the Wasatch Mountains went from 2,800 to 1,650. Why weren't the other units affected?

Anis Aoude-That was the year we adopted Pop 2 and we adjusted some of the models. Before that, each unit had its own population model, so we wanted to bring all the units onto the same model. Those units were being modeled incorrectly.

Tim Pilling-So these units could have been off significantly?

Anis Aoude-Correct.

Tim Pilling-This question relates to the other comments. Did we ever look at the data on the Uncompadre, where there was an extensive survey done. That study would have compared favorably to the weather in southeast Utah.

Anis Aoude-That study was completed and published in the Journal of Wildlife Management and it showed that the major contributor of fawn loss was habitat-

related and weather-related. There was predation, but it wasn't the biggest factor. Fawn gender was a big factor, as well as age going into the winter, and a lot of other things.

Bill Bates-We used some of that data as input for our models for the San Juan unit.

James Gilson-Why doesn't the division manage coyotes?

Anis Aoude-The legislature took them out of our control and put them under the Department of Agriculture. They are not protected by us in any way.

Kim Hansen-Texas has declassified cougars, so they can be hunted just like we hunt coyotes. Do we have the option of declassifying cougars in Utah?

Anis Aoude-That's certainly an option, but I don't think that would ever be politically acceptable. Even in Texas, cougars are not considered varmints. They are in a different classification.

Comments from the Public

Scott Watson-I spend a lot of time on the San Juan Mountains and I have a hard time having any confidence in the numbers out there. The division could do a lot better by explaining how they arrive at their population numbers. In the time I have spent on the mountain, I don't see 22 bucks for every 100 does. The herds and their health are down on the San Juan unit. Based on the optimistic news releases just before the hunt, we were flooded with hunters down there. We are getting way too many hunters and not enough management down there. The numbers are just going down. We had a huge dive last year and this year you just don't see the deer in town like you used to.

Frank Darcey-After the doe shoots of the late '80s, the years following were droughty with an over-abundance of predators. The deer on the LaSal Mountains went right down the tubes. The dynamics of the LaSal Mountains are different than the Book Cliffs or Abajos or San Rafael. In 1994, I drew a position paper and submitted it to Governor Leavitt suggesting that the state break their hunting regions into smaller units that we could look at and address. It was blown off with similar reasons we have been hearing here tonight. Now it's come back that there are no deer on the LaSals or in many other places, so we are right back to where we were in 1994. Let's look at micro-managing our units so that we can address problems in different areas. I would encourage you all to support Option 2.

Max Johnson-I have farmed east of Monticello for 40 years. Our habitat is good out there. Deer out there are not hurting for food. Two years ago, I used to go out in the fields this time of year and count 150 deer. This year, I'm counting 10. I have talked to a lot of hunters out there and they had extremely bad luck. I hunted on the Blues for 10 days and saw one buck and 15 does. I think predators are a big problem. Forty years ago, our trappers cleaned house with predators. The deer were short then, but after a trapper named Douglass had spent 5-10 years in the area, the deer came back. I think you still have the same problem.

Kim Hansen-We have a serious decline in the deer herd. There is a method to bring it back. As far as the options, I think Option 2 is the only way. We do have to micro-manage our herds and we have to try different things, because what we've been doing hasn't worked. We have a predator problem that is taking fawns 365 days a year. The answer is to knock off a few predators. The DWR estimates that we have 2,000-3,000 cougars in the state right now. Cougars typically kill about 50 deer a year to survive. If we take the low number of 2,000, we are looking at 100,000 that

the cougars are taking. Coyotes kill a lot of fawns in the spring. If we took 200 cougars that would equal 8-10,000 deer that are not killed by cougars. That number multiplied by the division's numbers of about 18-25% would make between 32 and 40,000 deer tags that we don't have now. Between the 1950s and 70s, the San Juan/Elk Ridge unit was harvesting 2,500 head of deer. That's about 10,000 hunters on Elk Ridge on an annual basis. In the late 60s and early 70s, when 1080 was banned, the deer herd started a dramatic decline. So from the 1980s to 1983, the San Juan/Elk Ridge was closed, the deer herd didn't increase that much. In 1984, it was reopened as limited entry. The deer herd still did not improve. Last year, there were only 40 deer tags that were issued on Elk Ridge. One cougar is going to kill more deer than all the tags allotted. Cougars, coyotes and bears bring virtually no revenue and they cost us thousands. If we cut deer tags, we lose state and federal money and the cost of a deer tag will go up. Hunters are the only ones that produce significant revenue. All the predators do very little to foot the bill. We need to bring our deer herds back. If we have more deer, we will have more bucks. I'd like to cite a study from Arizona in the 1970s, where they had deer in a plot that was entirely predator free. In that area, the does are producing 225% more fawns than anywhere else in that area. We need to go to the 29 unit management and need to do something different. What we have been doing is not working.

Kim McFarlane-Last year I spent a lot of time in the field. Except for the Henry Mountains, I was very disappointed in the deer herds. Again when I hunted on the Manti, I saw very few deer. All of our units are under objective. The buck:doe gives us a false representation of the number of bucks available per unit compared with the population objective. I would suggest that any buck:doe ratio should be based on the total population for that unit. We need to base our buck:doe ratios on the number of deer on the ground. When we talk about buck:doe ratios, we should publish the population objective for those herds. The population objective is a better indicator of where the herd is. The DWR needs to start managing for populations, and start pushing to increase deer in the state, rather just basing their success on buck:doe ratios.

Darrell Benson-In 1978-79, there was a graduate student on the LaSal Mountains doing his thesis. He found that there were as many bears taking fawns as there were coyotes. We don't need any more studies. I'm against all of the three proposals, because the DWR is trying to save revenue, the sportsmen are losing permits and the landowners will not lose any number of permits. I'm also in favor of the youth. Youth from 12-18 should not be included in the drawing. They should be able to buy their tag over the counter and get their hands wet for the first six years. People are coming into the sport of hunting, and if we don't allow those youth to come in and hunt their first six years, we will lose them. Sportsmen over 65 should be able to buy their license over the counter, because they have supported the division for many years. The only ones in the drawing should be those from 19-64. Sportsmen, 19 years of age, should be able to kill only 4 point or better. Those who are 12 to 18 should be able to kill any size buck. All publications are indicating that bears and coyotes don't have an effect on healthy deer herds, but Utah does not have healthy deer herds. The division says we have 15 bucks:100 does. I am on the LaSals every day and I don't see that number of bucks. I may see four bucks per 100 does but not 15. If the DWR managed the deer like they manage the bear population, we wouldn't be here tonight.

Lance Roberts-Last year I came to this RAC with a presentation about going with the smaller units and micro-management. I still feel strongly that that is the way to go. The bottom line is improving fawn recruitment and bringing our deer herds back and improving our buck ages and DWR-sportsmen relationships. Several concerned sportsmen put together a petition the night prior to the southern RAC. In one day, we had over 300 signatures, approving of Option 2. There are more petitions coming in. The petition says that: "To Whom It May Concern: I am writing this letter to inform you that I support the proposed changes to the current deer hunt in Utah. I support changing the state into 29 separate units and managing each unit separately. I feel there are issues with all proposals, but feel this is the best choice for Utah's deer herds. Under this program, the DWR will be able to make changes as needed and dictated by each individual unit's success or failure. I am certain there is not a perfect fit for deer hunting in Utah, but feel that micro-management is the best option to help the deer herd recover. Thank you for your time in managing the deer herds in Utah." I will leave these petitions with the RAC and hope that you will vote for Option 2 and make a step in the right direction.

Brian Johnson-I love hunting. I want the opportunity every year, but that's no longer possible. The majority may tell you that they want to hunt every year, but we can't hunt a resource that's no longer there. We are going to have to sacrifice. Sportsmen need to sacrifice our opportunity in order to recover the deer herds. The DWR uses the buck:doe ratio to determine numbers. I would suggest that they need to manage unit by unit and use the deer population on that unit to manage that unit not the buck:doe ratio. A 3-year average of buck:doe ratios are inadequate, considering the chance of serious winter kills. We need to have the ability to shut those tags off in one particular unit for the next year. We need to stop hunting from August to January. Our bucks need the opportunity to breed the does to get fawns in November and December and to get them bred during the first estrus so that the fawns are born earlier. Shutting off hunting on units helps the population. Sometimes this RAC has to go against the majority. A lot of people are driven by opportunity, but that isn't always the best thing for our resource. I would ask your RAC to go against the majority and vote for Option 2 and manage your units until we get our deer herds back to healthy numbers.

Deloss Christensen-Last evening we watched the southern RAC deliberate between Option 1 and 2. One of the concerns we have is that many RAC members have received emails from various people and so they were using that as a scale to say that there were 41 for one option and 30 for another option, so they wanted to vote for the group that had the most votes. They didn't even consider the 350 petitions there. They forgot those. I would just like to remind you that of all the contacts you have, you now have 350 more, who support Option 2. I thank you very much for asking the Board to put this on the agenda for this year. Without your help, we wouldn't be here tonight, trying to do what's right for the deer herd. Thank you. I am disappointed however that tonight we will not be discussing how to implement small unit management. What the Board has done is decide to talk about hunting strategies. What the Board should have done is to have asked us to develop small committees. On those committees would be a DWR biologist, a USFS and BLM biologist, landowner and sportsman for each unit. They would assess the deer on that unit. They would make recommendations based on the deer on the ground, not from a model. They would know if predators were coyotes or bears. They would be

aware of the different conditions on each unit. The committee could then tell what that herd needed. That's the kind of thing I thought we would be discussing tonight. My recommendation is Option 2.

James Gilson of Carbon/Emery SFW-I passed out brochures to get the ball rolling on an issue. Currently in Utah, blind hunters can buy a tag and go hunting and they can have a companion shooter. If I'm blind, another hunter could shoot my deer. Technology allows a blind hunter to shoot their own deer now. With the laser sights we have out there, the companion hunter can direct the laser, and the blind hunter can be directed to the deer and the blind person can shoot his own deer. I'd like the RAC to make a motion and send that to the Board to allow blind hunters to use laser sights and shoot their own deer from now on. It would be a great thing for our handicapped folks. A lot of things have been said tonight that have been difficult to bear. I once sat on that side of the table too. One of the key things that have come out tonight is that coyotes aren't managed well. The bottom line is they aren't managed well because they are not a protected species. I'd like you to make a motion tonight to adopt a motion that the Central RAC passed to put a 7 day trap check on coyotes, instead of 48 hours. If we can't control coyotes with poison, there are only a couple of ways to do it. Hunters will never control them. Trappers have the best shot. Conditions limit aerial gunning and it's expensive. One other issue I'd like to speak on is something Anis had said. He said that the herd size doesn't matter as long as we maintain the buck population. The herd size does matter. If you take the Manti at 50% objective and you get 15-18 bucks:100 does, you really have only half the available bucks, so the buck:doe ratio is really only half of its capability. Recovery is the key. None of the options proposed tonight will change the deer herds unless the tags are reduced. We've got to keep the fawns alive. We've got a cougar plan that doesn't allow the division to increase cougar tags, because they operate under a management plan. A better plan is coming up soon. Studies show that bears do eat fawns. Jim Karpowitz told us of a study in '78-'79 that bears accounted for around 20-21 percent of the fawn mortality. The bear population on the LaSals has increased dramatically. The bears do eat meat. If they don't, why have the government trappers changed from cougar to bear control on sheep herds. Tom Hardy said that 20 years ago he did nothing but cougar control on the Manti. Now he does a lot of bear control. The bear management plan indicates that this year we are going to increase the bear population. If you look at chronic low fawn survival, look at the Book Cliffs, the San Juan and the LaSals. If the number one issue is fawn survival, we need to reduce predator numbers. The people sitting on the RACs and Wildlife Board can make the decisions to do that. The bear and cougar proclamations are coming up, and they don't allow us to control predators anymore. The division doesn't remove coyotes because they aren't mandated to do so. Let sportsmen do something about that. Let us go trap, which is the 2nd most effective way to control coyotes next to poison and we know that that won't be changing. I talked with Waldo Wilcox the other day. He said that when he was a boy, deer hunting was poor, but when they introduced 1080, the deer herd exploded and he didn't see a coyote for 20 years.

Verd Byrnes-As you know I traded that side of the table for this one. This year I opted to sit out the deer hunt. I sat home and watched an ideal hunting season with fresh snow and hunters out in the field. What was found was a very low harvest

rate. During the elk hunt, I saw more predators than bucks. The only change I see is Option 2. I would recommend unit by unit archery hunting.

Don Peay for SFW-The SFW has spent nearly \$409,000 for fixing fences and for assisting the DWR in improving habitat. Coyotes remain a major problem. The proposed change in trap checks is the best way to address that. The Central region voted for that last night. The DWR has a population objective for deer at 425,000, which is still way below what it used to be. There are a lot of action plans that are out there to bring the deer herd up. The SFW supports Option 2, but recognizes there's a lot more needed to fix the deer herds. There's a definite need to end all antlerless hunting by December 1st. We are harassing big game until the first part of February and both deer and elk need a chance to survive, so we'd like to see that happen. Family hunting of deer in the state is about ruined because it's such a bad experience, not because of hunting regulations, but because you don't see a buck. Those kids won't hunt again. You need a quality product and that is deer.

Somebody needs to figure out the problem, but every indication across the state is that deer herds are declining. Let's give it one more shot and try to fix that.

Tim Pilling-First of all, I would like to support Option 1 and I would also invite the Board to do what is done in Wyoming, where deer are hunted from early October to late October to see if that might be a benefit. I suggest that we manage deer not so much by the buck:doe ratio but by the overall deer population on each unit.

Darrel Mecham-I will paraphrase a letter received by the Mule Deer Foundation. Habitat and predation are the most important factors impacting the mule deer population. We need to be more aggressive and creative in coming up with solutions for the declining deer herd. Boosting the mule deer population will result in more bucks in each herd. Having said that, the MDF votes for Option 1.

Eric Luke-We proposed Option 2 last year. There are quite a few new faces on the RAC and just want to remind the new-comers that this RAC voted in favor of sending Option 2 to the Board for consideration almost unanimously last year. At the same time, season dates were being looked at, so we're back again this year. We hope you will stand by your goals that you had last year. Option 2 gives us the best means to bring our deer herd numbers up. I think that's the general consensus here tonight. We need to bring the total number of deer up and this is the best avenue to accomplish that. I would like to see an amendment made to that option. I'm a bow hunter myself but I know we have to make some sacrifices. I would like to see the statewide archery hunt done away with. Make the archery hunters choose their unit as the other hunters.

Deloss Christensen-Some folks misinterpreted me. The southern region RAC voted in favor of Option 2.

RAC Discussion

Terry Sanslow-There is a couple of things we need to consider: the blind hunter, the archery proposal, the option selection, and trap checks.

Todd Huntington-I just wanted to start out by saying we were passed out a list of public comments tonight. Where did they come from?

Terry Sanslow-Those were all the emails that I received. It was similar to what the northern RAC had done. These are only the ones I received. I forwarded some letters that I received that I didn't know you had received or not.

Todd Huntington-I made my own tally and my numbers don't match what these are. I also made a tally based on what the public expressed tonight, which was similar to the email count that I received. About 50% for Option 2. 30 or so for Option 1. Everybody needs to go home and pray for rain.

Pam Riddle-Everyone's results may vary, because different people will target you. Your tally may be slightly skewed.

Darrel Mecham-I can attest to that. My numbers don't match those numbers. You also need to take into consideration the persons speaking tonight. I would like to know if archery was addressed with Options 1 and 2.

(The answer was inaudible)

Derris Jones-Is the 7-day trap check something that we can address?

Terry Sanslow-This is something we may want to wait on. It's just an option put out.

Bill Bates-This is something that could be discussed during the furbearer proclamation.

Blair Eastman-The antlerless hunting is something that needs to be discussed during the antlerless meeting.

Travis Pehrson-What about permit numbers?

Terry Sanslow-The permit numbers won't be out until February.

Travis Pehrson-We were told that it does have 100 fawns, and we end up with a survival of 40-60 fawns, is there a study to determine how much mortality is caused by predation? Is there a study we can see what has happened?

Bill Bates-The Division is putting together a study to answer to that question right now.

Travis Pehrson-Also, a lot of people are concerned about the number of deer. I've made comments before. I would suggest that the model needs to be thrown out, because people are not seeing the deer that the division claims there are. The division needs to work with other organizations such as the Mule Deer Foundation to help them determine what's needed to get a more accurate deer count. The public doesn't trust the numbers. There could be a separate count by an alternate entity to verify the count accuracy.

Kevin Albrecht-I'm very impressed with the turn-out tonight and also the emails and the late nights I've spent on the phone. It's certainly a very heated topic. I won't go into all that I've heard. This year in my deer hunt, we had five youth hunters in my camp. We tried really hard to have them have a good opportunity this year. We hunted in the same spot that we have for many years. It's part of our family tradition. We were unable to see a buck and show a buck to our youth. That concerns me. I'm concerned that we will lose these youth. I think that with Option 2, we can provide better opportunity.

Derris Jones-Kevin, were you on the statewide mule deer committee? When this unit by unit discussion came up, why wasn't it mentioned, but now seems so important?

Kevin Albrecht-This is my perception. At that time, we had only been in committee one year, and were told that fawn recruitment was very good and that a lot of big bucks had been seen throughout the state, and we didn't have the information that has since been made available.

Derris Jones-Kevin, Do you feel like the effort you invested in the deer committee was a waste of time? It seems like a lot of effort went into it that was later thrown out. Are you comfortable with the direction we are heading?

Kevin Albrecht-My feeling is that Options 1 and 3 are what has been done for years and that has not worked. Anis and Bill and the other wildlife biologists have a lot of knowledge, but there are different issues in each unit. There's no question in my mind that working out individual issues unit by unit will come up with better answers. It is by no means a fix all.

Pam Riddle-I have a question. Options 1 and 2 talks about maintaining a unit-based approach to deer management. I represent the BLM and need to look at the habitat. The BLM is not in the business of growing bigger bucks. We are in the business of offering multiple uses, and I am a little confused about the concept of unit-based management.

Anis Aoude-We do manage on a unit basis both population-wise and habitat-wise. We hunt bucks on a regional level. Doe hunts are conducted on a unit level to meet small scale needs. I hear it again and again and think people are missing the point. Hunting bucks on a regional basis is not going to grow a bigger deer herd. It just won't. People feel that if we manage on a unit basis, it will be a panacea and things will improve. Regardless of how we hunt bucks, if we can't have does, we won't grow more deer. To answer your question, we already manage on a unit basis, but hunt on a regional basis.

Pam Riddle-The overall perception is that the deer herds are very low. We need to do a lot of different things to grow the populations. The concern I have is that if we go by Option 2, there are extra expenses. This is money that could be put into deer management, such as habitat improvement and predator management rather than putting money into law enforcement. It will be difficult going from hunting regions to units. So we need to consider that.

Travis Pehrson-It's a vicious cycle that we worry about our deer numbers and then come to the bear and lion proclamations and we are shot down when we try to increase permits. The division needs to give way one way or the other. If we want to improve our deer numbers, we need to do something about cougars and bears. A few cougar and bear hunters should not have a voice over a hundred thousand deer hunters.

Terry Sanslow-Whichever option is chosen, how long do you plan to keep the chosen option? Three years, five years, whatever. Is there a time put on it?

Anis Aoude-No. Basically it's a five year plan. We can re-evaluate it at that time. It's a statewide plan amendment. Obviously, if it is working, we can renew it. If it's not working, then it can be changed much sooner.

Derris Jones-Option 2 isn't the answer to improved deer herds. This is the answer to how you guys want to hunt bucks. It is split almost 50-50 from the comments I have received by email and the comments I have received tonight.

Travis Pehrson-What about the archery question—statewide or unit by unit?

Terry Sanslow-Do you want to add the archery selection on Option 2?

Derris Jones-I would like someone else to take that one on. Without input from archers around the state, I would defer to the Board.

Travis Pehrson-What about making archers select by region?

Terry Sanslow-Travis, we will vote on this motion, and if you want to make a motion on that, you can do so.

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Terry Sanslow-Derris didn't want to amend his motion, so if you want to make a motion after we've voted on this, then you are more than welcome.

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept Option 2 of the Statewide Deer Management Plan Amendment as presented

Seconded by Todd Huntington

Motion passed with a majority vote 7-3. Opposing votes were cast by Laura Kamala, Pam Riddle and Travis Pehrson.

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to allow archery hunters to choose regions rather than statewide.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion failed with a vote of 3-7. Opposing votes were cast by Derris Jones, Darrel Mecham, and Chris Micoz.

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones that the Wildlife Board consider allowing blind hunters to use a laser sighting device and companion hunter.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

- 6) **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2011 Season Dates & Application Timeline** (Action)
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones- (inaudible—something about hunting elk into January.)

Anis Aoude-It's a similar kind of thing like having a season closure on our WMAs. In January the animals have quite a bit of fat reserves. They don't start getting into those fat reserves until later in the winter.

Derris Jones-It seems like... (Inaudible)

Anis Aoude-(inaudible)

Questions from the Public

Kyle Fulmer-Are there recommendations for boundary changes for the San Juan general season bull elk unit?

Anis Aoude-No. There are not. We don't feel a change is needed.

Terry Sanslow-Are you talking about the bull elk hunt north of Highway 491?

Kyle Fulmer-South of Highway 491 and east of Highway 191.

Bill Bates-If this is a comment? We will hear comments in just a few minutes.

Kyle Fulmer-I've addressed the RAC. I've done the 72 hour notice twice already this year. I've been to the Board. I intend to remove or have the elk removed south of the highway. This is still all a San Juan elk herd unit. They were transplanted here 20 years ago and things haven't changed since that day. I've been in the

CWMUs. I've never been approached by the landowners, but I am tired for not having the right to a hunt when I count a hundred head on my land today. No respect has been given. I have pushed the 72-hour notice to the fullest, because it's my only choice. I don't have any other option. Cow depredation has not worked for me. The DWR looks at CWMUs and they look at landowners associations. That's it. That's the way it's been for many years now. There are thousands of acres on the north side that are now in the CWMU or landowner association. It's sick when we do not have rights, but you go across the highway and you look at trophy class elk. The division does not bring the numbers to the Board. They are afraid, because three years ago they promised me that the landowners would have rights to these animals. We don't. So I pushed the 72-hour notice. My intention is still to push this notice, until they tell me I don't have a law for this rule to push. I think it's a crock. I've had the division down there, trying to kill animals. They will kill 14 on an open bull and take them away from public hunters. They kill a cow and a calf on me. I own 6,000 acres. I want money if I don't have that right. The difference between the laws of Colorado and Utah are sickening. They will let you hunt them. They give the rights to the landowner. There are no rights if you are not in a CWMU or landowner association. Nothing has changed. When is it going to be enough? When will private landowners not in these units, have a right to hunt these animals? I'm tired of feeding them. There are no more deer, since they brought the elk in here. You have a hard time finding deer, but you never mention the elk. All I have on me is elk. I am frustrated, because I fight for equal rights of landowners as a person who feeds them. Whether they say there are no damages or nothing, (inaudible) they are going to keep us in a trophy hunt area...(inaudible). I had to fight the 72-hour notice all the way to the end, until they gave me a bull tag for two years. They got two this year. They have overcompensated (inaudible) with two bull tags. Two animals. I wish you could understand. There is no other Board. They tell me to talk to you people, so that's why I'm talking to you that they have the herd established out there, and they look at other landowners.

Terry Sanslow-Your time is up. Here's a letter that we received from Bruce Adams, chairman of the San Juan County Commission. "It has come to our attention about a proposed change in the bull elk hunt north of Highway 491 east of Monticello. The commission urges you to coordinate such a change with us due to possible negative economic impacts that need to be studied before such a change is considered. We respectfully ask that the division coordinate with us in this matter." This is where the division is sitting. The county commission wants to sit down with us and discuss this. Maybe you need to talk to Bruce. We can make all the recommendations we want here...

Kyle Fulmer-I have fought and intend to take this to the fullest... (Inaudible)

Terry Sanslow- Sir. Your time is up.

Bill Bates-Why don't you make a proposal?

Kyle Fulmer-You are so tight with those depredation tags for landowners that are not in these units. You give us a few to shut us up and that's what I did for 10 years, but I got one bull tag.

Bill Bates-Thank you.

Kyle Fulmer-There's no accountability. No accountability.

(Public person)-I would like to know why you can only put in for a limited entry bull tag, rather than a limited entry bull and an antelope and a deer. Why can you only put in for one?

Anis Aoude-The reason it was decided to do that is that the odds would drop for everyone. This was a proposal made by a sportsman's group. The more people who put in, the harder it becomes to draw.

(Public person)-So that means you have the opportunity to draw for an animal once in your life instead of once in every 10 or 30 years?

Anis Aoude-No. I think the odds are about the same. It makes the odds worse if everyone can apply for all the hunts.

(Public person)-It seems to work in Colorado quite well.

Comments from the Public

Blaine Jensen-I'm with the Conover-Jensen CWMU. The Pagano CWMU said I could speak for them. We would like to move the Range Creek south draw from Dry Canyon out to the Nine Mile Canyon road.

Preston Grover-I am the president of a landowner association east of Highway 191. A lot of the landowners I speak with, they see the elk there. They know they can't get rid of them, so we hope to sell tags. They give us tags. That's the best you can do to compensate us. Then you open the unit up to any bull, and they get killed and the price of tags drop and we're not going to get any money out of them. I think it needs to stay a trophy unit. The elk are going to be there, so you do what you can do. If you make it an any bull unit, the tags are going to go way down. They won't sell, and we aren't going to get any revenue out of them. I don't agree with opening it up to an any bull unit.

Bill Bates- Preston, is there any chance you could join a landowners association?

Preston Grover-I don't think so.

Mike Rory-I am also a landowner like Preston Grover. I control property on two separate units. I agree with what Preston just told you. I feel that the elk are going to be there, no matter what. We need to keep it a trophy unit. That's the only way we can get compensation. I think that landowner control is the best way to go, because our interests are better protected. There are 78 participants in our landowner association. I can't speak for everyone, but there are only 3 or 4 landowners that aren't a part of the association. Associations are the best way to protect common interests.

RAC Discussion

Kevin Albrecht-I'm getting two different messages. Opening the unit up to any bull and then keeping it a trophy bull unit.

Bill Bates-The RAC doesn't deal with depredation issues. That is something the Division is directed to do through code. The RAC can consider changing it to an any bull unit.

Terry Sanslow-Right now, it is limited entry and he wants to open it to any bull. So we have two saying to keep it as is and one to change it.

Travis Pehrson-At one time it was an open bull unit. Is that correct?

Bill Bates-Yes.

Travis Pehrson-So it wasn't until last year that it was even part of the limited entry unit. Isn't that correct?

Bill Bates-It was open bull clear back in the 1990's. Until last year, it has been closed and only open on CWMUs. This last year it was expanded to be part of the San Juan limited entry unit. It was also open to spike bull hunters. Last year we made it spike only, and so you can hunt spike bull over there. Previous to this year, you had to have a limit entry permit, but it was not open to general season hunting. Travis Pehrson-I can see Kyle's frustration with all his crop damage (inaudible). Being in a landowner association, you have to have so many acres in each unit to be considered a part of the association. So you might have 10,000 acres that have no elk on, but a thousand with elk on them.

Bill Bates-It is 10,000 acres for a CWMU.

Travis Pehrson-Right, but they still have to have a certain amount of acres to be considered a landowner association.

Bill Bates-That's 51% of the private land must be enrolled in the program to qualify as a landowner association.

Travis Pehrson-Let's say that someone on the LaSal unit wanted to start a landowner association, they just have to get 51% of the land enrolled?

Bill Bates-That is correct.

Travis Pehrson-So the landowner association only gets tags. Why not give ...a bull tag and say you sell it if they have elk on them. If they don't, they don't get a tag. Just give a tag to anyone who has elk on them.

Bill Bates-You could ask Santa Clause I guess.

Travis Pehrson-So basically, you can give tags to an association and they allocate it out.

Bill Bates-You are right. It has to be in elk habitat.

Terry Sanslow-Also on that we have the letter from the San Juan County Commission, asking that the division discuss any change with them.

Travis Pehrson-You have to understand that Bruce Adams operates a CWMU and has his own personal interests at heart. His family's interests and revenue are behind the letter, which should be disregarded for those issues.

(Public person)-So we have that side of the highway open?

Bill Bates-South of the highway is open. What has happened is a few years ago we started getting a lot of problems with elk depredation. We looked closely at this issue and for us it made more sense to make it any bull because of the large amount of depredation to sunflower and safflower fields.

Derris Jones-I would like to ask Brad Crompton about the Conover-Jensen CWMU request. Is this something the division has recommended?

Brad Crompton-It is not something we recommended. The present boundary has worked so far, but there have been some concerns about it. The advantages are that we divided the unit there anyway for population objectives, so it's a pretty logical boundary. There is very little public land where a guy can hunt with a limited entry tag right now, where elk are in September. It is a little bit more accessible. The flip side of that is that there is very little public land on the any bull unit. It's more of a social than biological issue. We certainly don't object to the change. It makes some sense.

Blair Eastman-Brad, on those limited entry tags, are those public lands tags only?

Brad Crompton-Currently, that's how it works.

Blair Eastman-The CWMU tags (scarcely inaudible—may be misunderstood.) and then the any bull tags are valid only on private lands.

Brad Crompton-The way that is set up right now is that you can buy an any season bull tag.

Blair Eastman-So if I'm on 40 acres of Range Creek south, I can buy all the elk tags I want for any bull.

Brad Crompton-The way it sounds, yes.

Derris Jones-But just on private property?

Brad Crompton-Yes, just on your property.

Derris Jones-(inaudible)

Brad Crompton-(inaudible)

Blair Eastman-(Scarcely inaudible—may have misunderstood.) This is an honest question. On the late season hunt last year it got extended from November 13 to January 31. But they increased the number of elk that were taken. The idea was to kill more elk on that hunt. Do you know if they did that?

Brad Crompton-Didn't it just start for this fall?

Blair Eastman-Yeah.

Brad Crompton-I don't think the percent success was any higher. I don't have that number off the top of my head. We run about 78% success on that late season hunt. I don't think it was much different (inaudible). The idea behind it was (inaudible)

Blair Eastman-Thank you.

Travis Pehrson-So according to Kyle, the division told him to go and propose this at RAC meeting. Is this something that has to be proposed through us?

Bill Bates-Yes, to change it to any bull, it has to go through the RAC's and Board.

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Bill Bates-If the damage exceeds a threshold, say \$10,000, then the division has the option of issuing the landowner a bull permit. This year, USU conducted a study in the area and found that his damage was about \$2000, so he did not qualify for a bull permit.

Blair Eastman-A question on that, is he eligible to receive cow permits?

Kyle Fulmer-Would it be fair compensation to you to have cow tags when everyone was shooting bulls? You mean for 14 years, I can't draw out for limited entry? (scarcely audible...may have misunderstood.)

Terry Sanslow-Sir, I've asked you to please finish your comment. I won't ask you again. We are in RAC discussion. If anyone asks you a question, they are more than welcome to do so. Okay?

Kevin Albrecht-I see the problem with the limited entry and any bull boundary in San Juan County inaudible and would like to make a motion that the Board look into this.

Bill Bates-You can make a motion to address the any bull issue, but depredation issues are directed through code.

Terry Sanslow-We can make a motion for anything we want. You could move to make it an action item for them to give the issue to someone like Anis to investigate the matter.

Bill Bates-This is already an action item for the division.

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Bill Bates-Both the CWMU and the landowner association have offered to help Kyle out with this problem.

Blair Eastman-(inaudible)

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Kyle Fulmer—(inaudible)

Travis Pehrson-Suggested a survey to find out what the majority of the landowners in the area want.

Bill Bates-that would be a good way to resolve this while considering the county commission and other people's rights.

Kevin Albrecht-(inaudible)

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Kevin Albrecht-If the Board appoints someone to investigate this issue and brings more information back, I would recommend that we table the matter and then bring it up again.

Derris Jones-You've got to realize that...(inaudible—something like nothing would be done until 2012)...

Terry Sanslow-The Board would meet on December 2nd, so maybe they can get something rolling. We could put a motion in. There's no problem there. We could ask the Board to look some options.

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible)

Bill Bates-A major change like that would have to go through all the RAC's.

Travis Pehrson-(inaudible—something about CWMUs having contracts with them for a certain number of years.)

Bill Bates-(inaudible)

Blair Eastman-I have a question for Brad about the proposed boundary change to the Nine Mile Road. Do we need to change the boundary on the Pappas Ridge, because that's all in the open bull right now, isn't it?

Brad Crompton-Yeah, the way I envision it, and maybe it would be a question for Blaine, but it would be Soldier Creek to Nine Mile as opposed to...(inaudible)...everything south

Blair Eastman-(inaudible)

Brad Crompton-It would be limited entry. Public lands would be (inaudible). Everything south of Water Canyon and Dry Canyon is probably (inaudible).

Blair Eastman-(inaudible)

Brad Crompton-What this would entail is not Bartles and the country between Dry Canyon and Nine Mile Canyon.

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones that we accept the 2010 Bucks & Bulls & OIAL 2011 season dates, and application timeline as presented with a boundary change in the Nine Mile unit, moving the northern boundary of the Nine Mile-Range Creek south sub-unit to the Nine Mile Road.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to look at making the area north of Highway 491 a general season open bull unit, if that is what the majority of landowners want.

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed unanimously

7) CWMU Permit Numbers for 2011 (Action)

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

Travis Leavfaud-I am requesting a change in the Mini Maude CWMU. There's a section of state ground that is included in the boundary of the CWMU. I made some copies, showing the CWMU around the state section and public access to that piece of state ground. (Passed out the maps.) The section in question that I'd like to get back into public access is section 2. It's a state section. All the areas in yellow are accessible by landowners. It has always been open to the public until last year. It was actually absorbed into the CWMU this year. I am requesting that we get it changed back.

Blair Eastman-(mostly inaudible—something about compensation.)

Travis Leavfaud -Mostly inaudible—answer about compensation). It doesn't affect the amount of acreage the CWMU needs. It won't put them under what they need. I think they have 15, 600 acres right now. This section would be 640 off that. So they still have plenty.

Derris Jones-(Mostly inaudible—Question to Boyde Blackwell about what they usually do about access to state land)

Boyde Blackwell-(Partly inaudible—Something about a definable boundary, accessibility, meets a requirement for the region, and not knowing the area, I would turn this over to the biologists in the region, who know the area, and what's going on there. Their return is 4% and they get one additional permit for both elk and deer.

Blair Eastman-(Partly inaudible—something about one additional permit through the public draw.)

Derris Jones-Brad, is there a management reason to have that state section in the CWMU?

Brad Crompton-As Boyde said, The CWMU requested it to square up their boundary, making it a more enforceable boundary. As far as the division is concerned, it does make it a little easier to post, but you get in a pickle here, where you have two landowners that could access the state section. (Partly inaudible—may have misunderstood full intent.)

Derris Jones-It looks like it also set the corner from a state section to (inaudible)

Brad Crompton-Yeah. It goes over to that. It makes a better boundary for the CWMU, but cheats a couple of guys from access.

Travis Leavfaud-If it helps you guys know where this is, if you look at the top corner of this map, you can see the main road coming up and is the main road to the Mini Maude. (Inaudible--something about further explanation of side roads)

Mike Roring-This is a landowner association. I would like to assess at least and accept the boundary changes. As a side note, I would like to remind the council that Spring Creek has most of the property (inaudible). The division has done a very good job working with us with compensation. I am a landowner and have two

different CWMUs, but we are joined with the majority of landowners already. They are in this room. (Inaudible)...

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to exclude section 2 from the Minnie Maud CWMU

Seconded by Darrel Mecham

Motion passed unanimously, except for an abstention by Blair Eastman due to his conflict of interest as a CWMU landowner.

- 8) Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011(Action)
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Blair Eastman-(inaudible—something about the total number of permits.)

Boyde Blackwell-The two split recommendations is one with the West Desert in the central region and one with Mount Dutton in the southern Region. Both requested more permits than what they qualified for by rule. The division is recommending that they stay with the numbers they qualify for.

Blair Eastman-How about the next slide. (Inaudible)

Boyde Blackwell-(Inaudible) they are requesting 35 deer on the Vernon. They qualify for 34. This is kind of a standard thing. In the past several years, the west Vernon has always asked for 35. Mount Dutton has always asked for six. As we have been able to increase permits for the public, we've been able to increase permits for the landowner associations. So they dropped out now, and in fact, the West Desert last year qualified for 24, but we were able to significantly increase permits on that unit and brought them up to 34. (Inaudible) To stay within the rule, our recommendation is 34.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2011 as presented

Seconded by Travis Pehrson

Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **Rule R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment (Action)**
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Travis Pehrson-What is considered protected wildlife?

Bill Bates-Just about everything, except coyotes, raccoons (inaudible)

Travis Pehrson-Can you go out with a spot light and shine the light on deer if you don't have a rifle.

Bill Bates-That is correct.

Travis Pehrson-I just want to make sure that's covered (inaudible)

Bill Bates-If you want to spotlight coyote's or other non-protected species, you must get a permit from the county sheriff.

Travis Pehrson-If you have a spotlight permit and you go out during a hunt with a spot light, (inaudible)

Bill Bates-(inaudible)

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Blair Eastman to accept the R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion passed unanimously

- 10) **Rule R657-44 Depredation Rule Amendment (Action)**
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

I believe there were some sheep on Capital Reef. Would this be such a situation?

Boyde Blackwell-Yes. We would prefer to use sportsmen to remove these animals and this rule gives us the opportunity to do that.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

Kevin Albrecht-(Partly inaudible—something about animals moving into an area you could not hunt, and I think by making this change, it's a good move on the division's part.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the R657-5 Taking Big Game Amendment as presented.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed unanimously

11) Depredation Policy Amendment (Action)

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

RAC Discussion

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the Depredation Policy Amendment as presented

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed unanimously

Other Business

-Terry Sanslow, chairman

Terry Sanslow-We need to make a decision on the option of moving the RAC to a different location. What are your feelings on that?

Kevin Albrecht-I would give my input. I see people drive from Blanding and spend three hours on the road. Some of us only travel an hour or two hours. I wouldn't mind seeing, especially with the black bear meeting, going down there. But I don't see the reason to necessarily go to Price, because that just adds an hour onto the time for Blanding residents to drive. I wouldn't mind driving down there for the issues that are important to them. I wouldn't mind going south, just as the division went south to have their presentation to increase their communication with them.

Terry Sanslow-What about Castle Dale or Moab. These are just options. How do we determine which places we go for a meeting?

Pam Riddle-(Inaudible)

Travis Pehrson-(Inaudible)

Terry Sanslow-So we want to move the bear meeting to Moab or Monticello?

Travis Pehrson—I think that Monticello would make it closer.

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to change the December bear meeting to Monticello.

Seconded by Pam Riddle

Motion passed 9-1. Todd Huntington opposed the motion.

Terry Sanslow-Another issue is the amount of time we allow the audience to take. It's our prerogative to do that. Do we want to limit it or just let it happen? Shall we put a time limit on it? Should we put a time limit on questions too? We can do that. Blair Eastman-It's not so much the number of questions, but the number of times someone stands up.

Darrel Mecham-It's not so much the number of questions, but let's not let them talk and talk.

(Everyone was talking at once. Inaudible.)

Tony Chavira of San Juan County-My problem has to do with a small part in the south, where I have a resident herd of elk on it. I don't agree with the Fish and Game and have more elk than they are saying. They have given me the option of an association. I need 19,000 acres, and I can get all the landowners and acres. The problem is I have the elk on my place. If I split up the money by the acre, I have a small place with all the elk; I will basically get a thousand dollars out of the deal. That's what the Fish and Game is going to pay me for my damages, and we aren't seeing eye to eye on my damages. I don't know what to do about it. I'm frustrated and need some help.

Bill Bates-This isn't something that is under the purview of the RAC. This is something that's in code. What you need to do is (inaudible).

Tony Chavira-I have been. We need to do something different. I have trail cams. They come in at night. This is a discussion that we need to have after the meeting.

Tony Chavira-Okay. Thank you.

Terry Sanslow-Does that satisfy you?

Tony Chavira-Yeah.

Guy Webster-Before you go, are you changing the location of the bear meeting for this year or next year? You've already got it booked on the Internet. A lot of people are planning to come to Green River. I think a lot of people have plans (inaudible). It might be okay for next year, but I think it's a little late for this year.

(Everyone talking at once. Inaudible.)

Terry Sanslow-Green River it is.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

110 in attendance

**Next RAC meeting Wednesday, December 8th at the John Wesley Powell Museum,
1765 E. Main in Green River.**

**Wildlife Board Meeting, Dec. 1-2, 9 a.m., DNR Board room, 1594 W. North Temple,
SLC**