

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High School
165 S 700 E, Springville
November 10, 2011 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to reconsider statewide archery for 2012 (both regular permits as well as youth hunters)
Failed 5 to 4

MOTION: To accept the UBA season dates change on the Ogden/Willard Peak goat hunt (early hunt September 10th to September 23rd late hunt September 24th to October 14th female only goat hunt October 1st to October 14th)
Passed 8 to 1

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed 8 to 1

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012

MOTION: To accept landowner permit numbers for 2012 as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Springville Jr. High School
165 S 700 E, Springville
November 10, 2011 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Timothy Fehr, At Large
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Sarah Flinders, Forest Service
Michael Gates, BLM
Richard Hansen, At Large
Karl Hirst, Sportsmen
George Holmes, Agriculture
Kristopher Marble, At Large
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected

Members Absent

Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive

Others Present

John Bair, Wildlife Board Member

- 1) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
- **Fred Oswald, RAC Chair**

VOTING

Motion was made by Timothy Fehr to accept the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by Kris Marble
Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Regional Update (Information)**
- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Post-season deer classification to begin mid-November
- Deer numbers coming through check stations down
 - Checked deer in good condition
 - Preliminary finding – greater percentage of mature deer taken by hunters
- Heber Valley Elk Working Group to meet November 29
- Internal committee established to review urban deer problem, identify solutions (will involve other stakeholders at a future date)
- Bear recommendations finalized, will go out to RACs and Wildlife Board for review and final decision

Habitat

- Black Hill WMA access management project taking place now (ripped and seeded user-created roads, signs, road closures)
- Private land rehab project on Mona Bench (knapweed control)
- Jericho burn seeding project – BLM
- City Creek Canyon aerial seeding Nov. 9-10 (follow-up to yellow star thistle control work done in 2010)

- UDOT considering big game fencing project on Hwy 40 (Park City to Heber) will involve closure of “deer crossing areas”

Aquatics

- Least chub refuge population established at the Deseret Chemical Depot
- Fishing at Strawberry Reservoir good for rainbows and cutthroats
- Strawberry gillnetting surveys turned up more rainbows than cutthroats
- Jordanelle – creel survey showing that far fewer stocked rainbows showing up in creel as expected, biologists working with BYU on a study to determine cause(s)
- Deer Creek – rainbows doing well, 50,000 more stocked in October
- Utah Lake trawling showed white bass as the most abundant species in the lake
- More June sucker showing up as by catch in carp removal program, not considered a significant problem

Conservation Outreach

- Hunter/Shooter Recruitment Committee working on pilot project for Central Region
- Unit by Unit outreach effort underway – FAQs on DWR website
- Promotional campaign to increase awareness of deer poaching problems – partnership with conservation organizations

Law Enforcement

- Brent Kasza headed to the SR (Salina District) Dec. 1
- Two winter range action plans to be implemented soon (West Desert poaching and Sanpete WMA access plan)
- More doe poaching cases than expected on the deer hunt
- Officer are working several illegally taken deer and elk cases region-wide

Weber River clean-up

Jason Lowe – Wildlife Cooperative – We will be doing a clean up on the Weber River to thank private landowners that allow access to use rivers. Saturday November 12th 8:00 a.m. meet at Sinclair in Wanship. If you can't make it be aware that we are trying to do a service project every month. We will have garbage bags – bring gloves, dress for the weather.

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)

- Fred Oswald, RAC Chair

4) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kris Marble – For those current dedicated hunters who don't make the January deadline what are you going to do with them?

Anis Aoude – We will assign them a unit.

Kris Marble – Will that be a unit in the region they are currently signed up for?

Anis Aoude – Maybe not.

Kris Marble – Are you going to let them know that is what will happen?

Anis Aoude – Yes they will be receiving notification shortly.

Larry Fitzgerald – Is there any reason the youth couldn't hunt the spike bull units?

Anis Aoude – That area is an any bull unit. Those are the bulls that are causing the damage.

They can shoot a spike but they can also shoot an any bull.

Larry Fitzgerald – On a spike unit?

Anis Aoude – No. The youth hunt is only on any bull units. They can't hunt on spike units but they can shoot a spike in an any bull area.

Larry Fitzgerald – But there are a lot of youth that only hunt the spike units. Would the Fish and Game entertain letting them kill a spike or a cow on a spike hunt?

Anis Aoude – That becomes a little more complicated because it is not a youth hunt per say so there could be law enforcement factors. An adult shooting a cow and having the kid tag it. When it is a youth hunt we know all that is out there are youth.

Larry Fitzgerald – I just think that would give the youth a better opportunity.

Anis Aoude – I agree but if you allowed that you would kill a lot more cows and that may be getting to the level where you are harvesting too many cows for the population that is why we limited to the youth any bull hunt. We know how many hunters there are. We don't know how many youth may take advantage of the spike one and it may be higher than we anticipate.

Larry Fitzgerald – Are your elk numbers still above objective?

Anis Aoude – They are in some units but they are not in others. The spike hunt is basically statewide so we would have to manage it more closely if we allow them to do it everywhere. There are 15,000 spike permits that is a whole lot more than 400 so it could have an impact on the cow elk population.

Larry Fitzgerald – You don't know how many elk we have killed this year yet?

Anis Aoude – Not yet.

Karl Hirst – You are opening another (goat) hunt on Willard Peak but your recommended dates are compressed so I am not sure that is going to have the same effect of spreading out the hunters that you are looking for. Are you open to a suggestion of longer seasons?

Anis Aoude – Certainly. The reason they wanted the dates the way they are is there are a lot of users in that area and the success is 100 percent. It is very accessible and they can get the harvest. You can almost drive up to the goats in some areas. I think in nine days you could harvest a nice goat. Certainly there is latitude there.

Comments from the Public

Ben Lowder – First I would like to express my appreciation to all of you for your service and for the opportunity to make recommendations. I am representing the Utah Bowman's Association. I have two recommendations that I have emailed to you and have handed to Fred. The first recommendation is a joint proposal with Utah Bowman's Association, Bow Hunters of Utah, The United Wildlife Cooperative and the Mule Deer Foundation. This recommendation is concerning the archery deer hunt for 2012. We are asking the RAC and the Wildlife Board reconsider making archers choose a unit and rather allow archers to hunt statewide as we have done for several years in the past. The reasons for this recommendation are many. Over the years the DWR biologists have stated several times that there is no biological reason to restrict the area that archery hunters are hunting in. The numbers of hunters who harvest a deer with a bow are statistically not impacting the buck to doe ratios. Back in 2009 there was a statewide archery committee that was formed to address a perceived crowding issue in the southern region. UBA had two positions on that committee. I filled one of those positions. The results of that committee were that the crowding perception was just that, a perception. There actually is not a crowding issue with statewide archery. Also statewide archery is an incentive to encourage new hunters to get into the sport of bow hunting. That benefits all hunters across the board. Bow hunters have less of an impact on the resources with their lower success rate and it could provide an opportunity to keep opportunity without having to further cut permits as we have been doing and are going to have to do. Part of the unit proposal is to increase the buck to doe ratio. The more hunters you put into archery you can at least not reduce the opportunity while increasing the buck to doe ratio. We are seeing that right now on the extended archery unit. Last year despite the decision to go to unit by unit four of the five RACs supported to continue the statewide archery hunt. Finally the youth statewide archery hunt that the Division is currently recommending to do away with, if we were to continue hunting statewide archery that would allow that to continue. I realize that only 200 youth took advantage of that last year but that is

200 youth that got to hunt deer that otherwise would not have been able to. We all know that recruitment right now is one of our biggest struggles. My second recommendation is from UBA and that is dealing with the season dates on the rocky mountain goat hunt on the Ogden Willard Peak unit. The proposal for the new nine day hunt seems really short for a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. We manage these tags for 100 percent success and I don't see a reason why we shouldn't allow hunters a longer period of time to hunt to help spread themselves out over the season and to give them the opportunity to really have that once-in-a-lifetime experience they are looking for. I brought this up last night at the northern region meeting and I talked to Darren Deblois, he is the one who made the recommendations, and he had two concerns. Law Enforcement wanted a Monday opener rather than a Saturday opener. The other reason was he didn't realize that once-in-a-lifetime hunters didn't have to wear hunter orange. He was trying to start the hunts after the archery hunts were over to avoid bow hunters having to wear orange. Since that rule change in 2009 that is no longer an issue. I worked with him and came up with a proposal to extend those seasons out. The early hunt would be September 10th to September 23rd which is a Monday opener and a Sunday close. The late hunt would be September 24th to October 14th. Again a Monday opener and a Sunday close. And the female only goat hunt would be October 1st to October 14th. That would overlap the last 14 days of the late billy hunt and that would also be a Monday opener and Sunday close. The Northern region accepted these dates and Darren Deblois did not have any issues with these proposed dates so I would encourage you to take a look at this and recommend that as well.

Jeremy Hansen – I am from Sandy. I would like to support the co-sponsored proposal to continue with statewide archery for the same given reasons. I would like to also go along with the recommendation for the any bull hunt for the nine mile area.

Jason Lowe – United Wildlife Cooperative – We also would like to support the DWR's recommendation to change the nine mile range creek unit to an any bull elk unit and we also would love to support the joint proposal in regards to the statewide archery. Finally, in the coming months we would also like the RAC and the Division to consider ways to implement comprehensive hunter management in the newly created mule deer sub-units. Creating these sub-units allows us to manage hunters and deer on a unit basis yet they chose to manage every general season unit for 18 to 25 bucks per 100 does. Between this year and next we will have removed 13,000 hunters as well as all of the associated revenue. As you know these cuts do not address our deer rather they address the social aspect of deer hunting. As Division surveys have always showed, the most important thing to the majority of hunters is having the opportunity to be in the field with a tag. We also acknowledge that there is a segment of the population that desires a bigger antlered deer. The Wildlife Board has chosen to manage the state with 30 units. Do we have the opportunity to manage some of these general deer season units allowing for opportunity and other units managed for possibly larger antlered bucks? At this time the UWC urges the Division to come up with a comprehensive plan in the coming months to manage our general season units to reflect these stats in 2012 management plan.

Michael Christensen – I want to address the lifetime license holder issue. Greg Sheehan said when they looked at where lifetime license holders hunt 12 percent would be the highest proportion they would take out of any one unit. Now that we are going to the 30 units not one of us knows what kind of permit numbers we will have since they will be set in the spring. It could be that on some units that have smaller deer herds that are going to be managed for higher buck to doe ratios that those units could see a high influx of lifetime license holders. I would encourage the RAC to look at a 15 to 20 percent cap per unit for lifetime license holders so they couldn't take more than that portion of the general season permits. They would be allowed a second or third choice so they would be guaranteed to get a tag but they might be displaced. We are taking the thousand lakes unit from limited entry to general season and I think we are crazy if we think

there are going to be thousands of tags on that unit. The other thing I would like to see, if we look at the hunt season structure we have archery, muzzleloader and any legal weapon for deer. For elk even though it is limited entry we have archery, muzzleloader, any weapon and premium hunts. It seems to me that it would be so simple to make a dedicated hunter part of it when applying for the draw. That would exclude dedicated hunters from having a separate point pool and separate drawing. They are going to be allotted a certain number of tags anyway just like the muzzleloader and rifle and archery hunters. It is going to make it a lot simpler. We are making it too complex.

Gary Kummer – Two weeks ago I went into the extended archery area and a guy told me to stay out of that area. He said he just shot a six by seven bull over there with my bow and he said he made a 115 yard shot and he is beating on his chest. How many foot pounds are left at 115 yards? There are some of the best archery hunters in this room and I would hate to offend any of them but if you want to know where the deer have gone, they are wounded by a bow on the archery hunt. My kids and I wounded five deer on the bow hunt; I am putting it right in my face because I am a bow hunter. This happens. You know what the problem is, it is the range finder. This is a primitive weapon. What is next, heat seeking arrows? I have talked to many guys who have shot over 100 yards. There are a lot of people who love archery but sooner or later you are going to have to address the range finders. Bows don't have enough foot pounds after 100 yards. Another thing because you are going to loose so many tags and opportunity take away the two elk thing, the cow and the bull. Give one elk each. Some people can't draw a cow tag because some other guy already has two.

Steve Perry – It is an honor to be here for you to hear a proposal I have. I am getting older and realize my opportunities are not what they used to be. I am making this proposal that 62 and older be allowed to put in for all the hunts like non-residents. I have handed out a paper and have emailed all of you. Years ago I did a lot for the youth to get hunting and I guess now I am looking to take care of us seniors. We could only take one like it should be. I would also like to see that seniors could purchase points while they are on a waiting period. Someone asked me about setting aside permits for seniors and I said we already have 50 percent of the hunts going to highest point holders, some going to the youth and we have a lot of conservation permits that come out. I think the seniors would be just happy to be able to put in for a lot of the different animals. If a person had never taken an animal they would have eight opportunities. We could only draw one in any one year but put in for multiple species.

Randy Quayle – I just want to respond to the gentleman's argument a little bit ago about wounded game with archery. There was a study done on the Wasatch by the Fish and Game with collard elk. Out of the ones they collard there was a five percent mortality rate of un-retrieved game. Not one of those was taken with an arrow. They were all taken with a rifle. I am not saying we don't hit them but in order for it to be mortality they have to die after they have been hit. The mortality rate is just not that high. I do agree with him on long shots.

Tye Boulter – Thank you for your time and effort. I just want to say I have had an archery tag for the last nine years and in the last five years I haven't shot at a deer or ever shot a 100 yard shot so we are probably even kill for the guy that was up here before.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I would like to take what we have heard from the audience point by point. Let's go ahead and take up the archery proposals. Anis, if you would let us know what the Division's stand is. What was the rationale for discontinuing the statewide archery?

Anis Aoude – Because we were going to unit by unit. Initially we had no problem with staying with statewide archery when going to unit by unit but there was a fairness issue brought up.

Everyone else has to hunt unit by unit and archery hunters get to hunt statewide. There may be some units that might end up being managed differently if you have higher buck to doe ratios on some units and you may see an influx of archery hunters go there. Those types of things are the main thrust behind it. I think the Division could manage statewide archery if that is how it went, it is doable.

Fred Oswald – So it was a fairness issue. Everybody has to go unit by unit on a level playing field.

Anis Aoude – Biologically we can do the surveys and figure out how many are getting taken by each weapon type and then we could adjust. It would take a little bit more work but it is doable, we are doing it now.

Richard Hansen – I archery hunt and every year it seems there is always a push for more, more days ... The argument is and the biologists even say they don't impact the herds that much. I disagree with that. You could say the same thing about predators. I have heard the same thing said about cougars and bears. Added together every one makes a difference. Every one of them takes one more slice of the pie. I understand the fairness issue. I don't have anything against the archers and I don't think they impact it as much as rifle hunters for sure but my feeling is that if we are going to restrict rifle and muzzleloader hunters, everybody needs to feel the pain.

Kris Marble – I just wanted to clarify the Division's stance on this. As far as rifle and muzzleloader hunters the idea behind going to unit by unit management was to be able to manage each unit and control harvest. If archery was statewide are we losing the control we are going to gain by going to unit by unit?

Anis Aoude – It is going to be roughly the same number whether they are hunting statewide or unit by unit. Distribution may be a little different so you may have to have different permits for rifle or muzzlelaoder hunters on the units that archers may be hunting more. It will be different for sure but gain or loss it doesn't affect a whole lot. I do want to speak to what Richard said. No biologist is going to tell you that archers have no effect. They are harvesting at about half the rate of the rifle hunters, so they are harvesting. They are not out there just to go camping. They are harvesting animals and every animal harvested by an archer is an animal that can't be harvested by anyone else. They do have less of an effect so you can put twice as many hunters and harvest the same number of deer but they do have an effect. If you have statewide archery you may have to limit rifle and muzzleloader hunters on specific units that archers may be targeting more. There will be some imbalance. Eventually it all evens out because nobody wants to hunt in a crowded unit.

Karl Hirst – Other states are seeing archery as an opportunity. Arizona, unlimited archery, Idaho you can hunt all the limited entry elk units with your bow. Wouldn't this be the same and this would provide a way to keep opportunity for the sportsmen? I don't have a bone to pick with anybody but let's provide the opportunity for sportsmen across the board. Let's draw people out of the rifle hunt which will help the rifle hunters draw the tags.

Anis Aoude – I think you are right about other states using archery but there is not unlimited archery on mule deer in Arizona. On elk there is and we have unlimited elk archery here.

Karl Hirst – I buy an unlimited archery tag in Arizona every year. I hunt whitetail and about 80 percent mule deer.

Anis Aoude – That surprises me because success rate is fairly high. We could do that on certain units but it would be like we have currently with our unlimited elk hunting. It is whatever the public wants and how you split the pie and I am not going to tell you how to split the pie. All I can tell you is how we can do it and how it will effect how we would manage.

Karl Hirst – Just to restate, I really think that archery is a way to maintain the opportunity for our sportsmen. I was hunting in the early '80s when we had two deer and I watched people flow into archery. I think we will see the same thing. I think the rifle hunters and muzzleloader hunters

will be glad to have those folks out of the draw for those tags that will be harder to draw.

Anis Aoude – If we do have statewide archery you may not have more archery permits. You can only have so many numbers. It may actually be more archery if we go to unit by unit than if we allow statewide archery. As far as opportunity goes we actually may be able to have more opportunity if we manage a unit by unit than if we allow archers to go statewide.

Karl Hirst – I guess the second part of that is that when you decide how to allocate the reduction of tags you could balance that out and encourage people to go to archery. From my perspective it should be managed out on the number of animals harvested out of the total.

Sarah Flinders – In the past where we have had statewide archery and the five regions was there an unfairness issue then?

Anis Aoude - It depends on who you ask I guess. If you were to ask folks in the southern and southeastern regions there was. If you ask people from the northern and northeastern and central region there wasn't. When you get to the smaller units you may have more of a perception of an unfairness issue if people see a lot of archers going into any unit. You amplify the problem when you have 30 units instead of five regions. It's more complicated. You are amplifying the people that will complain by six fold.

Sarah Flinders – But if we do all go to units for all weapons won't those archers impact the rifle and muzzleloader hunters at a higher extent because they are going to be taking those animals first?

Anis Aoude – It doesn't matter who takes them first. It just depends on how many archers go into a unit. If it's statewide there could be more than the percentage that would be there if you had a draw system. If we went with a 60/20/20 split then 20 percent would be archers but if you left them statewide then you could have more than 20 percent going into any unit so you would have to cut the rifle and muzzleloader permits to overcome that. Because you don't know where they are going after the first year you would have to cut rifle and muzzleloader hunters to compensate for that. There would be an equity issue. You will be cutting rifle hunters if you have more archery hunters in one unit than you anticipated. It is not because they are there first. There are enough bucks to go around and success is higher on the rifle and muzzleloader hunt even though the archers are there first. It is just the number of bucks on the landscape and the number of hunters on the landscape.

Sarah Flinders – So either way there is going to be an equality issue?

Anis Aoude – I think that if you go unit by unit you can allocate them by percentages and you know the number that are going to be there. The way we set our splits is not just by the number of bucks harvested. We also know how many archers there are and how many rifle hunters there are and there are more people who hunt with a rifle so you have to have more rifle permits otherwise they will just be sitting out.

Timothy Fehr – It seems to me that we went to unit by unit in order to do a better job at wildlife management. It seems to me we should stick with it and see if we can make it work and see where we are. Right now I don't see an overwhelming reason to step away from where we were before. It might be good for archers but I am not sure it is good for the intent we had in going to unit by unit.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kris Marble to ask the Wildlife Board to reconsider statewide archery for 2012 (both regular permits as well as youth hunters)

Seconded by Karl Hirst

Richard Hansen – If it changed to statewide how many tags would you have?

Anis Aoude – The first couple of years will be educated guesses but after we get good data on each unit we can be fairly precise on how many permits we can put out there. We do it currently

even though we don't hunt unit by unit we gather data unit by unit. We have that information and we know where archers are hunting. When you go to unit by unit you may have a different dynamic. The southern region now gets a lot of archers but they have a lot of deer. If it ends up being the Wasatch or the central mountains that is getting the influx we may have to cut differently. It is doable but it will be different.

Larry Fitzgerald – So some units will take a greater hit from archers than others.

Anis Aoude – That is going to happen no matter what. We've all heard while you are out hunting that one unit or another has a lot of bucks this year and if you are regional hunting you can go to that unit and hunt it. If you have statewide archery you can still do that but the others can't.

Larry Fitzgerald – And will it also take away from the muzzleloader hunters and the rifle hunters on some units?

Anis Aoude – It may do that and it would be hard to say right now which units those would be but the potential is there.

Larry Fitzgerald – And it will make it harder to manage?

Anis Aoude – For the onset it will until we get a few years of data.

In Favor: Michael Gates, Kris Marble, Sarah Flinders, Karl Hirst

Opposed: Timothy Fehr, Richard Hansen, Larry Fitzgerald, George Holmes, Jay Price

Motion failed 5 to 4

Fred Oswald – The second item is the other proposal from UBA about the season dates for the Willard Peak goat hunt.

Karl Hirst – I was fortunate enough to accompany a friend on this unit this year. There was significant overcrowding the first couple days. It was a difficult place to be but after the first couple of days the hunters had enough time to expand out and it was not bad. I think two nine day seasons will compress them and they won't be able to spread out. I recommend we accept the dates given by the bow hunters. It adds five more days to it and it gives the Monday opener that law enforcement wanted. It is the best of both worlds. You have two seasons to cut the hunters in half and time for them to spread out themselves.

Fred Oswald – Clarification on this proposal, are the opening dates Mondays?

Anis Aoude – They are.

**Motion was made by Karl Hirst to accept the UBA season dates change on the Ogden/Willard Peak goat hunt (early hunt September 10th to September 23rd late hunt September 24th to October 14th female only goat hunt October 1st to October 14th)
Seconded by Kris Marble**

Richard Hansen – I noticed that this would over lap the muzzleloader deer. Is that an issue for hunters up there?

Karl Hirst -We didn't see enough deer for anybody to be up there. The dates would.

Jay Price – So this adds three days to each hunt?

Karl Hirst – Five days to each hunt.

Anis Aoude – Like Ben mentioned Darren is okay with the change. It is basically a non-issue if you want to vote that way. I actually asked Darren initially when he set the recommendations and his main concern was all the other users in the area but as we all know everybody has to share.

In Favor: Michael Gates, Kris Marble, Sarah Flinders, Karl Hirst, Timothy Fehr, Richard Hansen, Larry Fitzgerald, Jay Price

Opposed: George Holmes

Motion passed 8 to 1

Fred Oswald – Are there any other issues you would like to discuss?

Kris Marble – I did have one question about the lifetime license holders. Has the Division thought about that just in case it does become an issue?

Anis Aoude – We certainly have thought about it. We really don't know until the first year. The data we have now shows they equally distribute themselves to all the units. If we find there is an issue it certainly can be fixed the following year and we would set a cap somehow to deal with it. We don't want to fix a problem that doesn't exist. Lifetime license holders are few and have been in the system for a long time.

Kris Marble – And the Division doesn't have any kind of obligation to give them a desired unit?

Anis Aoude – It's a tough thing because when they got those permits they hunted statewide. We have an obligation to provide them an opportunity to hunt.

Kris Marble – But not a specific unit?

Anis Aoude – I guess it depends how much they want to push it. It is currently evolving because we are changing management strategy. They do have a license they purchased under different pretenses.

Kris Marble – But you do have a contingency plan?

Anis Aoude – Yes, we could certainly put a cap on each unit.

Richard Hansen – I think you will have to seriously look at that because the lifetime license holders are not stupid. They are going to go where they know there are bucks. Plus up to 15 percent of the tags are going to go to dedicated hunters also.

Anis Aoude – Theoretically if you are managing all units equally there should be no more bucks anywhere.

Richard Hansen – But you know that is not going to happen.

Karl Hirst – I am hoping that you have to address the lifetime license holders in the future because that means the deer have come back and there great areas in these general areas. At least right now I agree with you. Leave it alone and if we have to face it in the future then I think we are in a better place.

Anis Aoude – And it is an easy fix.

Motion was made by Jay Price to accept the remainder of the recommendations

Seconded by Richard Hansen

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

5) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012 (Action)

- Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Comments from the Public

Fred Oswald – I just have one comment card from Ken Clegg and I believe his is the president of the CWMU association. Is that right Ken?

Ken Clegg – Executive Director, I am actually not speaking on their behalf today. It is the one denial in the central region. I have some handouts that I could give you if you need to see how the map is shaped. The CWMU is called Skull Valley North and Skull Valley South and is primarily a winter range and farming area. It has about 50,000 private acres in Skull Valley and about 36,000 of those are in a CWMU and they fit the qualification. It is primarily two blocks, one north and one south. It was initially applied as a single CWMU but it is not contiguous. It was denied based on that. The north section is 3,700 and is actually under the 5,000. When we initially made our application it was 5,100 and realized that we actually applied for a neighbor who is not in the CWMU but we were in error. The Division is right; Tom has done an excellent

job. What we have determined is that the better way to solve that is to go back to the initial plan and have a single CWMU instead of splitting it into two. We felt that is more fair for the public hunter. It is a marginally small CWMU on the north and there is no agriculture associated with it. If a public hunter were to draw that permit and a catastrophic fire happens which it does about every year out in Skull Valley then it could be that there is not any cheat grass there and there are not any deer on the unit and it is probably not a fair hunt for the public. What we are suggesting is to use an existing rule for trade land policy. We are asking for 300 acres of BLM sage brush flat, it's not real high quality wildlife habitat but we are simply asking for that 300 acres of public ground to be included in the CWMU so it is a clearly identifiable boundary. It connects the two properties. What we would trade in exchange for that are three non-contiguous pieces that are not in the CWMU right now. They would be considered open to public hunting and we would still honor the public hunt that takes place on the north unit. So we would have an 80/20 split. We would have 8 private tags, 2 public tags and all of the hunters within that can hunt the entire 36,000 acres instead of being relegated to one side or the other. That is in essence what we are trying to accomplish there. Implications if we don't do it that way then the north unit would simply be denied and we would still have the south unit. There would be one public hunter instead of two and that one public hunter would hunt on the south side. The north side we would just have to hunt it with regular unit tags instead of CWMU tags which isn't the end of the world. It is not a big deal to us. We do think that the single CWMU would improve hunting for public and private hunters since they aren't relegated to one side or the other. It would also improve the flexibility in anticipation of the next fire out there.

Fred Oswald – I would like to have Boyde speak to your request. It seems to me there are two issues, one is a deadline issue that you have basically missed the deadline for doing that and that what you are asking is that that deadline be waived in terms of offering a new proposal. The second thing is I am not sure if we have ever had a proposal that allows two pieces to be contiguous with a piece of public land.

Boyde Blackwell – There are three reasons you can include public land in a CWMU. One is to make a definable boundary if it's needed. The other is if it's totally surrounded by private land and the other one is if it's to meet the needs of a management plan that the Division has to manage wildlife.

Fred Oswald – So this meets the first criteria?

Boyde Blackwell – No. I'll tell you why. You are including a piece of public land in order to make a CWMU and so that land isn't an integral part of the CWMU. As much as I appreciate Ken and appreciate working with him I would not be in favor of making such a move. It would set a precedent around the state that I don't think we are prepared or want to take on.

Ken Clegg – In terms of the clearly identifiable boundary I would disagree with Boyde on that one. It is a paved road. I think it does clarify. It is very minimal acreage where it does not touch. There are lots of CWMUs out there. I was amazed. There are 116 and I am the one coming and whining about something. Boyde does have a point, there are going to be lots of CWMUs or the potential to have new and good CWMUs that don't fit the exact mold. Obviously we can go to a neighbor and get some additional acreage and we can patch these things together. It just seemed like the right thing to us to be able to give two public tags out there instead of one and have a clearly identifiable boundary. The landowner wants that and then all of our ground is in the CWMU. Are we trying to be inclusive with CWMUs or exclusive, do want more of them or not and I suppose that's what the issue is.

Fred Oswald – I appreciate you coming to the central RAC and would encourage you to go to the Wildlife Board meeting as well.

Sarah Flinders – Tom, you are the biologist in the area, can you tell me what kind of an impact this would make? I see a benefit to something like that.

Tom Becker – There was a huge fire that went through there, 44,000 acres. There were a few deer in there prior to that but I haven't seen a lot of deer in that north Skull Valley north area. If they are in there like he said it is winter range and they come in fairly late. I just didn't see that there was much in the way of opportunity. The bridge if granted would allow them to use it in case there was some opportunity at all but it doesn't meet the rule for including public land so I had to deny it.

Kris Marble – Boyde, I think you basically answered the question but I wanted to clarify; there is no precedence for this correct?

Boyde Blackwell – No, not to add public land to make one CWMU.

Kris Marble – I think the Division would be interested in thinking of all the implications of that before making a precedence in this case.

Michael Gates – From the BLM perspective I agree with Boyde on this. We really want to avoid including public land in CWMUs.

Jay Price – There are other CWMUs that have public land included in them I think.

Boyde Blackwell – Yes there are but they do meet one of the three criteria. I guess my issue would be we are talking about a piece of public land that splits the two so it is not needed to make a good boundary between the two. It would if what we are trying to do is make one CWMU but that is not what's necessary.

Jay Price – Is there any deer hunting on that piece of ground.

Boyde Blackwell – I think Tom just said the deer are few if any and the fire had gone through and the habitat isn't there for a good quality deer herd.

Jay Price – On the public land?

Boyde Blackwell – Yes.

George Holmes – Is there a reason it was not one CWMU before and was it because the public land divided it?

Boyde Blackwell – Yes.

VOTING

**Motion was made by Kris Marble to accept the Division's recommendations as presented
Seconded by Timothy Fehr**

Jay Price – When is it we talk about the percentages that go to the CWMUs as far as public and private?

Boyde Blackwell – We have a five-year review and that needs to be done in 2013.

Jay Price – Is that retroactive?

Boyde Blackwell – It will go from that point forward. They all would change.

George Holmes – What is it that changes them? Is it the recommendations or is it the application from the CWMUs?

Fred Oswald – Those are not changed until the new five year rule is changed.

George Holmes – There were 116 that needed to reapply this year but that is not when this is set.

Fred Oswald – That's right. When they reapply they have some options they can take but those are all set in the five year plan.

George Holmes – If it's private and it's public what opportunity do the public have on that unit? What regulations can the operator of the CMWU put on those public hunters?

Boyde Blackwell – Everybody has to be able to hunt the entire CWMU and have at the same time frame as private hunters.

Fred Oswald – At our February meeting we might want to get into more detail to educate you a little more on how CWMUs work because it is important and as you can see there are lots of

CWMUs and lots of acres. I don't want to cut you off but I think it would be a good topic to have at our informational meeting.

George Holmes – How about I call for the question.

In Favor: Michael Gates, Kris Marble, Sarah Flinders, Karl Hirst, Timothy Fehr, Richard Hansen, Larry Fitzgerald, George Holmes

Opposed: Jay Price

Motion passed 8 to 1

- 6) **Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012 (Action)**
- **Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

VOTING

**Motion was made by Jay Price to accept landowner permit numbers for 2012 as presented
Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald**

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

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

Possible February meeting agenda items

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

45 in attendance

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

Next RAC meeting December 13th at the Central Region Conference Center 1115 N Main, Springville

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Richfield High School
Richfield, UT
November 15, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept the minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL 2012 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: To accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2012 season dates and application timeline as presented.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: To change the season dates on the Ogden, Willard Peak Rocky Mountain Goat hunts to: Early: September 10 – 23rd, Late: September 24 – October 14th, Nanny: October 1 – 14th.

VOTE: Motion carried. 9:2

3. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2012

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management plans and permit numbers for 2012 as presented.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION: That the Alton CWMU gets the same number of permits as the previous year.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT: Passed 6:5

VOTE: Unanimous

4. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2012

MOTION: To accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Richfield High School
Richfield, UT
November 15, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Steve Flinders Cordell Pearson Mike Worthen Layne Torgerson Brian Johnson Clair Woodbury Mike Staheli Dave Black Sam Carpenter Rusty Aiken Dale Bagley Mack Morrell	Douglas Messerly Stephanie Rainey Anis Aoude Boyde Blackwell Teresa Griffin Lynn Chamberlain Blair Stringham Dustin Schaible Mark Martinez Vance Mumford Jason Nicholes Jim Lamb Micah Evans Paul Washburn John Shivik Kent Hersey	Jake Albrecht	Paul Briggs

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. There were 43 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves.

Steve Flinders: It's six o'clock; let's get this meeting started. I'm Steve Flinders, the chair; I represent the Dixie and Fish Lake National Forests. I appreciate everybody coming out tonight. I'm going to

recognize Jake Albrecht from the Wildlife Board. And how about the RAC introduces themselves. We'll start on my left with Brian.

Brian Johnson: Hello. I'm Brian Johnson. I represent non-consumptives.

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

Dave Black: Dave Black, St. George. I represent at-large.

Rusty Aiken: Rusty Aiken from Cedar City; agriculture.

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

Mike Staheli: Mike Staheli, Delta area. I'm at-large.

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

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

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

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

Steve Flinders: Thank you. In a way of meeting order tonight we'll have a presentation from the Division of Wildlife. I ask you to be respectful and let the Division proceed through the presentation. We'll go by agenda item. We'll then after the presentation I'll ask for questions from the RAC. We'll proceed to questions from the public. I ask you to keep those to questions. We'll follow that up by a comment period from the public where you can give us your point of view. We'd love to hear it. Limit groups to five minutes, individuals to three. Please fill out a comment card, they're available on the table out back or raise your hand. Out front? There are some going around the room. Hand them to a Division of Wildlife person and they'll get them up front. We'll then proceed to comments from the RAC and motions and voting.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Steve Flinders: Unless there's any questions we'll look for approval of the agenda and a motion on the minutes from last meeting from anybody.

Rusty Aiken: I'd like to make the motion to approve the minutes and the agenda.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Rusty with the minutes and the agenda. Seconded by Cordell. All in favor? Unanimous.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as written. Cordell Pearson seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Wildlife Board Update:
-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: In the way of the Wildlife Board update, if you'll recall the last meeting was fishing proclamation; not very controversial. Our motions were all unanimous. The Wildlife Board passed things the same way that we did. There was a little bit of, for lack of a better word, controversy between the RAC meeting and the Wildlife Board meeting relative to Panguitch Lake. I think there's always going to be a tug-a-war between bait fishing, trophy fishing, and family recreation. Since no one came to the RAC meeting the Wildlife Board was hesitant to make any changes and dismissed it as just that, more discussion and thought that to stay on the course. Regional update Doug?

Regional Update:
-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'll try to make this brief in the interest of time as we may get into some lengthy discussions this evening.

- First of all it's the time of year when our biologists and conservation officers are out classifying deer to get that important data and determine how much production we've had during the summer and what the remaining buck to doe ratio is. Which as you know, and as we'll discuss further tonight is a key piece of information. You know I'd like to invite specifically the RAC members and frankly any other interested members of the community that would be interested in accompanying us on some of those forays to let us know. We'll be doing that over the next few weeks. If you'll contact me or your local conservation officer we can probably arrange to make that happen.
- Landowner turkey permit application period is in process for those that are applying for turkeys next year. Stephanie and I were trying to recall specific dates for the general turkey application period; I believe it's in December so it's coming up soon. And we'll get to talk about it more at our next RAC meeting, which is in early December.
- Fall fishing has been good on some of our waters. Right up to ice up it's a good time to get out there and catch those fish. They're trying to get fat before the winter; they know what's coming as we do.

Douglas Messerly: And unless there's any questions Mr. Chairman I'll leave it at that.

Steve Flinders: I have a question Doug, when is the Sportsman's permit application period? Do you know? Stephanie, do you know? Isn't it right now?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, it's November 1st. And I'm not sure what the deadline is. The 23rd, yeah.

Steve Flinders: So a little tickler for folks to check out that application. Any other questions for Doug? Seeing none let's move on to our first action item, Bucks, Bulls and Once In A Lifetime Season Dates and Application Timelines. Anis.

Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline (action) 6:29 to 24:56 of 1:55:17

-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Thanks Anis, Questions from the RAC on the presentation? Sure Dale.

Dale Bagley: On the Beaver nanny goat hunt, you've got on the Willard Peak, you've got a any goat hunt. Why the difference in those? Why can't we just have on any goat on the Beaver unit?

Anis Aoude: We do, we currently have two any goat hunts on the Beaver units, and in addition we'll have a nanny goat hunt.

Dale Bagley: Okay. I thought on the goat hunts there you had to stick to strictly a billy on the Beaver.

Anis Aoude: Right now you do, but we are adding a nanny goat hunt to actually reduce the population. So there's two any, there are all ready two any goat hunts that will remain there and then we'll add a nanny goat hunt on top of that. So there will actually be three goat hunts on the Beaver unit.

Dale Bagley: All right.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Go ahead Brian.

Brian Johnson: I just have questions on the goat hunt as well. Looking at the Willard Peak, I noticed those dates are quite a bit shorter than the Beaver and the objective is the same. I spoke to the biologist up there and he said that he doesn't see a reason why they couldn't just run the same as the Beaver. Do you see a biological reason if we're trying to reduce those tags that it couldn't just kind of mirror the Beaver unit?

Anis Aoude: Right. Yeah, he did say that. He does have a concern about a Saturday opener on that unit for the first hunt. And he said that he wouldn't have a problem with a longer hunt except he does worry about a Saturday opener. That's an area of high recreational use other than hunting and he feels that a midweek opener would be better, like a Monday opener. I think that's what the last two RACs have passed.

Brian Johnson: Is like a Monday opener and then a . . .

Anis Aoude: Yeah.

Brian Johnson: Okay. So it's just extending the opportunity to kind of alleviating the perceived . . .

Anis Aoude: Yeah, I think it ends up being fourteen days or something like that.

Brian Johnson: Alleviating the perceived notion of the . . . Okay.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, there's no biological reason it couldn't be (unintelligible).

Steve Flinders: Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Anis, on this late youth hunt that we're having on the Paunsagaunt. Is there any limit to the number of tags on any of this youth hunting?

Anis Aoude: Yeah it's spelled out in the Statewide Plan. And of course we're not setting permits now.

Sam Carpenter: Right I understand. I just wonder if there . . .

Anis Aoude: But the numbers of permits are set to basically bring the buck to doe ratio down below fifty. So as long as we're above fifty bucks per one hundred does we would issue enough permits on that youth hunt to bring the buck to doe ratio below fifty.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, bulls and calves, right?

Anis Aoude: What's that?

Sam Carpenter: Bulls and calves. I'm talking about the elk hunt.

Anis Aoude: Oh the elk hunt.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah.

Anis Aoude: Oh I'm sorry. I thought you said the management hunt.

Sam Carpenter: No. This recommendation for this late any weapon hunt, is there any limit on the number of tags (unintelligible)?

Anis Aoude: There is. In the Statewide Plan it does say how many, what percentage can go into the late hunt versus the early hunt. I don't know the percentages right off the bat but again we're not setting permits right now. But yeah, there is a, there is a formula how to set early versus late permits.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, and another thing we talk about in our Paunsaugunt elk strategy meeting that we had here a while back was the during the archery spike hunt you would be able to take a cow elk if you wanted to instead of a spike. I didn't see that in this. Is that on a different venue?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, it will be in the May meeting. So what we do is we'll look at all the units statewide and those that are below seventy-five percent of objective we will not allow archers . . .

Sam Carpenter: That's how that will go.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, and that's how it will go. And then likely the Paunsagaunt will drop out of that.

Sam Carpenter: Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Other questions from the RAC? I've got one more, Anis. I got several emails and maybe some other folks did. One resonated with me about the youth any bull hunt and bonus points. And I guess the reason it resonated is I've run two kids all the way through and never drawn a tag. Have you heard, has this come up in any other RACs?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. No it has not. You know it's something that really hasn't been on my radar either to be honest.

Steve Flinders: What uh . . .

Anis Aoude: As far as preference points for that specific hunt.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, bonus points, preference points, whatever you want to call them.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, I can run that by our folks in licensing and see how we can, we should have some kind of . . .

Steve Flinders: I not sure even what the odds are, you know, whether there would be any gain for kids. They get to put in for what, about four years?

Anis Aoude: Yeah. I'll certainly check into that. Yeah, it's something that really hasn't hit the radar screen yet.

Rusty Aiken: I'd like to comment on that too.

Steve Flinders: Sure Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Could it be a once-in-a-lifetime also for the youth, once they draw out they're not allowed to put in again?

Anis Aoude: I don't see why you would limit youth opportunity that way.

Rusty Aiken: Well just so other people could draw. Once they drew, or at least a waiting period.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Well if you put a point system in then those that have been drawing will draw more likely than those that have just drawn.

Steve Flinders: And there's a real competitive advantage for non-residents I know to draw those permits.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we'll certainly look at that.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC? Question from the public? For those of you that came in late this is a question period. We want to hear from you. We're glad you came. This is a comment card. We'll take comments after questions. Does anybody have a question for Anis about the presentation?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Give us your name and step to the mic.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy from Enoch. I have 3 questions. Because of the extension on the archery extended area goes clear to the lake now and the reason for it is for nuisance animals and stuff. Are there going to be provisions to hunt does on the Ogden unit? Right now it's just bucks only.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. That has not been discussed yet and it is something that will be set in the meeting but it is something I will bring up with the region to see. They do have it on the Wasatch part of it but not the Ogden. But yeah, it's a good point and I'll certainly bring it up when we write the rule in May. The boundary will still be the same but it will change the way the rule is written to allow for doe hunts. But that's not something that we're going to, we'll discuss that in the May meeting.

Lee Tracy: All right. Question number two: Are there plans to move the buck, bull and once-in-a-lifetime applications and draws closer to the antlerless draws and after their classifications so that we know how many tags we are competing for?

Anis Aoude: There are no plans currently. So it's basically . . .right now no. There are not any plans to change here.

Lee Tracy: You said that we would lose the Buck-Bull combo. How many permits are we talking about?

Anis Aoude: Okay, so basically we won't lose any permits on that. There were two thousand permits that were taken from the Northern Region deer permits and put into that so they would go back into that and then apportioned to the different units. So it won't be any permits lost.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the audience? Did I see your hand up earlier Paul? No other questions we'll move to comments.

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: Craig Christiansen, followed by Lee Tracy.

Craig Christiansen: I am Craig Christiansen from Cedar City, here representing UBA, The Utah Bowman's Association. I've got two recommendations from UBA, Mule Deer Foundation, and United Wildlife Cooperative, Bow Hunters of Utah, and Utah Bowman's Association jointly propose that the RACs and Wildlife Board reconsider the decision to make archery deer hunters pick a unit in 2012, and instead allow archery deer hunters to continue to hunt statewide. And the reasons for this proposal are as follows: As stated by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources biologists several times over the past several years there is no biological reason to restrict that area the archery deer hunters are allowed to hunt in general season hunting units. The number of hunters that harvest deer with archery tackle are not statistically impacting the buck to doe ratios. Number two: As determined by the Statewide Archery Committee in 2009, statewide archery hunting is what the majority of archery deer hunters want despite the outcry of overcrowding issues by a small minority. And three: statewide archery may encourage an increase number of hunters to start to choose archery. Moving hunters to archery could allow for less

impact to sportsman rather than just continuing to cut permit numbers. And then number four: having more hunters choose a less successful hunt strategy will increase buck to doe rations without loss of opportunity. Number five: despite the decision to start hunting smaller units with firearms the majority of the RACs and the majority of the public were in favor of leaving archery deer statewide hunting opportunity in tact. And number six: it would allow the youth statewide archery opportunity to continue. And then the second recommendation is to provide for a longer season length on a once-in-a-lifetime hunt. The Utah Bowman's Association recommends the following season dates on the Ogden Willard Peak Rocky Mountain goat hunts. Early is September 10th through the 23rd. Late, September 24th through October 14th. And then the nanny goat is October 1st through the 14th. And the biologist for this unit has no objections to these dates. And these dates provide for a Monday opener, which satisfies the law enforcement concerns for the unit. These dates have been proposed at the Northern and Central RACs and both RACs approved these dates. That's all I've got.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Craig. Lee Tracy followed by Steve Thompson.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy, United Wildlife Cooperative. The United Wildlife Cooperative supports the joint proposal just presented by the Mule Deer Foundation, the United Bowman's Association, and the Bow Hunters of Utah in regards to statewide archery. In the coming months we would also like the RAC and Division to consider ways to implement comprehensive hunter management in the newly created mule deer subunits. Creating these subunits allows us to manage hunters and deer on a unit basis yet we have chosen to manage every general season unit from 18 to 25 bucks per one hundred does. Between this year and next we will have removed 13,000 hunters as well as the associated revenue. As you know these cuts do not address our deer rather the social aspect of deer hunting. Past Division surveys have always shown that the most important thing for the majority of hunters is always having the opportunity to be in the field with the tag. We also acknowledge there is a segment of the population that desires bigger antlered deer at a cost of hunting less frequently, and we respect that. The United Wildlife Cooperative urges the Division to come up with a comprehensive plan in the coming months to manage our general season units to reflect these statistics in the 2012 managing plan. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Lee. Lee, we've got a question for you. Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Yeah, you say you represent the Utah Wildlife Cooperative.

Lee Tracy: United Wildlife Cooperative.

Sam Carpenter: Oh, this says Utah on here. Okay. And where are you out of?

Lee Tracy: The unit was formed in Salt Lake City.

Brian Johnson: Where do you live?

Lee Tracy: We have not quite one thousand members. And we're working on it.

Sam Carpenter: Okay. You're out of the northern end of the state then.

Lee Tracy: Well I'm from Enoch but I'm the southern (unintelligible).

Steve Flinders: Thanks Sam and Lee. Steve Thompson.

Steve Thompson: I'm Steve Thompson from Glenwood, Southern Region. My objective, my concern is the objective for the 28-day archery hunt. It's three times longer than any other season; you're giving any other sportsman. Fairness . . . I don't understand. With the technology the bow hunters have I don't understand why they're getting three times longer to hunt their big game whatever. Also, they're the first ones out for the season; that's a little advantage for the muzzleloader such as myself. I still think that they need to pick their unit, hunt their unit for their nine-days just like the muzzleloader, just like the rifle. So that's what I feel.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Steve. Got a couple of other comment cards here that don't fit quite as well in this category. It looks like there's others coming up. Gary Allen and Stanton Gleave it looks like your comments relate more to our spring meeting. But you're here and we'd like to hear from you so if you want to come forward and give us your comments and we'll ask the Division to make note of these for the antlerless meeting that's coming up this spring, it may relate more to since we're not talking numbers tonight. But please come up and tell us what's on your mind. You get three minutes each.

Stanton Gleave: All right. Well we didn't know for sure what meeting we are suppose to be to. But anyway, what I'm representing is the Monroe Mountain Grazing Association. We formed a grazing association to deal with these number of elk that's on the Monroe Mountain. And uh, I guess where we're coming from in 1970 there was no elk on the Monroe Mountain. Today there's, I don't know by your counts I think somewhere 1,200 or 1,300 and you want to increase it by 600 more. And the ranchers, we had a meeting and we're all opposed to that. Before you increase that elk herd at all you need to make some kind of compensation to the ranchers on the damage they're doing today. And that was our main comment. And I don't know what meeting that takes place at or if that's still on the agenda to increase that elk herd, but we're definitely opposed to it. And that's representing all the grazers or everybody that grazes cattle and sheep on the Monroe Mountain. And we wanted to mention one other thing, that grass on that mountain, on any of these mountains, there's been a lot of the ranchers ever since before this was even the United States, you know, our families have been who we've been making a living ranching that. And this herd of elk as got to be, it has to be controlled some place. There's room for a herd of deer back on the mountain and we all know that deer herd's been ate by predators. You need to do something with the predators and you can have all the deer, a big herd of deer back there, but this herd of elk needs to be controlled. That's my comment I get. And by the way what meeting do you say we need to be to?

Steve Flinders: There will be a spring meeting on antlerless permit recommendations. We'll look that up for you so you know for certain. And also, I've got maybe a follow up question for Anis or Teresa about elk management plan revisions when those may come back to the RAC.

Anis Aoude: What was the question?

Steve Flinders: Elk management plan revisions. When do you anticipate those coming up?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, those should be coming through the RAC in the June RAC meeting.

Steve Flinders: After the antlerless or before?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, after the antlerless.

Steve Flinders: I printed it out and left it on the printer, the new schedule. We'll see that we get that to you fellows. Come on up.

Gary Allen: I've just got the same comments that Stanton had. Pretty well exactly except for I want to know how you guys figure you can run 1,300 head by your counts on the Monroe Mountain when the Fish Lake National Forest, this is the whole Fish Lake, the Forest plan calls for 3,400 head? Is there any way you can give me an answer on that? And one other thing is I want to know how you can run on private land without, I mean just how you can do it to start with? You guys all know that I've, I feed your elk all winter and I want you to, I don't want the elk on it. I just, there's no . . . you guys ain't taking care of your elk at all. You guys need to cut the numbers way down, way down. They destroy my fences and my irrigation equipment until it makes it pretty rough to try to farm around there.

Steve Flinders: Could we get your name for the record?

Gary Allen: Gary Allen.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Gary. Is that a question for . . . Do you want to respond to that?

Douglas Messerly: Gary as we've discussed many times the elk are managed according to the Statewide Plan that's put in place, and by this unit management plan that we're in the process of revising right now. You attended the meeting, as I understand it, for the Monroe Unit so you're familiar with that process. The Forest Service was there at that meeting and their members of this committee to represent the interests of their management plans as well. And I presume that they have put forth whatever influence they need to to meet the objectives of their management plan. If they have not then you need to bring that to the Forest Service attention and have them push that point with regard to the management plan on those specific units where that's affected. With regard to wildlife on private lands, it's a simple fact that big game animals and actually small game animals and upland game animals use private land. And it's also a plain fact that if they were not able to do that then we would have less wildlife in this state. So sportsmen need to be grateful to private landowners for their tolerance of wildlife on their private properties. And often times the wildlife does damage that property. We have a set of programs in place to compensate landowners for damages done specifically by big game and Gary you are familiar with that program. And we've tried to employ that as best we can. In the past year the way that system works is a certain amount of money is allocated statewide to pay for compensation for big game damage to private lands. And last year the claims that were filed out stripped our ability to pay that so those payments were prorated to the tune of 81 percent of what the claims were. We've got a building block proposed that will be introduced in the legislature this year in order to increase the amount of money that we're allowed to spend to compensate landowners for big game damage. And that hopefully will answer your question about what we intend to do or what we can do. The truth is we don't control where wildlife goes. That's part of the definition of what they are, they go where they want to go because they're wildlife. We are charged with compensating for that and we do the best we can with the resources that we have.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. We're on a bit of a tangent but yeah. Yeah I'm looking at it right here too. I was going to say it's the April 10th meeting, isn't it? April 10th is numbers and also antlerless recommendations and guidebook. The Board meeting is May 2nd.

Anis Aoude: The unit plans will be in June. That's not on the new agenda that we sent out.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, and typically they're done before the antlerless recommendation in case we have to make reductions.

Anis Aoude: Yeah, right. This year we did not do it that way for the fact that we're putting both antlerless and bucks and bulls together, it would make for a very late meeting so we pushed it ahead.

Steve Flinders: Well there are no meetings in June so it's July.

Anis Aoude: Yeah it's the July one.

Steve Flinders: It's July 31st for management plans. And not to (unintelligible) this tangent but the Forest plan was mentioned. Real briefly the Fish Lake National Forest land and resource management plan is dated 1986 and it has been amended several times in relation to elk and livestock grazing. Utilization standards were adopted in the year 2000. I'd have to look specifically at the allotments in question but typically it boils down to it doesn't matter what eats it when it reaches 40 percent utilization animals need to be moved. So the numbers that were in the 1986 plan relating to elk . . . What I'm trying to say is the Fish Lake National Forest is on board with the new process the Division of Wildlife has, that's why you see me here tonight and that's why we're involved in those work plan meetings and participate and defer to the wildlife board for setting elk population levels. Getting back to the agenda item at hand, I've got some additional comment cards. Greg McGregor followed by DeLoss Christensen.

Greg McGregor: Good Evening. I'm Greg McGregor, St George Utah. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Messerly, members of the RAC, I really appreciate your time and the opportunity to stand before you. I am acting as voice this evening for a newly formed sportsmen's group out of St. George and Southern Utah; acting voice tonight for the Southern Chapter of the Safari Club International. Okay, we hope to make ourselves known throughout the wildlife community and the conservation community in providing a lot for conservation. One issue that we would like to address and I know this is kind of a tweener here between the numbers and hunt dates as proposed by the Division. One of the things that we've always been concerned about in Southern Utah is the skirt of the law versus the letter of the law in the fact that . . . And I'm sure the numbers, in fact Mr. Messerly talked about the wildlife biologists are actually out doing their counts now and we know that one of the advantages to having the subunits is to take into account how many hunters or how many animals can be taken into each of those units. And we just hope that, we'd like to go on record as saying that we hope the numbers, the counts are accurate enough to sustain the number of hunters in each one of those units. Many of you know that through the years the sportsmen in Southern Utah, particularly St. George, have been concerned about the nine-day hunt on the Pine Valley unit and all that out there. I know that this last year we've paid attention to the number of deer that were killed out there on the second half of the hunt and it was remarkably or markedly a lot more than on the first weekend of the hunt. Okay? And I would just hope they would admonish and make a recommendation that those numbers be taken into account when the counts are done and when the permits, the numbers of their permits, are given out to each one of those regions. Any questions? Thanks for your time.

Steve Flinders: Sorry, DeLoss followed by Gene Boardman.

DeLoss Christensen: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is DeLoss Christiansen from Glenwood, Utah. I want to thank this RAC in particular for your support last year in the effort that has been made with the support of the Wildlife Board for doing the unit management plan. I think that this board needs to be commended because I think you led in that position. And without your support I don't believe it would have happened. Last year as you recall you voted to ask the archers to hunt on individual units rather than statewide, along with the other hunters in the state. I'd like to ask you to support that again this year if you would. As you know it has just been mentioned by our friends that own private property our deer are really in trouble. And that's no secret to anyone here. They need all the help they can get. And pressure impacts deer. They're a sensitive species relatively speaking. I had the opportunity to attend a meeting about a month ago where a representative from the archers organizations in the state were there asking what you heard this evening, the (unintelligible). I asked that gentleman that evening, he had also made the presentation in a very aggressive and hostile environment at the RAC in Green River last year. And he became very assertive when the RAC chairman there asked them if they didn't want to participate by restricting their pressure on deer along with other sportsmen. And his answer was not one day, not one minute, not one acre. And I asked him if he had changed his feeling about that since that meeting last year, last month. And he wasn't angry any more but he said no that they didn't. They felt that there was no impact on the deer from archery hunting. And of course there is. They harvest deer, maybe not as many. They're out there in the field impacting these animals. And I'm an archer. I've archered, or I've hunted with a bow, my children have hunted with a bow. I have no feelings against the weapon. But I think we all need to participate in the effort that needs to be made to turn this deer herd around in the state; and I hope we can have your support again this year. Thanks so much.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Gene Boardman. A couple of questions from Chris Compton and Anthony Phelps. Do you want me to read these questions or do you guys want to come forward? All right Anthony. Chris, do you want to go after Gene?

Gene Boardman: All right, Gene Boardman, Hinkley, Utah. The reason I came to this RAC tonight was because I figured somebody was going to want a little better deal on this thing and the bow hunters showed up wanting a little better deal. I'm more concerned about that somewhere in this state somehow the dedicated hunters are going to throw one in that they want and I'm really concerned about that. In fact with the bow-hunting thing it does go to dedicated hunters because they hunt all three seasons, we don't. I wanted to tell you all here I've never killed a deer that was there because of the dedicated hunter program. I don't think I've ever seen a deer that was there because of the dedicated hunter program but I've sure lost a lot of tags and my family has lost a lot of tags because of the dedicated hunter program; especially it happens in this southern unit. I'd just like to see it go away. But I ask you if that comes up anywhere in the state let's everybody put in a little flesh on this thing; not that one group or another gets a special over-ride on it. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Chris Compton

Chris Compton: My name is Chris. I guess that the question that I've always had and I've never got an answer on it is relating to permit numbers and the issuance of them compared to application periods. My question is they do the counts and it says that if a buck to doe ratio doesn't, if the buck doesn't meet the doe ratio for a certain unit it should be closed. Is that correct?

Steve Flinders: Anis, you may want to come up, there's a long history with this and it related as much to once-in-a-lifetime species and survey timing, but go ahead Anis.

Anis Aoude: Sorry, yeah we do manage our buck to doe ratios on general season and limited entry units. And no we do not close units that are below buck to doe ratio. We reduce the number of permits on those units to bring the ratios back up.

Chris Compton: Okay, so that answers they never get closed. My question was if there were a unit that has to be reduced in permits . . . if you have the hunters that put in for it wanting to put in for a specific unit and if they put in for it and then they end up losing their permits why couldn't they reverse it to where you know permit numbers before the application period then if there's so many tags on a unit the hunters may or may not put in for that unit?

Steve Flinders: I can take a stab at that one. Ten years ago the permit numbers were shown in the proclamation with the hunts in January. Most of the, or in a lot of the surveys and all of the harvest data typically comes in later than that. So biologists are forced to be, and the Division was forced to be conservative in permit numbers. Does that make sense? So you can see the permit numbers but all of a sudden the spring rolls around and gosh we could have issued far more permits because now we have this new data. Herds and most populations are on the way up and most of the time we're incrementally increasing permit numbers. Is that right Anis? It's only been the last couple of years that you've seen some reductions. So you look in the odds book and they issued one hundred tags last year, one of the reductions was on the Parker this year and a lot of guys were shocked and would have put in somewhere else. I guess that happens but other states actually started this and Utah adopted it, and that's kind of where we're. Anyone want to add to that? Anis, is that accurate?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, sure. I can address that a little bit further. Not only because populations could increase, inversely populations could be decreasing and we may have issued too many permits. So it's best to make recommendations for the following year on the best available data, the most current data which we don't get until mid-February. So once we have that data we set permits. The reason the drawing is so much earlier is people like an earlier drawing because they are, they want to reserve whatever dates they want off or whatever. So that's the reason we have an early drawing. The other reason we have an early drawing is to actually beat some of the other states to the drawing because there's both resident and nonresidents that put in in the state. If you're, you know, last, you may end up having a lot fewer applicants in your state than other states. So there are a lot of things in play here. So we are trying to set permits on the best data available which doesn't come in until mid-February so we could have the drawing later but then people only have a month or two to plan a hunt that may be a once-in-a-lifetime hunt and so on and so forth; so that's the rationale for setting the permits so late and having the drawing so early.

Chris Compton: Thank you

Steve Flinders: Thanks Chris. While you are up there Anis, Anthony Phelps question is why not do a three point or bigger hunt on the deer hunts? Your favorite.

Anis Aoude: Yeah. Let me count the ways. I probably address the question to hunters online and by phone on a weekly basis. And I would love to send you the research Utah did when we did have three point or better in the 80's on ten or more units. Basically, when you think about it you think it would work but when you put it down on paper it does not. And I'll give you just the main reasons why that is. If you don't reduce hunter numbers, so you make it three point or better and still have the same number

of hunters, you're putting all that hunter pressure on the older age class of bucks. So what you end up doing is saving the yearlings and then killing all the older age class. Hunter success will reduce a little bit but you will kill more older bucks because you have lots of hunters out there and they want to kill something. So you save the yearlings only to be killed as a two-year old. So all you're doing is delaying the inevitable one year by doing three point or better and you're putting more hunting pressure on the older age class that you want breeding most years. So it actually works against you on a population level effect. So you end up having fewer older bucks in the population, more younger bucks which are usually the most numerous in the population and you want hunters to take some younger bucks out of there because if you have a lot of hunters out there and there's more young bucks than old bucks obviously they're going to take more young bucks. It's just the way it works out. So biologically it just does not make sense. It makes sense to the average hunter that if you save them as a yearling they'll be a three point or better the following year but it's usually you're only delaying it by one year. They're a three point the second year; most bucks are a three point the second year of their life. So all you're doing is delaying the inevitable one-year and you're not gaining any more bucks to do if you don't limit the number of hunters. The best way to grow big bucks is to limit the number of permits out there. It's been proven again and again not only in Utah but multiple western states have tried this and have gone away from it similarly. In about the same period, around the 80's early 90's a lot of western states tried it and they have all gone away from it. A few of them do still do it and that's more because of public pressure than anything else. They still agree that biologically it's an unsound, and the states that do still do it have very light hunting pressure, Wyoming for example. They can do it but they don't have the hunting pressure we do in Utah and they don't issue the number of permits we do here.

Steve Flinders: Thanks. Another confounding thing are the giant four-year old two points that you see selected for. That's all I've got for comment cards. Did we miss anybody for this agenda item?

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: All right. We'll turn it over to discussion by the RAC. Let the record show Mike Worthen has joined us. We heard about lots of things here tonight. Mack's here too, welcome. Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I really appreciate the public being here tonight and sharing their comments with us. First to address the statewide archery issue that's been brought up here tonight; when this RAC and Wildlife Board one year ago voted to go to a unit by unit management it was my feeling at that time and several of my constituents here on the board that what we're trying to do for deer isn't for us sitting here in this room. And I feel very strongly about this. What we're trying to do for deer is for my grandson, Cordell's grandson and all of you, it's for our future. We can't fix this deer problem in one year, two years, or five years. It's been going on for thirty or forty years. I mean it's just been a problem. The sportsmen that I've talked to for the last two years, and I am a sportsmen's representative and I talk to a lot of them, all feel like and they've all give me the same feeling, we've got to do whatever we've got to do to help bring our deer herd back. Put bigger bounties on the coyotes, you know, kill more lions, go to the legislature, and write your legislatures to get more money for highway crossings. I'm in the construction business and we just did a wildlife crossing up here on I-70 this last year to the tune of millions of dollars. Those are the kinds of things that we're going to need to do going forward in order to increase our deer herd is to reduce highway mortality, help with the predation, and also as hunters we've all got to sacrifice something. And I'm willing to sacrifice as a rifle hunter, I've sacrificed, you know I can't hunt the whole southern region. I've got to put in for a draw. I'm going to put in for the Boulder Mountain unit because I had a ranch over there that I go hunt on every year. This year my hunt

got cut to five days. Well that's not a big deal. I still went over there, had a good time with my family. But my feeling is and I feel very strongly about this, if the rifle hunters and the muzzleloader hunters are going to sacrifice and go to unit-by-unit management I feel like the archery hunters should make some kind of sacrifice too. And if that means you have to choose a unit, you're already getting to hunt 28 days on the first hunt plus the extended archery on the Wasatch Front, I don't feel like that's asking too much for you guys to help, to step in and help with the rest of us to bring this deer herd back. And I know that that's the feeling of a lot of sportsmen, especially here in Southern Utah. That's all I've got, thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thank you, Brian.

Brian Johnson: I've got a comment. Those are some great points. As we sit up here I think we've been charged to make decisions based on biology. And as we look at this I've done a lot of thinking about this and you just mentioned the extended archery hunt up in Salt Lake, and that hunt goes for the third week in August to the last day of November on bucks. There's no rifle hunting, there's no muzzleloader hunting. And that unit right there has 35 bucks per 100 does. And everybody in this room wants to see more bucks per does, more buck to doe ratio and more deer. And that unit up there, that little subunit probably has more hunting pressure than any other unit in the state and it has the most deer on it than any unit in the state, buck to doe ratio that's general season. I talked to the biologist just yesterday and he said that all bow hunters effectively do on that unit is just herd deer and keep them out of town. And that's why they instigated it, it's been fifteen years. And so as we make these decisions I understand that it's a social issue and the perception is that bow hunters get 28 days but they also can't kill a deer at 500 yards. And so I'm just throwing this out there. I just think it's worthy of discussion is all that I'm saying. You have a unit like that up there that has a lot of bucks per does. So I just . . . A lot of big ones, yes and it's a great opportunity. That right there is a pretty good model of what a lot states have gone to, everywhere else just because of either public pressure or to increase opportunity and have less impact on the herd. Archery hunters take around 16 to 18 percent. Muzzleloader hunters take around 45 percent and rifle deer hunters take anywhere from 35 to 45 percent depending on the year and the weather conditions. And so those are just a lot of things to think about. I'm just throwing that out there for discussion points.

Steve Flinders: Thanks, anybody else? Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Thank you. I will tell you, I have been an bow hunter back when we used long bows. You know I've done this forever, you probably can tell by the grey in my beard. But one of the things and I agree with Layne on this, you know we have gone from for many years trying to get where we could get down and start managing these units, controlling the number of hunters in the units. We've made sacrifices just throughout, all the way. We've really tried to do things, and after the meeting last year, anything we can to try to help the deer herd. To do something to let this deer herd come back. And the point that Brian just made, well there you go. I mean we pamper bow hunters to the, I mean there is just no limit; the long seasons, you get an extended hunt. Nobody's even mentioned elk but we have all kinds of hunting. I think with even on the spike archery I think it's unlimited for youth. I think that they can get all the tags they want to hunt. So I think we provide an awful lot of opportunity for archers and it just upsets me that we're just finally getting this going and the first boot hasn't hit the ground and we are wanting to change it. You know we've just put too much effort into this. There's been too much sacrifice. And I feel strongly that we need to go with this plan like Layne was saying, for five or so years and get this controlled. Where it's all speculation on how it's going to turn out and what's going to happen. But I am, I totally agree with what DeLoss has said here and I feel strongly that we need to

support the recommendations that the Board and the RACs put out last year and make the archers tow the line just like the rest of us have.

Steve Flinders: Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: Yeah. I don't want to beat a dead horse but we go through this every time and it just seems like there's no end to what archers want. I mean, I know that there was a presentation given in St. George and the question was asked, well why do you want that? And the answer from the archer was because we deserve it. Now why are you archers any better than the muzzleloader hunter or the rifle hunter? No trust me, I used to archery hunt. I don't any more. I have not one thing against archers. But somewhere we've got to draw the line and we can't just keep giving and giving and you guys need to take a stand to maybe support the deer herd, not your own personal interests. And like I said, I agree with everything Layne and Sam said. I think it's time that we just say okay. If it were up to me I would say the archery hunt should be two weeks, you draw your unit.

Steve Flinders: Other comments? Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I'd like to echo my sentiments with Brian, with all due respect to my other good friends here on this board. Archers are not hurting our deer herd, period. That's biological fact. Why we're beating up on them I have no idea. The whole essence of hunting archery is the solo experience out in the mountain. If we condense it to 14 days we blow that. I think Anis, wasn't it last year they hunted an average of 9 or 11 days on an archer, something like that?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, depending on whether it's a deer or elk archer, they hunt roughly around 11 days.

Clair Woodbury: Okay, we condense this to 14 days and every archer in the state almost is out there for the hunt bumping into each other creating a bad situation. Take less than 10 percent success on the tags. There's no reason for us to beat up on the archers. A couple of other things, I know Gary Allen mentioned the tags on the Fish Lake for the elk, the elk herd numbers at 2,400, I think it's actually 4,800 in comparing that to the Monroe. Also, the nine-day rifle hunt was a wonderful experience this year again. Middle of the week opened back up to light hunting pressure. I was able to go out with my boys and have a good hunt again, rather than a five-day condensed hunt with most people out there. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Clair, other comments? Sure Mike.

Mike Worthen: Thank you. I kind of agree with my colleagues down here, that this new system that we are going into, lets give it a try because I've been in a lot of other states hunting, I've lived in other states. I was raised here in Utah. But the deer problem isn't endemic to Utah, it's west wide; it's a real problem. And I've scratched my head and scratched my head wondering what in the heck was it? We blame predators but predators are a problem when the deer herds can't sustain the predations. So something has happened before the predators became a problem that allowed it to get down in. And I've worked with the livestock industry for years and I am sure there's a few in the room that can remember driving from Cedar City to Fillmore and seeing thousands of deer in the 50's and 60's. And then about 70 we started to see that gradual decline. And if you look at the livestock industry it was about the same time that they saw that gradual decline in AUMs, the habitat started to grow to where the deer couldn't get to it and maybe there's a correlation there. The nonuse of the Federal lands or the public lands is a

problem with the deer herd. Not so much the others, the others is a symptom of the deer herds. The predation is a problem when the deer can't take the predation, the population can't sustain it. So maybe there's something in there that mismanagement of our Federal lands is a huge problem that nobody's really looked at to see what relationship livestock grazing has had on that. Because back in the 40's, 50's and 60's was probably the highest grazing this country has ever seen where we had millions of sheep out on the range that was grazing that browse down to where new shoots would come out and the deer would survive on those where we were knocking the brush down to where they could get to good feed. And now we don't have that; we see sterile environments to where the elk do all right but the deer just take it in the shorts every year. And maybe we need to look at other areas. But this 29-unit system that we've got, I really think it gives the deer a chance. We have hunters that follow the deer on top of the mountain clear down into the winter range or the breeding ranges and really cause havoc on those last two days of the hunt. And for the life of me, and with the old system we could follow them deer around just about wherever we wanted to go. And now I think it's going to be a little better. I think we owe the deer a chance to see if this system is going to work and maybe work on some other areas such as limited hunts in some areas that we don't see them objectives instead of continue to push nine-day hunts or continue to push them deer to their limit. And that's about all I've got to say.

Steve Flinders: Thanks, anybody else? Mack.

Mack Morrell: This last month we have attended the elk management plan and different units, and I have been a party to two of those. And my personal feeling is, yes we need to do something with the deer. And the smaller units will help but the increase in the elk herd I think is very damaging to the deer herd. They've moved the deer out. They're moving them in town because deer are very fragile and they don't survive with pressure from the elk. The elk can, it's easy to control elk, all you've got to do is just kill them. Deer die, you know? And I think that looking at the elk management plan I think that the numbers of the elk should be reduced, that along with the smaller units to see what it would do to the deer population. I mean we're just talking the smaller units now but I think the big problem is in the winter time elk very directly compete with deer on the winter range, and deer can't stand that pressure and they move. It's also a social thing with deer and elk. You don't see deer where elk are at. That's all I've got to say.

Steve Flinders: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: One more, I forgot the most important thing Steve. ... Besides I think Mike's got a great point, we need to get more millions of sheep out there. Back in those days the coyotes took the sheep first and left the deer. I remember those days. Just a light moment there Brian.

Brian Johnson: Coyotes are hungry feed em sheep.

Clair Woodbury: They're just easier to catch. But on the smaller deer unit management let's not anybody suppose that all of us are in favor of it. I opposed it last year after a lot of thought. I've heard unlimited references to the smaller units in Nevada and how they do it. Nevada's been unit by unit for many decades. If you've read the Nevada deer studies they're at an all time low, right at 100,000. We're following their plan almost verbatim. Just a thought.

Steve Flinders: Let's stay on point now. More comments? Are we inching towards motions? We're talking about season dates on 30 units.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, I still want to make a comment.

Steve Flinders: Sure Sam

Sam Carpenter: While we've got all these bow hunting people here and these organizations.... I bewilders me why you guys are not trying to do something with the elk hunt and getting your archery hunts during the rut, the rifle have. And hunting with primitive weapons, I mean now there is a good goal for you guys to get squared away. This is the only state in the west, I think, where we rifle hunt during the rut and bow hunt and muzzleload in the fringes. And I just think that would be great. And one other comment is I totally disagree that these deer can be run from one end of the state to the other by archers and not have some stress and casualties to go along with that. I just don't get it when they say they don't have any impact on buck to doe ratios, well I think if you kill a buck you had impact. It may not be, it may be a decimal point in that ratio but it does affect it. And on that unless there are any further comments I'd like to make a recommendation.

Steve Flinders: Go Ahead

Sam Carpenter: I would like to recommend we accept the proposal as presented.

Brian Johnson: I would like to amend that.

Steve Flinders: A motion on the table, seconded by Mike Worthen.

Brian Johnson: Can I amend it?

Steve Flinders: Go ahead.

Brian Johnson: I am a little bit rusty on my Robert's Rules here. Um, I would like to first amend that motion with changing the Willard Peak, change the Willard Peak hunt dates to . . .

Steve Flinders: Those that were written into the record by UBA.

Brian Johnson: Yes, the September 10 – 23rd, the late hunt being September 24 – October 14th, and the Nanny from October 1 – October 14th.

Steve Flinders: Two ways that can deal with that. Sam, did you want to make that part of your motion?

Sam Carpenter: Was this recommendation made at the other RAC meetings that they are doing right here?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, it was and it was voted on and accepted by both.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, yeah, I'll second what he just said.

Steve Flinders: So with an amended motion? Is it, Mike do you still second that?

Brian Johnson: I'd like to amend it one more time. I've waited a long time to get up here guys.

Steve Flinders: All right, let's here it.

Brian Johnson: I would like to amend it to go back to statewide archery.

Steve Flinders: So I am guessing Sam you're not going to accept that amendment to your motion?

Sam Carpenter: Absolutely not.

Steve Flinders: So we're going to vote on these motions separately. Lets vote on the modified original motion, you better read that back to us.

Douglas Messerly: Vote on the statewide first.

Steve Flinders: Yeah, we're going to vote on the statewide as it was amended, which is as recommend with those Willard Peak modified dates.

? : You vote on the latest amendment first.

Douglas Messerly: You make it statewide archery first. You deal with that first then you work through the amendment.

Steve Flinders: All right we can. We'll go backwards. So, we'll work on the amended motion all by itself, statewide archery by Brian Johnson, seconded by Clair Woodbury. Any discussion on it. Speaking of Rusty. Let's vote it, those in favor? Those against? Did you get that vote? Motion fails.

Brian Johnson made the motion to amend the motion and return back to a statewide archery hunt. Clair Woodbury seconded. 2 in favor, 9 opposed (Cordell Pearson, Mike Worthen, Layne Torgerson, Mike Staheli, Dave Black, Sam Carpenter, Rusty Aiken Dale Bagley, Mack Morrell opposed). Amendment to Motion fails.

Steve Flinders: Back to the original amended motion.

Brian Johnson: We going to do the name separate or just, oh, it's accepted.

Steve Flinders: Do we need to restate it? Yeah, they've been read in twice I think. Any questions on that motion was as presented with the Willard Peak modified dates? Those in favor? Those against? Motion passes. Did you get that vote? Clair and Brian are against.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline as presented with an amendment changing the Willard Peak hunt dates to September 10-23rd, the late hunt running September 24-October 14th and the Nanny hunt from October 1-October 14th. Mike Worthen seconded. 9 in favor, 2 opposed (Clair Woodbury, Brian Johnson opposed) Motion carried.

Steve Flinders: All right, moving on to the next action item on the agenda - CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers- Boyd.

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012 (action)
- Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator 1:27:36 to 1:31:51 of 1:55:17
(See attachment 1)

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Thanks Boyd. Questions from the RAC? Brian.

Brian Johnson: I was just wondering, those guys down there have done a pretty good job managing that. What was their reason for wanting five to one? Is someone here?

Steve Flinders: Wade is here; we'll get to that. He's got a comments card. Hang on Wade. Sam have you got a separate question?

Brian Johnson: Well then my question is why is the recommendation three to one? I'm ignorant to this.

Boyd Blackwell: Because what we do is we take the overall number of permits that are available to the public, we take the proportion or the size of the CWMU to the overall unit so they get a percentage of the permits. And when you take the size of the CWMU versus the size of the unit and then the number of permits, total permits available to the public, they qualify for four permits. Then we break that down in a ninety/ ten split and they get three and the public gets one.

Steve Flinders: Sam

Sam Carpenter: Okay my question would be I've talked to Wade on this. They acquired another 1,240 acres. Was that figured in to what you've got here?

Boyd Blackwell: Yes.

Sam Carpenter: That was all a part of what you did? Okay.

Boyd Blackwell: Yes.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public? Wade. How are you doing?

Wade Heaton: Good sir, how are you? Wade Heaton, Alton CWMU. I've talked to a good bit of you already about this but I just wanted to fill in some of the gaps. First, I apologize for being the only problem child out of 116, I really do. You're meeting is long enough. But I do, there are a few point I want to get across, and the first one is as Sam brought up, in 2010, as a matter of fact the last two years,

we have gotten five management buck permits on the CWMU; four private and one public. We did increase the acreage on the CWMU this year. We added an additional 1,240 acres. And at any point that we've done that in the past, whether we put acreage in or we took acreage out we adjusted the permit numbers. And 1,240 just didn't justify a trophy permit but we felt like we were justified in at least asking for a management buck permit. And truth of it is we didn't really care if that went to the public or the private, but we felt like that at least we at least justified that adding that additional acreage into the unit that we could manage and utilize for the wildlife. At that point the Division informed me that they were actually recommending one less permit despite the fact that we were increasing the acreage on the CWMU. And so I am a little bit confused. I understand their reasoning for doing it but I am a little confused why the percentage was fine in '09 and 2010 at five permits and now suddenly that we've increased more acreage now the ratio is not fine and we need to decrease back to four permits. Anyway, I feel like we're doing a good thing on the Alton CWMU. I feel like this management program is a good thing. It's worked well on the Paunsagaunt; it's worked well on the CWMU. And it has given people the opportunity to go in and hunt and been able to remove some of those deer and we've been able to work on that buck to doe ratio a little bit. And that's the whole goal of that management program is to work on that buck to doe ratio. And we've tried to do our part with the Alton CWMU. So I just ask that you'd support us in that request for five private and one public tag for those managements.

Steve Flinders: Question for you Wade, from Sam.

Sam Carpenter: How would you feel if they just left it the same as last year?

Wade Heaton: Well at this point I would almost say that would work. I mean I was a little shell shocked, we asked for one more and they asked for one less despite the acreage. Truthfully, I mean we're not trying to be greedy. I mean if it ended up four and one again I'm not going to cry myself to sleep tonight.

Sam Carpenter: Okay, let me ask you another question. And this is just a rumor to me, but my understanding is you're nineteen trophy permits you used for of them for management and you don't necessarily take a trophy deer off the unit with those.

Wade Heaton: We have actually done that for about 5 years now. And out of those nineteen permits we take five of them and actually harvest management bucks with those. And it's worked out great. I think it's helped our buck to doe ratio and has helped some of those less desirable bucks not quite get as old as they normally would have. And so really yeah, we are asking for an additional on top of those so we're harvesting 40 percent of our total bucks harvested are management bucks.

Steve Carpenter: Go ahead Brian.

Brian Johnson: I have a question for you. I love the CWMU program. I think that I would personally support the four private and two public, just to give a little more public opportunity down there. I don't know how the rest of the RAC, that's probably part of the discussion, but you said you'd be okay with that?

Wade Heaton: You know to me the principal of the matter is if we're increasing the size of the CWMU the proportion of permits needs to increase. And so sure, if it ended up four and two I'd be totally happy. The principal of the matter would have been satisfied.

Brian Johnson: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Administrative points.

Douglas Messerly: Wade do you have any idea what percentage of the total deer habitat you have on the Paunsagaunt unit?

Wade Heaton: I do.

Douglas Messerly: What is it?

Wade Heaton: Uh, we're roughly, the CWMU itself . . . well . . .

Douglas Messerly: The CWMU itself is what percentage?

Wade Heaton: Are we going to use usable deer habitat or just total pieces of dirt?

Douglas Messerly: Deer habitat. The formula we use to calculate this.

Wade Heaton: Whether there's deer on it or not, if we use every piece of dirt the deer could walk on we end up being about sevenish percent. The last time I figured it.

Douglas Messerly: Say it again.

Wade Heaton: Sevenish. Seven percent.

Douglas Messerly: Seven percent. What percent of the premium tags do you get, do you know?

Wade Heaton: It's been approximately ten. I mean that's where it's always been. So about ten.

Douglas Messerly: Okay. Do you know how many management buck tags there were this year?

Wade Heaton: Yep.

Douglas Messerly: How many?

Wade Heaton: There's 75 on the Paunsagaunt and five on the CWMU.

Douglas Messerly: What's seven percent of that?

Wade Heaton: I'm just going to say it's real close to that.

Douglas Messerly: Four. That's exactly the formula we use ladies and gentleman. And that's how we figure it out is based on the percentage of deer habitat that the CWMU has. And we do this with every CWMU in the state. Everyone is allocated tags this same way. And you know it's interesting to hear when the property increases then tags should increase. If you weren't already over allocated I would

agree with that. But that's where the problem lies really. And if there's some confusion about why we didn't grant an increase because you increased acreage it's because you're already over allocated.

Wade Heaton: And I totally understand that Doug, I really do. And I appreciate that. I appreciate that point. And I guess the only place I would say I was coming from is we're using tools to set those permit numbers that I think could be more accurate. You know if we actually sat down and started to talk about deer densities and started talking about what percentage does the CWMU bring to the table as far as total benefit to that herd, and deer density, usable acreage, acreage that actually gets used then I think we're looking at a different discussion and a whole different number. Maybe we're under allocated.

Douglas Messerly: And I couldn't agree with you more. And I suggest that you have the CWMU association bring that point forward and have that formula adjusted statewide.

Wade Heaton: That's a good idea.

Steve Flinders: To that point the packet has 4.3 percent of the habitat for the Alton CWMU. Is it four or seven? 4.3. And Wade's point is you should take quality of habitat and other things into consideration and we'd have to readdress the rule. Or could address the rule or could do what the RAC sees fit. But thanks Wade, appreciate it.

Comments from the public:

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: RAC comment, discussion, motion?

Sam Carpenter: I just want to ask, why did we cut a percent if we, I mean why did we give them the extra permit the year before and now cut it now, why now? I mean did you use this formula?

Douglas Messerly: If you remember how this came about in the first year that we had management buck tags on the Paunsagaunt unit the Alton CWMU asked for management buck tags. We declined because it was a new program and we wanted to see how it worked. They went to the Wildlife Board and the Wildlife Board granted them five permits. Where they came up with that number I don't know. But that's how it came to be.

Sam Carpenter: And then we just started using the formula then this year.

Douglas Messerly: Well we started actually allocating those permits as per the formula this year to CWMUs, yeah.

Steve Flinders: Mike.

Mike Worthen: I guess I am a little confused on why, if there is a formula why do the CWMUs come and request permits? Shouldn't the formula dictate how many permits are given to each CWMU regardless of what they want?

Steve Flinders: Never hurts to ask.

Douglas Messerly: That's our plan. We use the formula. We calculate those. If we can't come to an agreement with the Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit based on the formula on those they're given the opportunity to come here and argue for more than what the others are getting, essentially. And it's your charge to hear those arguments and decide if they have merit. Sometimes the RAC and the Wildlife Board grant CWMUs special, special deals.

Steve Flinders: It boils down to the RAC and Wildlife Board set the rules, the Division has to live by them. The RAC and the Wildlife Board can break them. Any other discussion?

Cordell Pearson: No but I would like to make a motion.

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Cordell.

Cordell Pearson: I would to make the motion that we accept as presented by DNR.

Steve Flinders: Motioned by Cordell, seconded by Clair. Any further discussion. Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I think we need to leave the CWMU permits the same as they were in 2011

Steve Flinders: Lets vote on the motion on the table.

Brian Johnson: I will second that. Is that an amendment?

Steve Flinders: Is that a motion Sam?

Sam Carpenter: That's an amendment to the motion.

Steve Flinders: Do you guys want to accept that amendment? Yeah, we'll make it, or you could make it part of your motion.

Cordell Pearson: I would like to ask a question, what was last years, five? Five total, wasn't it? Four and one? And you were asking for seven and one? So you're asking for the same as you had last year.

Steve Flinders: He's asking for one more.

Cordell Pearson, No, I won't put that in my motion.

Steve Flinders: No, he doesn't want to make it part of his motion. So we have an amended motion on the floor, to leave it the same as last year. Which is not what Wade asked for but it's a compromise. Motion by Sam, seconded by Brian. Four and one? Any discussion on the amendment? Let's vote on the amendment. Four and one, motion by Sam, seconded by Brian. Those in favor? Hold your hands up. Those against. Passed. Did you get that counted? We better vote again, we've got confusion in those that need to keep us honest. Those in favor again of the amended motion please signify. Those against? 6 to 5, the amendment passes. So we need to vote on the original motion now that carries the balance of

things, which is the rest of the CWMU package. Those in favor? Any against? That was unanimous. Good job Boyde.

Sam Carpenter made an amendment to the motion to keep the permit numbers same as last year on the Alton CWMU. Seconded by Brian Johnson. 6 in favor, 5 opposed (Dale Bagley, Layne Torgerson, Cordell Pearson, Clair Woodbury, Mack Morrell opposed).

Cordell Pearson made the motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012 as presented. Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion carried unanimously

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012 (action) 1:45:52 to 1:46:52 of 1:55:17

-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

(See attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: That is brief. Questions from the RAC?

Questions from the RAC:

None

Questions from the Public:

Steve Flinders: Questions from the public?

None

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: I have no comment cards.

None

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: It's ours to deal with. Anybody want to make a motion? Layne.

Layne Torgerson: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we accept the Landowner Association Recommendations as presented.

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

Layne Torgerson made the motion to accept the Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012 as presented. Seconded Dale Bagley. Motion carried unanimously.

Other Business (contingent)
-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: I have no other business this time. What's your other business Clair?

Clair Woodbury: In other business I would like to ask the RAC and the Wildlife Board to add to their action log a question from one of my constituents. Is it possible to have a dedicated hunter program for elk? I had never thought about it. I had no answer for him. But it's something that we can think about and maybe look at in the future. That's all.

Brian Johnson: I have one other. One other comment. And this is just would be more informational, what's being done as far as toxic shot, toxic lead for deer hunting in the areas where the California Condor can be located in winter?

Steve Flinders: Anis, I'm glad you are still here. Do you want to field both of those items? I've heard dedicated hunters for elk batted around before, do you recall any?

Anis Aoude: Yeah, we have heard it before, people have asked about it. I don't know how we would go about it. There is really, I guess we could do the three-weapon type thing. I don't administer the dedicated hunter program so I'd have to, you know, just get a feel of what Riana's approach would be to that.

Steve Flinders: I think that for starters before we ask the Wildlife Board to put something on the action log we need a proposal in front of us. And what did, the member of the public that contacted you puts that proposal together or someone else . . .

Clair Woodbury: Yeah it was a member of the public, one of my constituents. A constituent had asked me about it and I hadn't heard about it and I thought well I, I told them I would pass it on.

Douglas Messerly: Let me ask you a question Clair. What is it that you expect back from that request, a presentation at a RAC meeting?

Clair Woodbury: No, just a letter that that the people think about it and maybe say even why it wouldn't work or why it possible could work and we could discuss it in the future.

Douglas Messerly: We've discussed it at length actually. I sat on the committee that determined, that decided what to do with unit by unit, or that decided what to do with dedicated hunters when we went to unit by unit. One of the proposals was to do away with the dedicated hunter program. One of the other proposals was to make it an elk dedicated hunter program. The problem with that is there's no incentive for people to join a dedicated elk-hunting program. Tags are over the counter, they do sell out but it's not until the end. And the primary draw for the dedicated hunter program is and always will be the guaranteed tag for deer, which are difficult to get otherwise. Without that draw it would be difficult to get people to commit to the extra work. People are free to come volunteer their time at the Division of Wildlife any time they want to to help wildlife. They don't have to be in one of these programs. But I'm not sure, I think the reason that it hasn't been proposed or that it probably wouldn't fly if it were to be proposed is that the administrative costs of keeping a totally separate system would far outweigh any

benefit that a limited number of participants would gain from that. I think that's the problem.

Clair Woodbury: The one thing I would add, and I agree that's the biggest draw is the guaranteed tag. Also, very high on the importance list is being able to hunt all three hunts. That would be the draw.

Douglas Messerly: Sure, increased opportunity would be the draw. And I'm not sure what the draw would be with elk. What increased opportunity? You could hunt, I guess you could hunt all three seasons with elk but I'm not sure how big of an issue that would be.

Clair Woodbury: I don't either. I know I would like to hunt more than just the rifle elk hunt. When I can't find one and I know they herd back up for the muzzleload hunt.

Douglas Messerly: Well put in for a cow tag.

Anis Aoude: And the way that these are usually handled if it does go on the action log for the Wildlife Board is they would ask Riana to look into it. She would gain some statistics and come back with a recommendation to whether she would want to go forward, cost benefit analysis, all which would be done by her program. So that's usually how action items work, if that's what the RAC wants to . . .

Clair Woodbury: I'll pass that on to him and if he wants to pursue it he can.

Anis Aoude: Okay. As far as non-toxic shot . . . So the past couple of years what we've been doing is trying to guess which hunters are hunting those areas, because as we know . . . well we know how many hunt the Paunsagaunt but the Zion unit was encompassed in the Southern Region RAC. So what we have done in the past is through the drawing try to find out what folks do hunt that. So we ask them a question when they're putting in for a drawing, will you hunt the Zion unit? And then we gather that list and send them all a letter with a voucher to redeem for twenty dollars off non-toxic shot. So it's basically a, it's an incentive program, it's not a mandatory thing. So as we go to unit by unit this will become easier. We will know who drew permits for those units. And on the Paunsagaunt and the Zion unit we would actually target those people specifically and give them that opportunity to basically try to get twenty bucks off of, if they buy a non-toxic shot.

Brian Johnson: Okay, and just for a point of interest. The organization that I represent isn't interested in banning toxic shot. They understand that there's a unique balance between wildlife and sportsman and the preservation of wildlife and they are for those sportsman dollars increasing their opportunity to view wildlife and they wanted me to just pass along that they really appreciate what everybody is doing for the sport and for the continuation of extending the opportunity to see and to view and be a non-consumptive user of that. And I just wanted to pass that along and I'll pass this information back. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Mike.

Mike Worthen: With regards to the condor, in fact I am working on this with the county right now because they've got a five-year review that the Fish and Wildlife Service have to answer to. The condor is a nonessential experimental population meaning they don't carry any specific regulations that the states have to abide by. But as mentioned it is appreciated probably that you use non-toxic shot because they do consume animals that are shot and that's probably one of the bigger mortalities that these birds have. And heaven forbid that we get them as an endangered species because then we'd have problems.

But anyway, that's basically where they, where that stands.

Steve Flinders: Any other discussion tonight? Accept a motion to adjourn? Motion by Cordell.

Clair Woodbury: I'll second that.

Steve Flinders: Second by Clair.

Cordell Pearson made the motion to adjourn. Seconded by Clair Woodbury . Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

**Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
November 16, 2011 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.**

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written.

VOTE: Passed unanimously

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline

MOTION: To accept as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimously

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012

MOTION: To accept as presented.

VOTE: Passed Unanimously

Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012

MOTION: To accept as presented

VOTE: Passed with one abstention vote

RAC Members Present

**Kevin Albrecht, USFS
Seth Allred, At Large
Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor
Sue Bellagamba, Non-Consumptive
Blair Eastman, Agriculture
Wayne Hoskisson, Non-Consumptive
Todd Huntington, Vice Chairman
Derris Jones, Chairman
Darrel Mecham, Sportsman
Christine Micoz, At Large
Pamela Riddle, BLM
Charlie Tracy, Agriculture**

RAC Members Absent

**Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official
Travis Pehrson, Sportsman**

**Others Present
Mike King, Board Member**

Public in Attendance

21

1) **Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure**
-Derris Jones, RAC chairman

Derris Jones- Lets go ahead and get started tonight, we have three actions items we need to handle tonight. History shows that sometimes it takes several hours to get some of these agenda items. First order is the approval of the agenda.

2) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
-Derris Jones, RAC Chairman

Derris Jones- Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

Todd Huntington- I make a motion to approve the agenda as is.

Kevin Albrecht- I second the motion.

Derris Jones-Approval of minutes? Has everybody had a chance to look through the minutes? I appreciate you getting those to us Brent.

Sue Bellagamba- I make a motion to approve the minutes as is.

Chris Micoz- I will second it.

Derris Jones-All in favor? Opposed? I don't think we took a vote on the agenda. All in favor of the agenda? The agenda has been approved unanimously.

3) **Old Business**
-Derris Jones, RAC Chairman

Derris Jones- I am going to have Mike King give a quick update on what happened at the Board Meeting on the Aquatic Proclamation. Is there any other old business?

Chris Micoz- Did we ever approve the minutes from the meeting before the last meeting?

Derris Jones- Probably not. Let's go ahead, is there a motion to approve the July 27th Cougar minutes?

Kevin Albrecht- I will make a motion.

Todd Huntington- Second.

Derris Jones- All in favor? Unanimous.

Mike King- The Wildlife Board meeting wasn't much different than the RAC meeting, talking about the fishing items that came before you, so essentially the Wildlife Board approved everything that all of the RAC approved and did that unanimously, there were three main items, the private fishing ponds, the fishing contest, and the fishing guide

book, and all of those passed unanimously and beyond that, there wasn't much other business, there were a few variances that was approved but that was really about it. That is my report Derris, is there anything else that came out of that?

Derris Jones- No

Mike King- The next Wildlife Board meeting is December 1, 2011, so if you have anything that you would like me to present to the board or to discuss with the board, let me know and I would be happy to do that. There is also a working session the day before that meeting on November 30th and if there is something you would like me to bring forth to that meeting, I would be happy to do that too. I don't know how that works for getting things on that agenda but I am happy to explore that if there is something you think we need to discuss there in that meeting and I think it begins at 1:00 pm on the 30th of November. That is a public meeting as well, so that will be streamed live just like the board meetings are.

Derris Jones- Thanks Mike.

**4) Regional Update (Informational)
-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor**

Bill Bates- I hope everybody notices we have new microphones and new sound equipment and hopefully our recordings will be better, we have had quite a bit of problem with picking up all of the conversations, so if everybody would just make sure you bring these nice new mics right over there where they can hear you, we would appreciate it. I will try to quickly do our regional overview. Aquatics section has been really busy, they have been doing gill netting and also have been working on the project up Ferron Reservoir, the 5th of October they did gill netting at Scofield and caught what would be the state record Tiger Trout at 3 lbs and 8 oz. Now we don't have a category for Tiger Trout in the state angling records, but it just shows there is some really nice fish up there. The bad news was they did catch a lot of Chubs and we were hoping that the Tiger Muskie's and the Cutthroat Trout would reduce the number of Chubs but maybe over the next few years that will play out and obviously these fish are eating a lot of them and doing really well. The Tiger Trout at Electric Lake we also did some sampling there and we caught some nice ones there as well and the Tiger Muskies in Joe's Valley are up around 30 inches we expect those to be up around 40 inches by late next summer. The Aquatics section also done some river shocking up on Straight Canyon just yesterday, we were looking to see if any Tiger Muskies have come out of the dam at Joe's Valley down into the stream and we have not found any, even with the high water this year, we did find we had some Splake that had washed over and that was a little bit of a surprise, we caught about 24 of those but some really nice Browns in that section.

Brent has been really busy and will continue to be, he has a Mule Deer watch this Saturday at Nash Wash at 2:00 pm at the Cisco exit and Brent is going to take some people out and show them some rutting mule deer and kind of talk deer biology, so if anyone is interested or if you have friends that are, go ahead and send them. They have also been busy with radio shows and the State Fair and the Green River Big Horn Sheep watch is scheduled for the 3rd of December, now we used to do the Big Horn Sheep Festival down in Moab about this next Saturday but this is what we did instead this year.

I went and spoke at the River Rendezvous convention they had down there and spoke about restoring native wildlife, unfortunately it wasn't recorded so nobody will ever know what I said, but it was fun none the less.

Law Enforcement has been really busy, they have documented 84 different investigations and issued 83 citations, they have investigated 10 poached elk, three of those were trophy bulls, 14 deer, and there were 4 major cases that were made and those included illegal hunting on CWMU's, 2 cases of non resident permit fraud, and taking a branch antler bull on a spike unit. I think last time we spoke about the Corolla, the lesson is here, we appreciate Facebook. I think that picture was taken right off Facebook. The license plate was right there and it was tracked down and so it worked out very well.

The Habitat Section has also been very busy, they have been doing the Habitat projects, on Veteran's Day they went to Moab and did some plantings down there, and they have been working on the Grimes Wash Habitat and flew in some seed on Airplane Springs on the Henry Mountains.

The Wildlife Section has been involved with Youth Chukar and Pheasant Hunts, CWD sampling and they will be getting deer classifications soon, they are also coming up of the middle of Big Horn Sheep flights, that is the reason I am a little bit incoherent, I have been up flying with them today. Getting back to CWD, we have had 3 positives so far, all in our region, one was on the La Sals where we have had it in the past, and it was up by Geyser Pass up where that one was taken. We did have one taken down in San Juan County in unit 14. That is the first time that unit has had a positive. Unfortunately, the hunter that took one was one of our employees and so we are going to make him the State Wide CWD caller because now he knows what he is looking for, but it was quite a surprise. The other one came from the Manti, it was taken up by Potters Pond. It was also a surprise because we haven't had anything on this side of Skyline Drive before. There have been some interesting results. Are there any questions? These are all deer, we have only had one elk test positive, and that was on The La Sals 2 years ago.

If it is ok Derris, I would like to turn just a minute to Mark Martinez, Mark is from our Salt Lake office and he works with the internet and social media and he has a little bit of information that pertains to what we are talking about tonight about boundary maps on the internet.

Mark Martinez- Hi, as Bill mentioned, my name is Mark Martinez, and I work with outreach in the Salt Lake office on the website and I have actually been traveling to all of the division offices giving training on the maps features that we have on the website as well as the website in general, if you haven't visited yet, we have a part of our site that is dedicated to the maps and boundaries for hunting units, this is something I am doing training for because it's an expanding feature, something we just developed over the last year, and it is a major work in process, so I am getting feedback from the regions and finding out what questions they have, what concerns our customers have, and we are going to go back and use that information to make the website much more user friendly. I would encourage everybody, if you haven't visited the site to please go and do so, you can get to it from the main menu on our website, we already have a FAQ for the 30 deer hunting units, so if you are interested in seeing the maps for that, we have PDF's available now and we are working on getting interactive maps out as well. If anyone does find any issues, or if they have any questions, or if they want to provide feedback, they can either let me know directly at markmartinez@utah.gov or you can go to DWR Comment and send an email there and they will route it to me. Thank you for your time.

Bill Bates- Mark, will that be available as an app like on your iphone or smart phone?

Mark Martinez- We don't have plans in the direct future, but we are programming it in a way that it will be compatible with smart phones, so if you go to that page on an ipad or a tablet, it will look really good. If you go on a phone, you can use it but it is not really set up for the small screen of a mobile phone, but we are looking at optimizing it for mobile devices in the future.

Bill Bates- Are you going to have an app for guide books?

Mark Martinez- Not in the near future, not an app specifically, I am working on ways to make the guide books more readable, so we will offer a Kindle edition and an ePub edition, which is a digital book edition. Thank you.

Derris Jones- Before we get started on the action items, for those in the audience that have never been to a RAC meeting before, the process we are going to use is the DWR is going to present their presentation on their recommendation. After they are done with their presentation, we will have questions from the RAC to clarify to any information presented at that time. After the RAC is done asking questions, then I am going to open it up to the public out here to ask questions for clarification also. I ask that you not try to turn a comment into a question form, we are not going to play Jeopardy with trying to make a comment a question. I promise I will give everybody an opportunity during the comment period to get their comments put forward, but try to use the question period for clarification so that you know understand what the division is presenting so you can form your own opinion and bring your comments forward. That comment period will be right after the questions from the public, as soon as the questions from the public are over we will right to the comment period and I ask that everybody in the audience that wants to have a comment to fill out one of these yellow cards back there on that table, as they come up I will put them on the bottom of the pile and we will start with the first one I've got and go through that. I am going to ask that individuals limit their comment period to 4 minutes and if you are representing an organization, I will give you 10 minutes. If 4 minutes is not enough to get your comment through to me then I will consider giving you what time you need but if you are just repeating yourself over and over I will ask you quit at 4 minutes. Once the audience, the public has given their comments, I am going to close it to the public as far as presenting any more comments, at that point, we will discuss amongst the RAC members and form a motion and make a vote and that motion will be carried forward to the Wildlife Board for their consideration at the board meeting on December 1st. So with that, let's get started with the presentation.

**5) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline (Action)
-Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Anis Aoude- Thank you Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned I will be presenting the Bucks & Bulls OIAL season dates, a lot of the information I will be presenting is dealing with general information and a lot of other seasons in your packets that are in a presentation like this, I can't go into, so if you have looked at those and have any questions about them, feel free to ask me questions about those as well. As you know

this coming year in 2012 this will be the first year we will hunt general season on a unit by unit by basis, so as Mark said earlier a lot of the information you need is on our website with a FAQ page and maps of the units and boundary descriptions and all of the above. Again, I would be happy to answer any questions you have here as well.

In this RAC, we are only going to be setting season dates, the permit numbers for all of our hunts including antlerless will be set in April RAC and May board meeting. So, for general season deer, really the seasons haven't changed a whole lot from last year they just shift a little bit to allow for a Saturday opener, so the archery season will start August 18th and end on September 14th, the muzzleloader season will start on September 26th and go thru October 4th and any weapon season is October 20th thru October 28th. The archery is 28 days and the muzzleloader is 9 and the rifle or any legal weapon will be 9 days.

Moving to general season elk hunting dates, on archery spike bull hunt, it will run from August 18th thru September 7th, it is a 21 day hunt, the reason that hunt is shorter than the any bull hunt is because as you know on those units we have limited entry hunters hunting elk at the same time. This allows those limited entry elk hunters to have the last seven days of their hunt without any interruption from spike bull hunters and we chose the latter end of the season because it is the part closest to the rut so it gives them the better opportunity of harvesting during that period. The archery any bull season will run from August 18th thru September 14th and then the any weapon elk season will run from October 6th thru October 18th, it is a 13 day hunt. The muzzleloader will run from October 31st thru November 8th, and then the youth any bull hunt will run from September 15th thru September 23rd, those of you that are not familiar with this hunt, we have roughly 400 or so in that hunt and it is just to get youth out there hunting on any bull units and it is in the rut, it gives them a better opportunity to harvest than they would on the regular hunt. There is a late youth any bull hunt that only occurs in the Northeastern region, on the Vernal unit, that hunt is a long hunt, 46 days, starts December 1st through January 15th. The reason this hunt is so long it gives those youth an opportunity if those bulls are not down on winter range a longer period to be able to drive around and see where those bulls are. The reason this is a late season hunt is because these elk are usually on private land during the regular season and don't come off onto public land until they later in the season. This is a hunt that this region uses both to allow for youth opportunity and to deal with some depredation issues.

Some recommended changes either seasons dates or boundary descriptions so some of the state wide recommended changes is we would like to allow those who draw a youth any bull permit to harvest a bull or antlerless elk, again like I mentioned there is a couple of youth any bull permits, one is around 400 permits and the other is around 15 permits, so if you allow those folks to harvest an antlerless animal it's not going to effect the population level at all and it will also give those youth an opportunity to harvest where otherwise they may not if they are just hunting on a bull.

We are recommending removing the split from the bull moose hunt, basically the way it runs now is it starts in mid September and goes through the muzzleloader deer hunt and it closes and then we run the muzzleloader deer hunt and it opens again. We are recommending running it right through the muzzleloader deer hunt basically adding 9 days to the hunt because of new legislation that passed a couple of years ago, OIAL species don't have to wear hunter orange during their hunt so this will allow the muzzleloader hunters not to have to wear orange and there is so few moose hunters out in the field that it is not really that big of an issue for safety reasons. We would

recommend discontinuing the buck bull combo hunt, this is a hunt that currently occurs in the Northern region only and it was designed to move pressure from the public land portion of Northern region onto the private land portion of the unit because most of the any bull units in that region are on private land mostly, since we going to a unit by unit approach, it makes this very hard hunt to administer because the elk units don't exactly align with the deer units and it is also not needed anymore since we can now deal with the hunter crowding issue by reducing permits in one place and increasing them in another place. We can deal with it by a unit by unit approach without having a buck bull combo. We are also recommending discontinuing the over the counter state wide youth archery deer permits, that is a program we put in a couple of years ago to try to get youth that don't get a deer permit in the drawing to be able to go in a by a permit, there hasn't been a whole lot of interest in that, the most we sold statewide is 200 permits and once we go to unit by unit it will make it harder to administer we don't no longer have state wide archery, it may be even become less of a wanted permit. Youth do get an opportunity to draw, they get 20% of the permits right off the top, so they have a pretty good opportunity to draw anyway so removing this will probably not hinder their opportunity to hunt.

Some of the region recommended changes for the Southern region would like a new limited entry late any weapon elk hunt on the Paunsaugunt unit, because our limited entry units, most of them have an early and a late rifle hunt or any weapon hunt, the Paunsaugunt does not currently have one and they are starting to some bulls on that unit late in the season and would like to offer that opportunity for hunters to be able to harvest so they will probably allocate the same number of permits but they would split them between early and late and try to harvest some of those late elk. Usually the late hunts most of units have a lower success rate so we could offer a little bit more opportunity and that is one way we could do that on that unit as well. The Southern region would also like a mule and any goat hunt on the Beaver unit, that population continues to grow and is above what the forest service would like to see on that mountain, so we are working with the forest service to try and maintain the population where they would like to see it. By trying to reduce that population in any goat hunt would be need to be done to basically lower the population by taking any. You have those season dates in your packet. The Southern region also needs to clarify the Plateau Thousand Lakes Boundary, this is just an attempt to align with the neighboring San Rafael and Henry Mountains Unit, when we started going unit by unit and started looking at these units specifically, we found some discrepancies between boundaries and regions so just to correct that it is just to make a more definable boundary.

The Southeastern region, there is a recommendation to the Henry Mountains Bison unit boundary for two reasons, there is an area on the unit where we are seeing some bison that are outside the unit so we want to realign that unit boundary so the hunters can actually access those bison and the other change is to exclude the park from the boundary so the park boundary would become the western boundary of the unit. There is also a recommendation to change the Nine Mile Range Creek unit to an any bull elk unit, this unit was public land was limited entry and private land was any bull and we were asked by the wildlife board to look at that again to make a recommendation for either one or the other and the recommendation from the region is to make that unit an any bull unit. They are also recommending changing the dates on the La Sal Deloris Triangle limited entry muzzleloader elk hunt basically this is a minor change to avoid an overlap with the rifle hunt.

The Northeastern region, they are recommending a new bison hunt on the Book Cliffs unit to deal with tribal bison that come onto the unit off of the tribe, this will not include the entire Book Cliffs area, this is basically is the Northwestern portion of the Book Cliffs and it is dealing with Bison that are chronically coming off of the tribe, the reason we did not make the entire unit open is because the bulls we transplanted are not old enough to be harvested, so we don't want to be put pressure on the transplanted animals but we do want to be putting pressure on those animals that are coming off of the Ute Tribe, this hunt will help us accomplish that, there is roughly, depending on the year, 200-400 bison in that area coming off of the tribe, there is plenty of bison there. This will be a OIAL hunt with the season dates in your packet as well and this hunt will also help us to create a hunter pool for some of the bison that is coming off of the Book Cliff units and going onto the nearby Nine Mile unit it also gives us a hunter pool, this year we had some of those come off and we had to use the Henry Mountains bison as an alternate pool, but now this will give us a new hunter pool to draw from as well. They are recommending a change to the Uintah Basin extended archery unit, that boundary traditionally has gone a little bit higher upon the mountain than probably should have been then they notice they are harvesting some deer and maybe mountain deer and not deer that they are not trying to target in town, so they want to shrink down that boundary a little bit and there was also some conflicts with the nearby Diamond Mountain deer unit which is a limited entry unit. They would also like to change the youth late elk hunt boundary, this is the hunt I mentioned earlier that is a really long hunt, they actually want to expand the boundary as well as make it a really long hunt. Again, it is helping them expand an opportunity for youth and it is helping with depredation issues in that area late into the season.

Some of the changes in the Northern region that they would like recommended, is the Crawford Mountain portion of the Cache unit, they would like to make an any bull elk unit, currently it is the entire Cache is a spike bull unit and then a limited entry. The reason they want to do that basically for those who do not know this area, it is basically everything east of Bear Lake to the Wyoming boarder and north to the Idaho boarder. That area is not great elk habitat the elk have moved into that area and they are primarily using agriculture as their habitat, we want to discourage them from being in that area and making it an any bull unit will help us do that. They would like a new any goat hunt on the Willard Peak unit, this is another unit where we have another goat growing population and to issue more permits with only one any goat hunt would cause crowding issue and there would be able to have more permits on that unit, they would also like to expand the extended archery boundary in the Northern region to the shore of The Great Salt Lake, so basically this is the Wasatch Front extended and Ogden extended but only in the Northern region portion of the state. Currently it goes to I-15 is the western boundary, now it will go to the east shore of The Great Salt Lake, so basically it takes over most of the valley there. This is basically to help deal with some nuisance and depredation issues, and it also allows for our opportunity for archers hunt a little later into the year.

Some of the key dates for the 2012 season, the big game drawing for bucks and bulls, OIAL and for new dedicated hunter applicants, is basically going to be February 1st to March 1st, those who want to apply for just a bonus point or if people want to withdraw an application, they actually have until March 8th to do that and then the results will be posted May 31st. Current dedicated hunters will have to have their unit choice by the

deadline of January 13, 2012. The dedicated hunter coordinator will be sending those letters and emails out to get people to send in their choices.

Shed antlers and shed horn season dates will be basically, if you want to hunt them will be between February 1st and April 15th you are required to have an online course certificate so basically you go online take the course and print the certificate and put it in your pocket if you are going to hunt antlers or horns during that period. The dates where hunters may purchase or sell big game or its parts, again this is something that is in the guide book every year and no changes there but we always like to put them out there so people realize when they are, you can sell antlers, heads, horns of legally taken big game from February 15th thru July 31, 2012, and untanned hides may be bought or sold August 1st thru February 14th.

Lifetime license holders will have to have their units selected by March 1st, again they will be sent out a questionnaire to choose their units, and those fail to choose a unit by the deadline will basically get what is left over after the drawing and give permits that way. These are season dates for disabled hunters on general season extension days, sometimes it is a preseason extension so they get to hunt before the regular hunt and sometimes it is a post season. To get this extension these folks have to go into our office and fill out a form, get a letter from a doctor that they are truly disabled and the disability is permanent. For archery deer, pre season extension August 13th thru August 17th, for muzzleloader deer it is also preseason from September 21st thru September 25th, and for any weapon deer, the rifle deer is also preseason, October 15th thru October 19th. Archery elk is the same as the archery deer, August 13th thru the August 17th and the muzzleloader any bull elk is a post season, November 9th thru November 14th. The any weapon any bull elk is a pre season, September 15th thru September 23rd. They can also hunt that Northeastern region unit where the youth can hunt in that late season as well. Muzzleloader spike, post season, November 12th thru November 16th and the any weapon spike elk is a post season from October 19th thru October 23rd.

Derris Jones- Is there any questions from the RAC?

Kevin Albrecht- I was wondering why the certain dates were selling for game parts?

Anis Aoude- The reason for that is to basically have them outside the regular season so if folks are so inclined, could sell a hide, go out and shoot another deer, sell another hide, and during the season that is actually legal. So basically they fall outside the legal season so you can't be doing it while the hunt is on.

Kevin Albrecht- A lot of the times you will see someone takes an animal and they are going to do a European mount, they will sell the hide to the taxidermist, usually that is during the time of the hunt, is that now illegal?

Anis Aoude- It always has been. So those dates are not new dates, those are dates that has always been there.

Derris Jones- Any other questions from the RAC?

Derris Jones- On the agency draw, boundaries on the bison, the Coal Creek talks about the Green River coming down to the Coal Creek, is that the Coal Creek that is the south boundary of the Ute reservation? Or is there another Coal Creek on the north end?

Anis Aoude- No, it is the south boundary but it excludes the reservation, so they just drew the boundary around the actual unit.

Derris Jones- It just seems weird that they bring it all the way down which includes most of the reservation and then exclude...

Anis Aoude- Yes, because there is not a definable boundary on the top so the more definable boundary is the actual unit boundary itself which does go back down to Coal Creek, so that is the easiest way to write a boundary, otherwise you would have to tell people the boundary is the boundary of the reservation which is a hard one to know.

Derris Jones- On that antler gathering on the online course, is that an annual course or do you take it once?

Anis Aoude- It is. You have to take it every year.

Derris Jones- Has it changed at all? Do you guys update it or do anything different?

Anis Aoude- We usually don't update it unless something happens out in the field that we learn about that we need to punctuate, but usually we don't change it.

Derris Jones- The last question I had is can you tell us why there is different dates on the management buck units?

Anis Aoude- Because the Henry Mountains has a bison hunt going on at the same time so they are trying to work around that where the Paunsaugunt does not.

Derris Jones- Any other questions from the RAC? We will go ahead and open it up to questions from the public, again, I want to remind everyone this is questions for clarification, you will get your chance for comment right after this.

Derris Jones- Are there any questions from the public?

Mike King- In the Northern region changes, it talks about expanding the extended archery boundary, is that deer and elk, is that what you are talking about there?

Anis Aoude- Yes

Bill Bates- Anis, I was wondering on the any bull handicapped extension, can anybody that get that approval, can they hunt on the Northeastern region extended archery unit?

Anis Aoude- Correct.

Derris Jones- Comments from the audience? I want to remind anyone from the public that wants make a comment to fill out the yellow card that are on the back table and get it up to me and we will start with Randy Quayle.

Randy Quayle, Utah Bowmen's Association- First of all, I would like to thank the RAC Wildlife Board for your time that you guys put into this, we know you guys are all volunteers and your time is well appreciated as is the Fish and Game time. We have two recommendations tonight, the first one is concerning the state wide archery deer hunt, The Mule Deer Foundation, The United Wildlife Coperative, Bowhunters of Utah and The Utah Bowmens Association jointly propose that the RAC and Wildlife Board reconsider the decision to make archery deer hunters pick a unit in 2012, and instead allow archery deer hunters to continue to hunt state wide, the reasons for this proposal are as follows, as stated by the Utah DWR biologists, several times over the past several years, there is no biological reason to restrict the area that archery deer hunters are allowed to hunt and general season hunting units, the numbers of hunters that harvest a deer with archery tackle are not statistically impacting the buck doe ratios, having more hunters choose a less successful hunt strategy will increase buck doe rations without loss of opportunity, Wasatch front archery only areas are one of the examples of that, despite the decision to start hunting smaller units with fire arms, the majority of the RACs and the majority of the public were in favor of leaving the archery deer hunting opportunity intact, there is also a fairness issue that was brought up, if those hunting with firearms had to choose a unit then the archer should have to choose a unit also, if fairness comes into play, then split the available permits into three equal parts, that would be fair but we know that is not going to happen. If need for changing units is biologically or enforcement reasonable, then by all means we support that. If there are no biologically reasons to restrict archery hunting it should be then rethought, there has been enough opportunities lost and tags cut to all hunters as it is and in the process has lost a lot of hunting interest in Utah. Let's not take opportunities away and restrict even more hunting opportunities.

Our second recommendation, the Ogden Willard Peak, rocky mountain goat season, it split the first year with three units there, the proposal earlier was that a nine day mountain goat hunt in each hunt, and we feel like that is too short of a hunt for a OIAL permit, we would like to propose a change on that from the first hunt be a billy goat hunt, September 10th to September 23rd, the second hunt, September 24th to October 14th, and the third hunt would be a nanny goat hunt, October 1st to October 14th. There are going to be some other hunters up in the mountains at the same time but where mountain goats live we don't feel like that would be much of a crossover with the archery hunters or the muzzleloader hunters, and I think the Fish and Game is kind of thinking about that one anyway. That's my proposals, thank you.

Derris Jones- Randy, so I have these dates straight; there will be an overlap on the second hunter choice with the nanny hunt?

Randy Quayle- Yes, it would be September 24th to October 14th, and October 1st to October 14th for the nanny goat.

Brad Timothy- I have been up on the Nine Mile Range Creek area most of my life, I have hunted from Nine Mile in thru Range Creek and I have guided in there for

probably the last 25 years, I would like that to go as you suggested to open bulls so I could have a chance to hunt some of the big bulls there that is on public ground instead of turn it all over to the land owners or a draw, the odds of my drawing anymore at my age is slim to none. I would like to have it an open area where I could have a chance to be able to hunt that open area where the bulls are, there is a lot of private ground in there, they have public ground locked up and I have no problem with that but there is public ground on the outside that I can hunt, right now I can't draw a tag, the odds are just not in my favor of being able to and right now I would like to be able to hunt elk and this is a way I think it needs to be so I can hunt elk. Thank you.

Dennis Gibson- I don't want to go over all of that again, but Brad stated it pretty much even at my age, even if you was younger of having a chance of drawing an elk tag, and also I have guided for the Tavaputz Ranch and the last five or six years that I have guided with them on an open bull unit, we have seen bigger bulls every year, so going to this open bull area, I don't think will hurt the quality of the animals up there in that area. Thank you.

Kenny Ganter- I work for the Tavaputz Ranch as a guide and I feel the same way as the two that just spoke, so I won't take much of your time, I feel it's pretty much, if they are going to make some changes to try to close it, that is not the way to go, if you are going to do something with it, go ahead and open it up and let the hunters have a chance. Thank you.

Butch Jensen- We are the owners of the Tavaputs Ranch on the Tavaputs Plateau kind of on the southern region of the Range Creek unit, we agree with the Fish and Games recommendations to have this unit any bull.

Jeremy Hansen, United Wildlife Cooperative- First of all I would like to thank the RAC and DWR for their hard work and dedication for the wildlife and sportsmen of Utah. First, UWC would also like to support the divisions proposal to turn the Nine Mile Range Creek into an any bull unit, we just feel like that makes sense. UWC also supports the joint proposal presented by the Utah Bowmen's Association, Bowhunters of Utah and The Mule Deer Foundation, in the coming months we would also like to the RAC and division to consider ways to implement comprehensive hunter management in the newly created mule deer sub units. Creating these sub units allows us to manage hunters and deer on a unit basis but we choose to manage every general season unit to 18 to 25 bucks per 100 does. Between this year and next year we will have removed close to 15,000 hunters as well as associated revenue. As you know these cuts do not address our deer, rather the social aspect of deer hunting. Past division surveys have always shown that the most important thing the majority of hunters is having the opportunity of being in the field with a tag in hand. We also acknowledge that there is a segment of the population that desires bigger antlered deer at the cost of hunting less frequently. UWC urges the division to come up with a comprehensive plan in the coming months to manage our general season units to reflect these statistics in the 2012 management plan. Thank you for your time.

Kaylin Cowley- First off, I don't want to offend anybody up Nine Mile or anybody that I might offend, I am sorry. We are not in a limited entry right now and we have a

problem with people trespassing. I believe if you open it up everybody that owns property will have that same thing, I personally know 2 people that trespassed and killed an elk and was not prosecuted. I think you should still close it off and no offense to you Butch, if private land owners want to protect their land better than CWMU and, you know, that is just me, but I think it is better for land owners, it is really not that hard to draw, it is actually pretty easy to draw that unit. Paunsaugant is an easy unit, there are units you can draw that have good bulls. I like to have the board reconsider that and look at all of the aspects of you will get trespassing, poached bulls, and everything else. Thanks.

Derris Jones- You are asking to leave it as limited entry or to shut it off all together?

Kaylin Cowley- Well if I had a choice, I would shut all of Nine Mile off, but if you can't do that, I would understand.

Bill Bates- You don't mean shut it down hunting, do you?

Kaylin Cowley- No, like that gentlemen said, it might be hard to draw, but up the tags, but if they say it won't hurt, then up the tags and give more people opportunity in this area to hunt.

Derris Jones- Ok, that is all of the cards I have, if anyone in the audience wants to make an additional comment we will have them hurry and fill out a card, if not, we will go ahead and close it to the public and open it up to the RAC for discussion.

It looks like 2 variances from the division's recommendation.

The UBA and UWC would like to see a statewide archery as well as season date changes on the Ogden Willard Peak goat hunts, and then the Nine Mile recommendation to either be open bull or leave it as currently as it is as limited entry.

Chris Micoz- On the Range Creek Nine Mile, don't landowners in a CWMU have to have 10,000 acres? So there are probably quite a few I would assume that do not qualify to be in a CWMU and if it went limited entry that would eliminate all of them from being able to hunt their land, is that correct? Or, they would have to draw a limited entry tag I guess?

Anis Aoude- What we are recommending that it becomes any bull, so they could actually buy over the counter tags and hunt their own land.

Chris Micoz- He made a comment of becoming CWMUs but not everybody would qualify to be that.

Anis Aoude- No, they wouldn't have to. Actually for the private land owners, it wouldn't change anything they are currently in any bull units, so they would remain in any bull units.

Kevin Albrecht- I was wondering if Brad or someone to speak to them now a little bit about how much public land there is up in this area. And some of the land locks and some other issues.

Brad Crompton- Private public land issues, most of you are aware that the total elk habitat on the unit only works out to be something like 25% private, but the huntable elk habitat in September and October, I don't know, but I would guess 80 to 90% of the elk reside on private lands. Hunting opportunities on public lands is relatively limited whether it is a limited entry situation like we have had in the last several years and in general season any bull. There are a lot of acres that are public lands that you really can't get to from a road, those public lands are inaccessible most of the year, you could hike there somehow, but it is difficult hunting. It is a small area where you can hunt on public lands where elk are.

Derris Jones- Brad, before you leave, I don't mean to put you on the spot but if you don't feel comfortable answering this, don't. In your opinion, are there going to be more elk killed under open bull than there has been under limited entry?

Brad Crompton- There probably won't be much of a change, this unit was an any bull I think in 1997 or 1998, there was a four year period there, and in the late 90's until 2001 I think. The harvest hasn't changed, when we cut off 2/3 of the unit and made it limited entry on public lands the harvests of bull actually increased over that period, despite limiting some harvest. This issue is the same, the elk live on private lands and it's really not about killing more elk, it is about providing more opportunity, that's the way we balanced it. It is a very difficult decision to make, just because the elk to reside on private lands and the private land owners have some issues but we would like to avoid the trespass and a lot of the other social issues that are involved with opening this unit up to general season when it's a 50/50 and we are not sure what do, we like to error on the side of providing public opportunity. I don't know if that answers your question or not?

Anis Aoude- As a statewide perspective, the Nine Mile Range Creek area is not unique, in the Northern region, it is full of units that is mostly full of private land where the elk reside on private land and they are in any bull units, so it is really access issues, it doesn't fall outside of what we already have in a lot of places and in other regions.

Derris Jones- The main difference I see is there is a lot of public land on that unit that the elk are using in November, and with limited entry you have a November opportunity.

Anis Aoude- You do with a muzzleloader on the any bull hunt as well.

Derris Jones- One more question with that, that late hunt, it allows you to maybe address some of the bull to cow ratio and as I seen in your other regions that there was a youth late hunt that allowed opportunity, would that be something the bull to cow ratio would biologically need an additional late hunt?

Kevin Albrecht- Yes, I can see how that would be an opportunity, provided the region thought that was needed.

Derris Jones- Are there any other comments from the RAC members?

Todd Huntington-I move to accept the DWR proposals as presented.

Chris Micoz-I second the motion.

Derris Jones-Let's vote on the motion.

The motion was unanimous with one abstention by Blair Eastman due to a conflict of interest.

**6) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012 (Action)
-Boyd Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator**

Boyd Blackwell- I am here tonight to talk to you about address or summarizing the CWMU applications and management plans that we received this year, and permits, and the I will move onto the Landowner Association after we have done the CWMU's. This year there was 87 CWMU's that were required to renew for the 2012 hunting season, we received 83 applications and management plans from them, 4 of the CWMU's have dropped out of the program and 1 CWMU, the division is recommending denial of the application and 1 CWMU, there is a split recommendation, we will go over those as I hit the various regions. There was 10 CWMU's required renewal for 2013 and 2015, for the 2014 there was 9 new CWMU's this year, so there is a total of 116 CWMU's for the 2012 hunting season, if it is approved by the Wildlife Board. It is broken down by Northern region with the lions share of 70, the Northeastern is 5, Central region is 12 and Southeastern is 16, close behind the Northern region and then the Southern region is 13. There are 2 million acres that are involved in this CWMU program with 440 land owners. There are 104 CWMU's that are requesting buck deer permits, 16 bull elk, 30 bull moose, and 13 buck pronghorn, and 3 are requesting turkey permits. We are finding that many of the CWMU's are dropping out of the turkey program since we have gone to over the counter turkey permit sales. This is the breakdown for species for a total of 2,940 and 488 public permits. Regional issues, there are 5 new CWMU's in the Northern region and then Junction Valley is a change in boundary, they have increase by a little over 1,000 acres, the Northeastern region has added 2 new CWMU's, the Avintaquin and Buck Horn for deer, and then for Skull Valley, the division is recommending denial, we received their application for 3,749 acres, so this year they need to have 5,000 acres in order to be a deer CWMU, so they are under, we asked them several times for plat maps for which they were unable to provide and so they didn't qualify under this and so we are recommending denial. The Southeastern region has 1 new CWMU called Deer Haven, down in the San Juan County area, then there is the Minnie Maud which had a boundary change, and then there is the Spring Creek Dodge that had a boundary change. In the Southern region, we have the New Harmony which is a new CWMU, the Johnson Mountain Ranch wanted to change the deer permits from 27 and 3 to 9 and 1, and then they are also asking to drop there season variance if they are allowed to ask for a variance and their season date would allow them to hunt until November 10th they no longer want that, they want to end October 31st. Then the Alton CWMU is requesting a change in their management buck deer permits they wanted to go from 4 and 1 to 5 and 1, the division is actually recommending that they receive 3 and 1, a total of 3 out of 4 permits. This is how much they qualify for and going through the qualification and the number of

permits that they can qualify for, they should be receiving 4 permits. The Wildlife Board 2 years ago, when they first started the management buck permits, the region recommended no permits and came up with 4 and 1, as we looked at the calculations they qualified for 3 and 1, but they are asking for 5 and 1.

That is everything Mr. Chairman.

Derris Jones- Any questions from the RAC?

Sue Bellagamba- Does any of those units include Dugout Ranch in San Juan County?

Boyde Blackwell- No

Derris Jones- On the Alton CWMU, is the division recommending 3 to 1 or 4 to 1? So if the RAC passes the division recommendations it would be 3 and 1?

Boyde Blackwell- Yes

Kevin Albrecht- And they are now 4 and 1?

Boyde Blackwell- They are now 4 and 1 requesting 5 and 1.

Todd Huntington- How did they get the 4 and 1 if they are only qualified for 3 and 1? Why didn't we put them at 3 and 1?

Boyde Blackwell- 2 years ago when we first went to the Management buck permits, the region recommended that we have no management buck permits on the unit, they went to the Wildlife Board and requested the 4 and 1, and the Wildlife Board granted 4 and 1 and at that point we let that go and then they wanted another increase when they actually qualified and 3 and 1. Are recommendation is to go for the permits that they qualify for.

Charlie Tracy- Just out of curiosity, where is Deer Haven?

Guy Wallace- Deer Haven is a split off of the Spring Creek Dodge property.

Derris Jones- Any other questions from the RAC?

Any questions from the public? I don't have any card from the public.

Kevin Albrecht- On the Minnie Maud, I noticed the deer and elk were the same number, is that the correct number or is that a misprint?

Brad Crompton- It is correct.

Derris Jones- Is there any other discussion?

Let's entertain a motion.

Charlie Tracy- I make a motion to accept the recommendations as the division presented.

Pam Riddle- I second it.

Derris Jones- All in favor?
Opposed?
Unanimous.

7) **Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012 (Action)**
-Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

Boyde Blackwell- We have Landowner Association voucher recommendation for the 2012. We received 15 applications, the division is recommending approval of 15 applications, there are no split recommendations, and so we are agreeing with the applications that came in. There are 125 deer vouchers, 4 management buck vouchers and 93 elk vouchers and 9 pronghorn vouchers for Landowner Associations. Thank you.

Derris Jones- Questions from the RAC?

Sue Bellagamba- Do any of these Landowner Associations involve Dugout Ranch in San Juan County?

Guy Wallace- Yes

Derris Jones- Are there any other questions from the RAC?
Questions from the public?

I have no cards for comments from the public so we will move onto the RAC discussion.

Sue Bellagamba- I think I have to refuse myself from voting for conflict of interest.

Derris Jones- Ok, thanks Sue.

Kevin Albrecht- I make a motion to accept the division's proposal as presented.

Charlie Tracy- Seconded.

Derris Jones- All in favor?
Unanimous.

Approved with one abstention.

Meeting started at 6:30 p.m.
Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY-MOTIONS PASSED
Bingham Research Center, Vernal – November 17, 2011

5. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2012 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE

MOTION: to allow making an amendment to statewide management plan to allow for a management hunt on a limited entry unit (specifically for the Book Cliffs)

Passed 5-1 with one abstention

MOTION: that shed antler hunts start no earlier than April 1st.

Failed 2-5

MOTION: to accept the DWR extended archery boundaries that have been written with the exception of the change in the Ashley Maeser area that was proposed by the bow hunters.

Passed unanimously

MOTION: to accept the rest of the recommendations as proposed by the Division

Passed unanimously

6. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2012

MOTION: to accept the rest of the recommendations as proposed by the Division

Passed unanimously

7. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2012

MOTION: to accept the variance as we have for the last 17 years

Passed 6-1

MOTION: to accept as presented

Passed unanimously

**Bingham Entrepreneurship & Energy Research Center (Bingham Center), Vernal
November 17, 2011**

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Floyd Briggs, RAC Chair
Carrie Mair, At-Large
Bob Christensen, Forest Service
Beth Hamann, Non-Consumptive
Brandon McDonald, BLM
Wayne McAllister, At Large
Mitch Hacking, Agriculture
Kirk Woodward, Sportsmen
Kevin Christopherson, NER Supervisor

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Andrea Merrell, Non-Consumptive
Rod Morrison, Sportsmen

RAC MEMBERS UNEXCUSED:

Ron Winterton, Elected Official

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Gayle Allred, Administrative Aide
Ron Stewart, Conservation Outreach
Jack Lytle, NER Conservation Officer
Torrey Christophersen, NER Lieutenant
Dan Barnhurst, NER Sergeant
Anis Aoude, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Pgm Coordinator
Mark Martinez, SLO Web Developer
Derrick Ewell, NER Wildlife Biologist
Randall Thacker, NER Wildlife Biologist
Charlie Greenwood, NER Wildlife Mgr
Dax Mangus, NER Wildlife Biologist
Amy VandeVoort, NER Wildlife Biologist
Brian Maxfield, NER Wildlife Biologist
Lowell Marthe, NER Wildlife Biologist

WELCOME – Floyd Briggs

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Wayne McAllister motion to approve
Beth second
Passed unanimously

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Beth motion to approve
Bob second
Passed unanimously

3. OLD BUSINESS

4. REGIONAL UPDATE - Kevin Christopherson

We had good deer harvest on the east side of the region. We didn't see a lot of yearlings this year probably because of winter mortality from last winter. We will be starting deer classification to look at buck/doe ratios. Any RAC members who want to look at the winter range and do deer classification, let me know and we'll get you out.

Monday we held a pre-RAC meeting. We appreciate everyone who came. I think we'll try to do that when we need to. We did not change any of the RAC pack proposals but if you still want to make recommendations bring those forward and we'll talk about them.

I'll turn the time over to Derrick Ewell from the Duchesne area to present some information about the Anthro Unit.

Derrick's slide show was not compatible.

Kevin Christopherson: While Derrick is trading it out I'll mention that the DWR just had an audit. I have not had a chance to review it yet. I've been told there are some good ideas and that the Division hopefully came through it in good shape.

Floyd Briggs: I forgot to mention I received some information regarding recovery and restoration of Mexican wolves in Utah we need to keep an eye on. DWR is opposed to that but in some southern states like New Mexico, it's being proposed. It doesn't sound good to me.

Del Brady: I heard Arizona Game and Fish was in favor of it. They did focus on Southern Utah and Southern Colorado as potential sites.

Floyd Briggs: When they were talking about that, there's a lookalike clause. If wolves are migrating from the north to the south, under that clause they could be protected so it could be an important issue.

Derrick Ewell:

Anthro Elk
Estimate of 1,400 animals
Current population objective is 700 (winter)

Concerns are
Hunter Satisfaction
Tribal Hunting
Open bull units both to the North and South
Migration of elk off the unit
Oil and gas development

Population over objective
Poaching of elk.

We started an elk collaring study and collared 40 cow elk across the entire unit. We wanted to see how many winter on the unit and if the elk that summer on the Anthro subunit winter there also.

We're trying to determine migration patterns

We're trying to determine general summer and winter ranges

Mitch Hacking: It's difficult to manage during the summer. Don't you manage during the hunt?

Derrick Ewell: We count the population in the winter but we also want to manage the area they summer in so they're not overgrazing. Essentially we manage them in the winter. Most of our hunts are in the fall.

Mitch Hacking: Where are these elk during the hunt season?

Derrick Ewell: We don't have any collars on bulls but they're going to go where the cows go.

Mitch Hacking: You think they're scattered as much?

Derrick Ewell: In September when we flew they were still in the scattered locations. Probably about November, December, they'll start migrating back on the unit. Elk are smart.

Bob Christensen: Looks like you have an over-objective everywhere?

Kirk Woodward: There is only 1/5 of the winter population on the unit during the hunt.

Carrie Mair: Isn't it managed by the objective based on how many are on the unit in winter?

Derrick Ewell: Yes. Populations by winter count but bulls by age. Every surrounding unit is way over objective.

Randall Thacker: There are two separate problems; population objective including migration in winter and bull numbers in the fall.

5. BUCKS, BULLS & OIAL 2012 SEASON DATES AND APPLICATION TIMELINE – Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

2012 Deer Hunt Recommendations

First year of General Season Unit by Unit

Archery 8/18-9/14 28 days

ML 9/26-10/4 9 days

Any weapon 10/20-10/28 9 days

2012 general season elk hunt dates

Archery spike bull 8/18-9/7 21 Days

Archery any bull 8/18-9/14 28 days

Any weapon elk 10/6-10/18 13 Days

ML 10/31-11/8 9 days

Youth Any Bull 9/15-9/23 9 days

Late Youth Any Bull 12/1-1/15 46 days

BBOIAL Recommended Changes

Statewide

Allow those who draw a youth any bull permit to harvest a bull or antlerless elk

Remove the split from the bull moose hunt

Discontinue buck bull combo hunt

Discontinue over the counter statewide youth archery deer permits

Regional Changes – Northeastern Region

New bison hunt on the Book Cliffs Unit to deal with tribal bison that come onto the unit

Change Uinta Basin extended archery boundary

-reduce conflicts with Diamond Mountain Deer Unit

-Reduce harvest of mountain deer

Change the youth late elk hunt boundary

-Expanded opportunity for youth

-Expand our ability to address elk depredation issues

Key Dates for 2012 Season

Big game drawing for bucks, bulls and OIAL and new dedicated hunter applicants

-application period: Feb 1-March 1, 2-12

-Application period for bonus and preference points and application withdrawal period:

Feb 1-Mar8, 2012

-Results posted: May 31, 2012

Current dedicated hunter deadline for choice of region will be January 13, 2012.

Key dates for 2012 season

Shed antler and shed horn season dates

-Online course and completion certificate required: Feb 1-Apr 15, 2012

Dates when hunters may purchase or sell big game or its parts

-Antlers, heads and horns of legally taken big game may be bought or sold: Feb 15-July 31, 2012

-Untanned hides of legally taken big game may be bought or sold: Aug 1, 2012-Feb 14, 2012

Lifetime license questionnaire/Unit-selection deadline

-Unit selection deadline: Mar 1, 2012

-Those who fail to choose a unit by the deadline can obtain leftover permits if available

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: On NE region changes item 2; it's about the boundary on extended archery hunt. I didn't see the detailed hunt boundary map.

Anis Aoude: It's a written boundary description.

Mitch Hacking: I have to have pictures. (Kevin showed Mitch a sample map NER had provided.)

Bob Christensen: Moose hunt, extending it during ML season hunters won't have to wear hunter orange for OIAL?

Anis Aoude: Yes

Floyd Briggs: Have there been any other states showing an interest in nanny goats?

Anis Aoude: We would rather have our hunters harvest them rather than give them to other states. We will have a surplus even with harvesting more nannies and we have places we want to transplant them in state. We will have to update the plan before we begin.

Bob Christensen: Regarding the bison hunt. Are there quite a few bison that come over from the Tribe?

Anis Aoude: 200-400

Carrie Mair: I thought we're trying to grow them so we can have a harvest. Why hunt them?

Anis Aoude: Because these will count against our numbers. They are trespassing in areas where they have to be removed, and we want to grow our herd in other areas.

Questions from Audience:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

Comments from Public:

Daniel Davis (Split Mountain Archers and bow hunters): Would like to make an amendment on the archery boundary for the Uinta Basin. Mainly keep the original boundaries but emphasize the issues we have on mountain deer on the north. The changes they have proposed wouldn't allow it to serve its purpose. The objective was to manage deer and to encourage people to hunt with archery. A proposed

boundary has been handed out. We need to look at elk as well. Want to change buck season date to the middle of November instead of November so we won't take migrating deer on rutting season. And we can focus on agriculture deer. See attachment.

J.C. Brewer: Because of being a continuous limited entry unit over 12 years, the Book Cliffs deer unit has been over-objective in the buck/doe ratio. The average has been 38 instead of 25-35. I propose splitting the unit at the divide. The reason I was given for the southern section unit to be so much over objective is that fewer hunters want to hunt the south slope. Splitting the unit and having the applicant choose one side or the other would solve that problem. It's been compared to the Colorado unit which is an unfair comparison. You could increase hunter opportunity for the south side. During the rifle hunt, mid to late October, most of the deer have already migrated so there would be little hunting on the summit for law enforcement problems which is why I'm not proposing it for archery or ML. Putting more pressure on the south side would bring the balance back on the harvest.

Kenion Powell (Mule deer Foundation Uintah Basin Chapter): I'd like to address the Book Cliffs. We lowered it 450 tags but we have a management problem because we have inferior deer. Put the tags toward a hunt for the inferior deer. People are looking at 26" 2-points and nobody's shooting them. They're eating the habitat of the bigger deer. We could have a youth hunt or a management hunt to remove them from the herd.

Lynn Higley (Utah Bowman's Association): I have two recommendations. Mule Deer Foundation and Utah Bowman's association ask to reconsider making archery unit-by-unit. Want statewide archery back. There is not a biological reason to restrict the area. They're allowed to hunt general season unit and not statistically impact buck/doe ratios. May encourage and increase hunters to hunt with archery. Having more hunters choose a less successful hunt will increase buck/doe ratios statewide and allow the youth statewide archery opportunity to continue. Recommend season dates for nanny hunts.

Perry Hanks (United Wildlife Cooperative): I support the joint proposal by the Mule Deer Foundation and Utah bowman's for archery proposal... Creating subunits allows managing subunits yet we have managed to manage every unit for 18-25 buck/doe. Reducing hunters by 13,000. The most important thing to the majority of hunters is to be in the field with a tag. We also know there are people who want bigger bucks.

Mike Davis (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation): We ask the RAC to consider the season dates on shed antler gathering. We propose closing the season until April 15. Prime grazelands are torn up. I would like to support the Split Mountain Archers' map on the extended season. Instead of 500 North, utilize the canals in the Maeser area and to extend the area on the east side to Green River as it used to be (one mile buffer on boundaries). I don't think that's going to affect the Diamond Mountain bucks at all, open up the Chew ranch area specifically.

Clay Hamann (Myself, property owner): Last year I pushed to change the boundary off the face of Dry Fork and Taylor Mountain because it was not accomplishing its purpose which is to take valley deer. The proposal this year by the Division goes too far and eliminates the Maeser area where I live. We have a lot of resident deer in the area. We've had haystacks pulled over and fruit trees destroyed. I want to see

pressure in that area to reduce pressure on my property and surrounding area. I like the proposal by Daniel Davis. It leaves the southern boundary intact. Where the Highline Canal crosses 121, includes the upper Maeser area where deer are creating a hazard on roadways, etc. Even though the pressure isn't as heavy as I'd like, it does create some pressure to help with agricultural concerns.

Comments from RAC:

Carrie Mair: Would it be feasible to manage each unit based on historical data?

Anis Aoude: It would be. The problem is which unit ends up being managed for a higher buck/doe ratio or a lower buck/doe ratio. Everybody has their own opinion. By making things similar statewide it decreases tension and trying to make that decision.

Carrie Mair: If we have a unit which historically has 7 bucks/100 does those tags will never regenerate.

Anis Aoude: That's right. We want the change not for biological reasons but for social ones. Hunters who want to see more bucks in the field.

Carrie Mair: Even though they want bigger bucks, there's going to be no opportunity to hunt any bucks.

Anis Aoude: Biologically it doesn't matter but socially it does. You're going to have fewer hunters.

Anis Aoude: This state wide plan is due for renewal in 2013 and we could make recommendation to shrink the objective from 18-25 to 20 or maybe even have two types of hunting.

Carrie Mair: Will it be a general objective across the state?

Anis Aoude: I know the biology but the social stuff is not going to be dictated by me, so we'll make recommendations and let the public invited help us make decisions with which units end up being what rather than piecemeal. At that time we'll have a couple years of data and make a more informed decision.

Bob Christensen: I think one of the Board members, Ernie, made a motion that Northern and Central regions stay with the Option 1 and the Southern, Southeast and Northeast would go with the 18 bucks per 100 does and that failed.

Anis Aoude: And there was no public input. If we're going to do a comprehensive management we need to have all the players at the table and come up with a consensus. The Division knows the biology and we'll present that data .

Carrie Mair: Is it going to be biologically advantageous to manage for 18-25 bucks/doe on a unit?

Anis Aoude: It would not be harmful. You'll have more bucks. As far as population growth, it may not change things at all.

Mitch Hacking: On the Uintah Basin Extended Archery that they're talking about changing, am I correct it's just a change in Maeser and Dinosaur National Monument?

Daniel Davis: Yes.

Kirk Woodward: I think the archers' proposal is really good and they've cut that buck date to the 15th to protect during rutting.

Mitch Hacking: On the extension to archery hunt, is it bucks only?

Kirk Woodward: It's either sex until end of November then doe only. The original proposal was for this to be a depredation hunt but it has become a widely popular recreational hunt. They're proposing moving it back to the original boundary on the east. There are people who don't hunt at all until now because they can go hunt bucks in that area. This meets the Division's needs for a clearly defined boundary (pointing to map provided by bowmen). It takes off Dry Fork Mountain areas, and on the Diamond areas, moving the dates back keeps the Diamond Mountain deer.

Bob Christensen: Is the Division okay with the boundary change?

Charlie Greenwood: I think in general we're okay with that boundary change in the Ashley/Maeser area. Is the Green River still a one mile buffer?

Kirk Woodward: Yes.

Charlie Greenwood: Two years ago, we had three tools to deal with depredation in the valley. This extended boundary was a tool to deal with depredation 15 years ago. The other tool was an Ashley Valley doe hunt which we had about 15 years. It was taken away last spring because people did not want does harvested in Ashley Valley. The other is landowner permits for deer in the valley. Those are the options we have. We lost one. I guess I'd like to see this discussion next spring in the antlerless RAC. If there are concerns about deer, we ought to look at the Ashley Valley doe hunt.

Bob Christensen: So what was the reason for the one mile buffer?

Carrie Mair: To include agricultural lands on both sides.

Mitch Hacking: Is the change on Split Mountain where the new bowman's proposal comes straight south and eliminates the boundary around the national park?

Anis Aoude: Yes. We would rather people be able to hunt through the end of the season and have a restricted boundary than cut the whole hunt short to deal with that one little area. The UDWR boundary is farther west on roads, not the poorly marked monument boundary.

Mitch Hacking: So if that change is proposed it has the 15th date with it?

Anis Aoude: I guess you can't have both. You'll eliminate everybody else from hunting in the rest of the unit for the sake of Diamond Mountain.

Carrie Mair: Is it being managed for depredation or recreation?

Anid Aoude/Kirk Woodward: It has become a recreational hunt.

Bob Christensen: As we make a motion, do you want to split a couple things apart or take the whole thing?

Floyd Briggs: How do we want to deal with it?

Bob Christensen: If we split the voting, maybe we ought to start with archery.

Brandon McDonald: As far as antler sheds, Mr. Davis proposed antler shed start April 15. I don't think that's a bad idea because BLM and DWR have done a lot of restoration projects all over and how it's been is we're just creating new playgrounds for these people to go out there. The ethics course didn't solve a thing. It was a good warning. Sometime in the near future we ought to eliminate the ability to go out early on shed antlers. Also, I spend two to five days a week in the Book Cliffs as part of my job. I know what the deer are like. I see a lot of 2-and 3-points and they're big. Maybe it is a good idea to have the youth go out for a year or two and knock some of the 2-points out.

Carrie Mair: We need a management hunt. We would need to make an amendment to the Management Plan. We discussed putting that in place for three years with half of the tags going to youth and seniors similar to Paunsaugunt and Henries. It would give the opportunity to eliminate trash deer.

Floyd Briggs: I would suggest more emphasis on the deer committees. If they made that proposal it would be an agenda item.

Brandon McDonald: I think we should have a whole list of alternatives rather than just one or two. The deer quality has gone downhill.

Floyd Briggs: On the North Slope a big 2-point looks pretty good.

Kirk Woodward: Brandon, there's nothing wrong with you making a management proposal on the Book Cliffs.

Brandon McDonald: I'd like to hear DWR's opinion.

Floyd Briggs: The random ideas get run over, but if you start at the bottom like deer committees you're more likely to have success.

Carrie Mair: Before we can set numbers, we have to get an amendment to the Statewide Management Plan in order to allow for a management hunt on a limited entry unit.

Floyd Briggs: We can send anything to the Wildlife Board, and that might be the place to start also.

**MOTION by Carrie Mair to allow making an amendment to Statewide Management Plan to allow for a management hunt on a limited entry unit (specifically for the Book Cliffs)
Second by Kirk Woodward**

Bob Christensen: How has it worked on the Henries?

Anis Aoude: On those it's a whole different way because we manage them on age objective. So if you get above 50 bucks/100 does that's when you have a problem. It would not translate well. It's really not even warranted because if you add more permits, someone will harvest them. When you get low fawn/does ratios you get the problem. This problem will fix itself if you have fawns and does. It's a lot more complicated than the general public perceives it to be.

Carrie Mair: There is a large amount of people who are seeing a large amount of 2-points.

Anis Aoude: There's large 2-points on every unit in the state. It's not unique to the Book Cliffs. The reason you see it is because it's a large unit and they're being passed up. My approach would be not to cut those 50 and then some of them are going to be taken.

Brandon McDonald: What happens when we propose this to the Board? I'm against antler point restrictions but maybe for a special youth hunt.

Kirk Woodward: None of that can happen until the amendment is made.

Floyd Briggs: We can pass it onto the Board.

Favor: Kirk Woodward, Carrie Mair, Bob Christensen, Beth Hamann, Brandon McDonald

Opposed: Wayne McAllister. The genetics are still there even if it stays a 2-point and is ten years old. You can't say it's a 2-point and will stay that way its entire life.

Abstain: Mitch Hacking. Because I need more information personally.

**Mitch Hacking MOTION that shed antler hunts start no earlier than April 1st.
Brandon Second**

Kirk Woodward: They're proposing no shed antler hunting before April 1. Right now, we can hunt in December or January; you just have to have the ethics course from February to April. They're wanting to eliminate all shed antler hunting prior to April 1st.

Mitch Hacking: Right.

Carrie Mair: If I'm walking around in January and I find a shed, I'm going to pick it up.

Mitch Hacking: When we're out on Federal ground, we're seeing damage.

Bob Christensen: That's a law enforcement issue with whatever ground it's on.

Carrie Mair: There's a lot of poaching too. We can't take away opportunity because of some people who are doing things improperly.

Kevin Christopherson: Before we vote, Anis, does this RAC have the authority to regulate that?

Anis Aoude: We tried it in the Northern region and went away from it for a lot of reasons. In the Northern Region, they were caching antlers, GPSing them and going back and picking them up later. We can't prohibit them from being out there, only from picking up antlers. The law enforcement folks statewide put a whole committee together to study this. There will still be people out there tearing up the ground; they just won't be picking them up. It's been tried in one part of the state and didn't work, that's why we went to the orientation course, to help educate the people. If you guys want to go that route, I'm not opposed to it; I'm just explaining why we went that way.

Bob Christensen: I think there would be a lot of people who would be opposed to that. I've been in Wildlife Board meetings where the Wildlife Board made fast decisions and had to readdress it and get public opinion and make changes.

Favor: Mitch Hacking, Brandon McDonald

Opposed: Kirk Woodward, Carrie Mair, Bob Christensen, Beth Hamann, Wayne McAllister

Floyd Briggs: Do we want to do the extended archery?

Kevin Christopherson: I want to clarify a couple things. We can live with the boundary adding the Maeser/Ashley area. Boundaries are a tricky business because you want something obvious for the sportsmen, which is why we used the highway. We could live with either proposal. I would encourage you to consider why we removed the one mile river thing. It's a law enforcement nightmare. There's just no way to measure the one mile buffer. Whether you take ours or theirs, I would encourage you to not have the one mile buffer.

Kirk Woodward: I appreciate what you said. I think this has turned into a recreation hunt and so that one mile boundary on the southern end is difficult. Originally I felt that was good because it was a recreational hunt but I understand now why you're saying that. I do think the change proposed especially in the Maeser/Ashley area is important.

Kirk MOTION propose to accept the DWR boundaries that have been written with the exception of adding the change in the Ashley Maeser area that's been proposed by the bow hunters.

Kevin Christopherson: So you're accepting the Division's proposal except for Maeser/Ashley?

Kirk Woodward: Yes. Keeping the extra days to hunt but give up the one mile boundary on the southern end

**Mitch Hacking Second:
Passed unanimously**

Beth MOTION to accept the rest of the recommendations as proposed by the Division

Second: Kirk Woodward

Favor: Unanimous

Bob Christensen: There's a proposal for statewide archery and we're not accepting it, but I went through the big game annual reports and the percent of harvest for archery. There's a misnomer that the archery hunt has no impact on the herds. They harvest 13%. In my opinion, that's 13% to impact the buck/doe ratio and there is an impact on the buck/doe ratio. Muzzleloader success was 18% last year. If it stays statewide archery and that's 13% and Muzzleloaders take 18%, there's not a lot of difference and so you wonder if we're going statewide archery why aren't we doing statewide Muzzleloader. The reason I'm saying that is because, losing 13% in my paycheck, I'd notice that. It's not as much as the rifle hunters are taking but if you combine them, that's 30%. In my opinion, that's significant per unit.

6. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012 Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See handout

Questions from RAC:

Kirk Woodward: Can you show us the boundaries that are the two in Northeastern Region?

Biologists provided a map.

Randall Thacker: The Avintaquin Canyon is south of Strawberry Pinnacles, the other is the Buckhorn Ranch on the top of Currant Creek by the Water Hollow turnoff.

Questions from Audience:

None:

Comments from Audience:

None

Comments from the RAC:

None

Beth Hamann MOTION to accept the plans presented by the Division

Kirk Woodward Second

Favor: Unanimous

**7. LANDOWNER PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2012 – Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program
Coordinator**

Questions from RAC:

Mitch: What are management buck vouchers?

Boyde Blackwell: Paunsaugunt has a management buck hunt. They're allowed to ask for it because it's on their unit. It's in the statewide management plan.

Questions from Audience:

None

Comments from RAC:

None

Comments from Audience:

Dave Chivers (Diamond Mountain Landowners Association): We're asking for a variance. We have had this variance for 17 years. It makes it possible for each landowner to manage their property. We're asking for that again this year.

Josh Horrocks (sportsman, outfitter, and conservationist): I would ask you to support the variance proposed by the Diamond Mountain Landowners Association.

Carrie Mair: How is it a value for wildlife?

Josh Horrocks: The rule wants to allow the general public to access private property without landowners' consent. We want the landowners to determine who accesses their property. The ranchers used to kill all the deer and elk because they tore down their fences and competed with their cows. Now that it's become valuable; they like them.

Carrie Mair: Wildlife is a value for everyone and not for monetary gain. Do you believe the value you're discussing is monetary?

Josh Horrocks: Yes.

Floyd Briggs: How is this different from state statute? If you have private lands posted, doesn't that accomplish the same thing?

Josh Horrocks: This rule overrides that.

Carrie Mair: I think we need to verbalize it.

Boyde Blackwell: By rule, in the landowner association permit rule, when they take a voucher and they take that voucher and sell it, the landowner or member of the association has to allow a like number of permits if they sell that permit on their private property to hunt. In that very rule, in the next section #6 says they can request a variance so they don't have to allow that like number onto their private property to hunt.

Carrie Mair: Dave, I sent you an e-mail asking for a list of the general hunters that you have. Do you have access to that?

Dave Chivers: Yes. Last year's is complete. This year's is not yet.

Carrie Mair: Do you have the number approximately of hunters you had on your land?

Dave Chivers: No. It's a large number from all over the United States. The landowners have been very good. This year one of the landowners gave one of his permits to a handicapped child to have a guided hunt. Those kinds of things happen every year. There are a large number of public hunters that are hunting on our private lands. Every landowner gets to choose if they turn hunters loose; some landowners will charge if they want hunting rights to that property. If we didn't receive a variance to this rule, we would have 80% of the hunters on the private property.

Carrie Mair: How many hunters were charged? How many were allowed free reign? How many had to have a guide?

Dave Chivers: It's not a perfect record because you're asking 157 landowners for records. We just know that on our mountain it's kind of like your backyard. If you tell me that I've got to let these people on my

property without my permission, I'll say no. I think the Division would tell you that when people call, we take pretty good care of them. It has worked really well for the public and for the landowners.

Carrie Mair: Does the Division have a problem with it?

Charlie Greenwood: No. It works.

Mitch Hacking: We found it works better than the CWMU is and general season but it does require us to ask for a variance every year.

Kirk Woodward: Move to accept the variance as we have for the last 17 years.

Wayne McAllister: Second

Favor: Carrie Mair, Bob Christensen, Brandon McDonald, Wayne McAllister, Mitch Hacking, Kirk Woodward

Opposed: Beth Hamann. Just listening to public comment where I work at the BLM, the public is really unhappy with the access they have to the Diamond Mountain area and the lack of access to the ground. "These are the maps, why can't we get to the ground? We're getting charged to cross on public lands and public roads. They say we can't go onto the ground unless we have their guide." The Diamond Mountain hunt is almost impossible to fulfill for the average hunter.

Dave Chivers: If that's happening, you need to report it because nobody can charge to cross public property.

Floyd Briggs: That should be brought up at county commission meetings.

Boyde Blackwell: We do need a motion on overall permit numbers. You did an action on the variance

Bob Christensen: MOTION to accept as presented

Beth Hamann second

Favor: Unanimous

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 pm

Next meeting December 8, 2011

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Nov 09, 2011

6:00 P.M.

Place: Weber State University

RAC Present

John Blazzard- Agric
Robert Byrnes –At Large
Paul Cowley- Forest Service
James Gaskill- At Large
R. Jefre Hick-At Large
Russ Lawrence - At Large
Jon Leonard- Sportsman
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bryce Thurgood- At Large
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Anis Aoude
Boyde Blackwell
Darren Deboois
Justin Dolling
Jim Christensen
Randy Wood
Dave Rich
Scott McFarlane
Mitch Lane
Kevin Bunnell

Wildlife Board

Ernie Perkins
Bill Fenimore

RAC Excused

John Cavitt- Noncon.
Jill Silvey- BLM

RAC Absent

Joel Ferry- Agric
G. Lynn Nelson- Elected

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 15

Introduction: Robert Byrnes-Chair

Agenda:

Review of Agenda and Sept 28, 2011 Meeting Minutes
Wildlife Board Meeting Update
Regional Update
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012
Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012

Item 1. Welcome and Introductions

Introduction of RAC Members

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Sept 28, 2011 Meeting Minutes and Agenda

Byrnes- Wall does have an excused absence for Sept 28 meeting.

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the minutes as amended.

Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Motion: Cowley- Move to approve the agenda for tonight's meeting.

Second: Lawrence

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Wildlife Board approved the three action items that we had approved ourselves as presented. Our motion to request a variance or change for youth fishing contests, the division will talk and meet with fishing groups during the summer and come back with a proposal if it is required.

Item 4. Regional Update

Justin Dolling, Acting Regional Supervisor

Personnel Changes- Jim Christensen replacing Kirt Enright as the Box Elder Biologist, Riley Peck Sensitive Species Biologist replacing Masako Wright. Conservation Officer Jade Sumsion has moved onto the Forest Service in Boise Idaho. Current Law Enforcement will pick up his duties.

- Law Enforcement working on a plan for our winter range poaching.
- Deer hunt was pretty slow. Few yearlings as a result of winter loss last year.
- Biologists working on elk plan revisions and adjusting population objectives.
- Biologists are working on post season deer classifications.
- Swans are starting to move in. Last count was about 43,000.
- Habitat section is working on mule deer winter range on the Millville Face.
- Weber River restoration on oxbows in exchange for angler access.

- Working with UDOT and private land owners on deer crossings in Sardine Canyon.
- Aquatics are working on cut throat restorations. Developing two new urban fisheries in Kaysville and Layton. Working with Kaysville irrigation.
- Nongame aquatics section was involved with a least chub project on Antelope Island.
- Weber River is good fishing for browns right now.
- Outreach are putting the final touches on the Management plan for Hardware Ranch. Wild find stories with the media. Develop interactive mapping.

Item 5. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2012 Season Dates and Application Timeline

- Anis Aoude, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Scott Hatch- Why are we going to ruin the family hunt by splitting the state up into 32 units? Why is there not bounty on cougars, bears and coyote?

Byrnes- This is the time to ask questions on the presentation. The Wildlife Board has already said we are going to 32 units and we are not discussing cougars tonight.

Scott Hatch- That is my question, if you want to answer it or not.

Anis Aoude- Basically, the reason we are going to 32 units is we were asked to take it out as an option and through the public process, it was a fairly split decision but about half the folks were for it and half were opposed to it. It basically came down to the decision of the wildlife board. They had to make a very tough decision and they decided to go with 30 units. That is the reason we are here today proposed hunt dates for those 30 units. Whether it ruins the family hunt or not is neither here nor there.

Scott Hatch- It is important.

Byrnes- You need to respect his time to respond to your question.

Anis Aoude- I think most people can still find a way to go out hunting on a specific unit with their family. From the surveys we have done, very few people hunt more than one unit.

Therefore, it is not going to ruin the family hunt to that extent. I agree with you that it is going to limit what folks can do but it is a decision that has already been made and it is not going to change. The second question dealt with lions and bears. We managed those populations with accordance to management plans that are passed through the public process and we will continue to do so.

Scott Hatch- You are never going to have a decent deer herd until you have a bounty on the cougars.

Byrnes- This is a question period and I asked you to come up to the microphone if you have a question. We cannot record what you are saying in the back. Please follow the rules how we run the meeting.

RAC Questions

James Gaskill- On this moose hunt, if someone has a muzzleloader deer tag and a moose tag will they be able to carry two guns or how will they deal with that?

Aoude- They will have to take whatever animal they have a tag for with the proper weapon. They will have to figure out either how to carry two weapons or hunt for one thing one day and another thing another day.

Gaskill- What is law enforcement going to say about that?

Aoude- Currently, you can hunt with any weapon.

Gaskill- But not during the muzzleloader season.

Aoude- We have other units with similar things happening. On our goat units, there are other hunts going on. This is not anything new. It is going to be a little bit more tricky but if somebody shoots an animal, the current projectile better be the one that killed that animal.

Mitch Lane- There are similar situations when a weapon would be restricted to someone unless they were also in possession of a license or permit that allowed them to take something else.

This would be a similar situation. They could legally possess both of those firearms if they had a permit that allowed them to carry each of those. Obviously, like Anis said, they could only use the appropriate weapon to take the respective animal for each permit.

Gaskill- So, the answer is they would be allowed to carry both guns?

Mitch Lane- Yes.

Gaskill- This may be off the topic a little bit but are we going to have some good comparisons between under satisfaction pre 30 unit division and post 30 unit division. If so, what kind of weight will we give the results?

Aoude- We always have satisfaction index on all the surveys we do. We will continue to do that. Satisfaction generally follows hunt success so if folks are able to harvest an animal, the satisfaction is high. If they are not, usually their satisfaction is low. It runs about the same all of the time. If we do see a decrease in satisfaction, we will certainly look at the reason for it.

Bryce Thurgood- I know the Willard is over objective on goat. Have they looked into expanding to the north? North of Sardine or south in Weber Canyon instead of just killing them all.

Aoude- Maybe I will let Darren answer that. It is his unit and he is here.

Darren Debloois- They are kind of doing it on their own right now. We do have goats on Ogden Peak. We do have goats across Weber Canyon. We have goats on the Cache that have come all the way around. That is why the objective was set fairly low. We are getting to the point where goats are expanding on their own. There are some on the Wellsville. That is all pretty good goat habitat. The Forest Service manages those lands and they have significant concerns what goats might do to vegetation. There are not any plans at the moment to augment those natural movements. I don't think it would be out of the realm of possibility. It would have to be something we would discuss with the Forest Service and come up with a plan. We probably would not be looking at taking goats from Willard and moving them. We would be more interested in getting some genetic diversity from other herds. Either in the state or outside of the state. We would still be looking at trying to control that population through hunting. It would be tricky to catch goats on Willard, it is very rugged.

Aoude- We are currently revising the statewide goat plan. You can't move goats unless you have an approved site to move it to. We will be looking at those sites as approved sites. We have to get the approval of the Forest Service before we can put them there. They do not perceive goats as being native which makes it difficult for us to put them in any new places. If they pioneer there on their own, we are able to supplement them.

Thurgood- Thank You.

Ann Neville- Could you go into more depth about the buck/bull combo and getting rid of that. I don't quite understand why?

Aoude- Basically, that hunt was done because the Northern region has private land units and public land units. The private land units had little hunting pressure and the public land units have a lot of pressure. So, to deal with that, we split 2,000 permits off the general deer hunt and put them on any bull units which tend to be the private land units. We are no longer going to be managing on a regional basis. We are going to be managing on a unit by unit basis. If we have overcrowding on a specific unit, we can take permits off it without having to put them anywhere else. Or, we could put them somewhere else without having a buck/bull combo. The buck/bull combo goes with any bull elk units. Those may not perfectly overlap with our 30 general season units. There is a lot of complications that come with the buck/bull combo. There may be a proposal done to combine those hunts but that is a different thing. For now, to simplify matters and keep our management similar everywhere, it would be easier to not have that combo.

Gaskill- Regarding the extended archery boundary in the northern region, it is already legal to use any weapon in that area correct?

Aoude- Correct. With the extended archery boundary comes an extended archery season as well.

Gaskill- This is not like they are moving in there. They live there right?

Aoude- Correct. We are extending the boundary so people can harvest them later in the year as well.

Gaskill- Do we anticipate that is going to help alleviate the depredation problem?

Aoude- It will alleviate some. We still have to deal with some of it.

Gaskill- That is the main issue now right?

Aoude- For the most part. I can have Randy address it more. From what I understand, they have some depredation issues that they want to try and alleviate.

Randy Wood- It is both. It offers some opportunity for the archers to go out farther to the west. We have some pockets out there where we have deer that could be taken with archery equipment. It is all private land. They are causing nuisance and depredation problems. We expanded that to offer more opportunity and hopefully take some of those deer with the hunters instead of us out there causing the problems.

Gaskill- Why not extend the any weapon season just as well. We would be more efficient in killing the deer.

Wood- Presently, the any weapon season is out there.

Gaskill- Why not extend that like we are extending the archery?

Wood- I don't know.

Gaskill- If you really want to kill the deer, a rifle is a whole lot better.

Wood- Right now we probably have very few rifle hunters that hunt the west part of Davis and Weber counties. We feel there is probably a better opportunity for the archers to get out there amongst the small plots of land and little areas to hunt.

Byrnes- The boundary in the description is only the Ogden extended archery boundary.

Wood- No, it is both. They meet but we extended the portion of the Wasatch that is in Davis County and went out to the shore and then also the Ogden unit went out to the shore of the Great Salt Lake. They both go out there.

Byrnes- In our packet, it says boundary change Ogden extended archery boundary.

Wood- It also should have been the Wasatch. The portion of that is in our unit, the Wasatch extended hunt.

Byrnes- We don't have a description of the boundary change for the Wasatch.

Aoude- It is included in there. If you read the boundary, it does go to I-15 and all the way north.

Byrnes- It says beginning on the Weber/Morgan county line and I-84; west on I-84 to Weber/Davis county line; west on this county line to the 4298 foot contour line (shore of the Great Salt Lake); North at this elevation to the southern dike of the Willard Bay Reservoir; East and North along this dike to I-15.

Gaskill- There is no Davis County in that boundary.

Aoude- My apology if it is not there.

Wood- It is to extend that portion in our region. Both of them out to the boundary of the Great Salt Lake and around.

Byrnes- Anis' presentation said the extended archery. It was very general. Whereas our packet has the boundary extension for the Ogden.

Wood- We were looking at our region, extended archery for our region. The Wasatch goes through too.

Byrnes- When we make our recommendation, if we do it as presented, it is for all the extended archery within the northern region.

Wood- That is what we would like. Behind it was to extend both in Davis and Weber County.

Paul Cowley- Can you talk about why we actually have dates when people can sell animal parts as far as the antlers or hides, especially in view of the internet selling opportunity.

Aoude- Basically, it is set up so they cannot sell them outside of when they could have legally obtained them. We have always had those dates. To be honest, I am not sure why they are where they are. I could find out and get back to you.

Cowley- Is there a value to having dates. I understand why we would want to restrict them to being parts of animals legally taken.

Aoude- Right.

Cowley- I am not sure the dates provide much value at this point.

Aoude- I am not exactly sure.

Neville- There is no punitive damages for anybody who sells on eBay unless you are going to follow up on that.

Aoude- They do actually monitor a lot of those things and make a lot of cases that way.

Thurgood- Extended archery hunt. I grew up in Syracuse and I know this is a depredation issue and I support that but do some of these landowners complaining about depredation problems get reimbursed. Most of them won't allow hunters to hunt. They won't let them hunt but are asking for handouts to compensate them. Is there any way of saying if you are going to ask for that, you have to grant permission to hunters?

Wood- Presently, no.

Gaskill- Is it true they get permits to shoot deer on their property that are a nuisance or depredation.

Wood- In the rule, there are options for them to get those.

Gaskill- They do in fact get them?

Wood- In some cases, they do get them. It is an option.

Cowley- With the bison hunt in the Book cliffs, what coordination it taking place with the tribe over there?

Aoude- Quite a bit. They may still not be on board with what we are doing. They also have not managed their bison to hold populations where they need to be. Once they come off the tribe, we have to deal with them. They count towards our objective on our unit so we need to be able to harvest them. There has been quite a bit of coordination. We have actually had nuisance hunts in that area dealing with animals that go off the unit to the west. We are trying to coordinate with them but until they start managing their herds, there is not a whole lot we can do but harvest what comes off.

John Blazzard- The preseason and postseason handicap hunts. Could there be an issue with a rifle hunt overlapping a muzzleloader or archery hunt?

Aoude- They are done in a way that they don't overlap. Most of those folks are sticking to the roads and things like that.

Byrnes- Can you give us a number on the extension request you get?

Aoude- How many requests do we get?

Byrnes- Or, how many you grant?

Aoude- I don't have the exact number but I don't think it ever goes over 150 statewide. I don't know if we issue that many but I think that is how many requests we get. I can get that number and get back to you. It is a fairly small number.

Byrnes- I think that is good.

Thurgood- It is still longer for the limited entry hunts right?

Aoude- Those are different. Those are set unit by unit and case by case basis. Those are decided by the regional biologist on a case by case basis.

Public Comment

Ben Lowder-Utah Bowmen's Association- Email sent earlier today and copy was given out prior to meeting. First recommendation is a joint recommendation among the Mule Deer Foundation, United Wildlife Cooperative, Bowhunters of Utah and Utah Bowmen's Association. This recommendation is dealing with the 2012 archery deer hunt. We recommend that the archery deer hunt continue to be statewide rather than making the archers choose a unit. Second recommendation is concerning the mountain goat hunt on Willard Peak in the northern region. It is a short season for a once in a lifetime opportunity. Recommend extending those seasons to give those hunters that receive that OIAL opportunity to have the best hunting experience possible. Law enforcement would prefer a Monday opening instead of Saturday. My recommendation for the Willard mountain goat unit would be to set the season for the early season, September 10th to the 23rd. For the late season, September 24th to October 14th. And October 1st to October 14th for the nanny hunt.

Byrnes- So the nanny would overlap the late?

Lowder- Right. It is exactly what the proposal is on the Beaver unit as well.

Gordy Bell- Bowhunter's of Utah- Support Ben's proposal for statewide archery hunt. Cannot stress the need for opportunity and this is one way to get it back.

Jerry Hill- United Wildlife Cooperative- Supports joint proposal in regards to statewide archery. Would like the RAC and the division to consider ways to implement comprehensive hunter management in the newly created mule deer subunits.

Byrnes- Letter from Guy Crossland- The Mule Deer Foundation, the United Wildlife Cooperative, Bowhunters of Utah and the Utah Bowmen's Association jointly propose that the

RAC's and Wildlife Board reconsider the decision to make archery deer hunters to pick a unit in 2012, and instead allow archery deer hunters to continue to hunt statewide.

Gaskill- Email from Steve Perry regarding the OIAL application procedure. He wants to make it possible to put in for more than one OIAL species each year.

Byrnes- He would like to have residents to apply and receive bonus point similar to what we allow non-residents?

Gaskill- Correct.

Gaskill- Would like to comment on the presentation from the Bowhunter's. On item 1, we could substitute or eliminate archery tackle from their statement and it would still be true. The number of hunters that harvest deer are not statistically impacting the buck/doe ratios whether they are archery hunters or rifle hunters. I would also love to hunt statewide. I don't use a bow and I don't see that using a bow should give you the privilege of hunting statewide. I don't think my muzzleloader impacts the buck/doe ratio anywhere. I don't agree with that proposal.

John Blazzard- I would like to agree with James on this issue. I would like the hunt statewide also with rifle and I hunt with a bow also. I think we need to start taking a look at how much of what we are allowing to happen and the number of people out in the woods all the time.

Jon Leonard- Mixed emotions about this. I also like the argument for dispersing more hunters if that might attract more hunters into the archery season. It would have less impact on population. We stated before that we are all for opportunity and they provide a lot more opportunity than we could get otherwise with the limited tags. I would like Anis to address the comments by those organizations since they do represent significant segment of the hunting population. Is the compelling argument from the division standpoint just difficult in managing a statewide with the 30 units?

Aoude- Logistically, it would not be any different than it is currently. The main reason is the perception of fairness. Biologically, we could do it. Logistically, we could do it. The majority of the public did not want to go that direction.

Thurgood- Going back to this 30 unit, it puts a huge influx of archers in those units. Isn't that kind of defeating the purpose of that?

Aoude- It could but that currently happens with regional hunting. There are units that have higher buck to doe ratios and those do draw archers into them. You will have that but again; it is not something we won't pick up from the harvest surveys from the classifications. We will be able to monitor it. You are right, because you go to unit by unit, there may be those that are shopping for units that are suppose to have a better hunt. There should not be any units that are better than others because they are all general season units. That happens currently and you hear about it.

Cowley- Can you address the mountain goat date timing differences?

Aoude- I will let Darren address this since it is his unit.

Deblois- The primary concerns up there we are trying to address with shorter hunts was some law enforcement concerns with the number of people. If you are not familiar with Willard Peak, there is a road that runs from Mantua all the way up to Willard Peak. It is very accessible and incredibly popular with hikers, motorcycles and ATV riders. You are piling hunters on top of those people so the things we wanted to address was splitting that hunt in order to alleviate some of the crowding issues between hunters. We wanted to open on a weekday so that we were not throwing hunters on top of the weekend recreators. They would have a Monday through Friday. Some of those hunters would get their goat and there would be

a little bit less pressure on top of other recreators and public perception. I think that both of those things would be addressed with the dates proposed. I do not think there is any biological reasons why we could not do that. I had some concerns about hunter orange. Those have been alleviated through the new law. Biologically, I do not have any concerns with their proposal in terms of dates. It works for what we are trying to do.

Thurgood- What is the success.

Debloois- We are assuming 100%. Biologically, we are putting out permits that we expect to be filled and that is how we are going to deal with population dynamics with the nanny hunt and with the other permits. That really is not an issue.

Byrnes- The Beaver actually opens on a Saturday but you prefer a Monday?

Debloois- I prefer a Monday opener for reasons I stated.

Byrnes- The first hunt would overlap the following weekend.

Debloois- Right.

Byrnes- In reality, you are just skipping the first weekend.

Debloois- The logic behind that would be hunters would have a week without a lot of other users to go up and try to harvest a goat. The goats are certainly accessible and I think a lot of goats probably get taken during that first week. By that first weekend, there will probably be a little less overlap between the general public and hunters.

Byrnes- Some of you were not on the RAC when the proposal came around for the 30 units. It might have been 29 at the time. We did not vote for it. The Wildlife Board approved it. At that same meeting, they voted not to have statewide archery. Our agenda item for tonight is to set season dates and the application timeline. Basically, what the presentation was.

Motion

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the recommendations from the Division as presented with the alternative Willard Peak Goat hunt season dates.

Second: Thurgood

Discussion on the Motion

Lawrence- I think that OIAL would not hurt to extend those season dates and recommend that to the Wildlife Board.

Byrnes- On the goat hunt on Willard Peak?

Lawrence- Yes.

Byrnes- Would you like to make an amendment or would the maker of the motion be sympathetic to the change?

Gaskill- I have no problem if he wants to make an amendment.

Lawrence- Make an amendment to extend season dates on the goats for the Willard Peak unit.

Byrnes- If Jim is ok and Bryce, since you second it, would you be in favor of that? We could incorporate that into one motion and not have to amend the original motion.

Thurgood- Sure.

Byrnes- The motion would be to approve the bucks and bulls and OIAL 2012 season dates and application timeline as presented with the proposed changes for the Willard Peak goat hunt as far as the dates.

Gaskill- O.k.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Aoude- We did get a clarification on those season dates. It is basically so people do not harvest animals during the season, sell them and then go back and harvest another and then sell it during the open season. That is the rationale for those dates of selling. They would have to wait until the season is over before they could sell them.

R. Jefre Hicks- You said that the motion towards the statewide archery would be outside our scope of agenda for tonight? It would have to be done separately to the Wildlife Board?

Byrnes- It would be outside our action item on our agenda. It would have to be something you would recommend. It would have to be a separate motion to the Wildlife Board. It is not really in our action tonight. It has been approved by the Wildlife Board.

Hicks- I am just trying to determine if we are going to open up a can of worms that cannot be reclosed? Can we talk about this motion after the break?

Byrnes- You can make a motion but it is not within our agenda. It could just be a recommendation to the Wildlife Board. As I stated, they made the decision before.

Hicks- Even if we did make a recommendation, would the Wildlife Board ever be able to reassess that since they already made the decision.

Byrnes- I would present our motions at the Wildlife Board meeting.

Hicks- And ask them to reconsider their last decision.

Byrnes- It would be a request from our regional advisory council. They would choose whether or not to address it. If they chose not to address it, they would tell me why.

Motion

Motion: Leonard- Make a recommendation to the Wildlife Board reconsider to allow state wide archery.

Second: Hicks

Hicks- I wanted to make sure what we could do here without actually saying something with no backup.

Cowley- It is just a recommendation.

Gaskill- I am not really sure we can vote on something that is just being presented tonight.

Byrnes- We will have to vote on it because it is a motion but it is not an action item.

Cowley- It would be good to see how many of our RAC agree with that recommendation. I think there is some value to that.

Gaskill- I don't disagree with that.

Byrnes- You also have a different makeup of the Wildlife Board now. I am not sure how their sympathies fall. We have two new members on the Wildlife Board. I don't expect it to change at the point we are at now.

Leonard- The important thing is that we are conveying public sentiment. This is pretty significant on our population that is presented tonight. I think we need to reflect that and pass it on to the Wildlife Board.

Gaskill- For a long time, I have had a fair amount of discomfort with the way the meetings go as far as somebody wants to bring up an idea and it is not on the agenda so it makes it difficult for someone to come in. It is the way meetings should be held. A topic should be brought up,

discussed as an informational item and then brought back as an action item. I don't have any philosophical objection to it but I have some legality question to it.

Byrnes- That is why I wanted it separate from our action item. We do make recommendations from time to time that are not really part of the action item. They might be associated.

Aoude- Because we are season dates setting and season setting, this could be part of that. It is a season that they are asking for being statewide vs. unit by unit. It is not totally outside of what we are dealing with tonight. It is a recommendation outside what we are recommending but it does not fall outside the scope of it. If the board wanted to, they could adopt this at this board meeting and it could be something we could move forward with.

Neville- I manage a CWMU unit in the central region and I was approached by a couple of people in Tooele. They had opinions about how the archers have more opportunities than others. They felt it was unfair. I just wanted to reiterate that there is a lot of feeling of unfairness with the statewide.

Cowley- We heard a gentleman earlier where he was fairly disgusted with the 30 hunt unit and it seems to me like we are basically readdressing that very issue again. It just depends on equality and addressing the statewide or regions vs. the 30 hunt units.

Hicks- I have had people say both ways that archers seem to get more of a shot than everybody else. On the other hand, I have to agree with Jon that there is a big enough segment that would like us to bring it out that it is probably worth at least making a motion and let us send it on if this RAC chooses. I think it is at least worth sending it out there.

Leonard- I am not an archer and I kind of get a little tired of the issue of fairness. Too much now with bonus points and limited entry we are losing track of the opportunity that hunting brings. I would like to see the opportunity out there. We are already going to reduce opportunity with the 30 units. We owe it to the public to relay the ideas and the opinions that have been addressed tonight.

Thurgood- I am an archer and I have talked to a few friends today about this issue and we are all at the point where we would like to sacrifice to get away from the camping trips everyone is complaining about and get back to something everyone has success at.

Motion Fails- For: 4 Against: 6

Item 6. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2012

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

None

RAC Questions

Byrnes- In the packet, there are two CWMU's that the private acres, it shows a number but no percentage. If you look at Bear Springs. I am assuming that is 100%.

Blackwell- Yes.

Byrnes- There is one other.

Blackwell- On that, the problem we had with that one was it did not get added in on the access document maker. The column was not wide enough to allow it in. That will be the same on the other one too.

Byrnes- Compensation for including public land. It does not seem to be consistent throughout unless it is not noted here. Can you explain how you require that?

Blackwell- There are two things they can do. The first one is that they can provide the percentage of their property; it comes off the top in permit numbers. If they use 10% of their CWMU as public land, then they take off that top 10% before the splits even take place and that goes into the pool for the public permits. Then, they do the split. The other way is they can provide the same amount acre per acre of another piece of land for the public to hunt in another area.

Byrnes- Is there a percentage of the total where you do not require compensation?

Blackwell- If it comes out to less than one permit.

Byrnes- If you look at Fort Ranch.

Blackwell- Which Ranch?

Byrnes- Fort Ranch, it is on page 8. They have 4.1% of public acres but it does not state any specific compensation there.

Blackwell- That is because I believe on that one, it is because it does not qualify for one permit.

Wood- That is right.

Byrnes- Is Lone Tree Taylor Hollow the same?

Blackwell- Yes. It is 1.1%.

Byrnes- Is Promontory Point the same thing? It does not qualify?

Blackwell- Yes. I recently came out and gave specific directions to the regions to make sure they follow this closely. I have provided them with a permit table where all they have to do is put in the numbers and it spits out what the breakdown is going to be. I feel pretty confident in what the regions provided me here with compensation.

Byrnes- The reason for my questions is obviously we have a lot of CWMU's and the public is interested in that compensation specifically.

Blackwell- I totally agree.

Cowley- Wondering on the public lands, has there been much discussion with those public land managers to make sure we are not having problems with outfitter and guiding legalities on the public lands portion of those CWMU's.

Wood- The biologist contact those public land managers when there CWMU and corporate public land into it. They would go talk to the BLM or Forest Service of that are as they are making recommendations.

Cowley- They verify whether or not that person is allow to outfitter and guide or not.

Wood- Yes, well they include it. They do not check to see if that guy has a permit or not to guide. That would come under you guys if he is guiding on the Forest, we do not check that.

Cowley- O.K.

Public Comment

Todd Black- It is my understanding when that legislation was passed, that CWMU's whether they have public or private, were excluded from that.

Cowley- Not with federal law.

Blackwell- There are excluded from the state but not from the federal law.

Todd Black- I respectfully disagree. I challenge you guys to look at the legislation because it was drafted and included in that.

Todd Black- Sardine Canyon CWMU- Talked with Boyde and our local biologist. Our current plan did not change what we had from the previous 3 years. Propose to change those season dates to take the later season date at September 11th through November 10th. Also, we want to reduce the total number of tags and vouchers both to private and public over the 3 year period as follows: 13 and 2 for the first year, 13 and 1 and 13 and 1 for the subsequent 2 years for a total of 39 private and 4 public vouchers.

Byrnes- I thought you said 9/11 through 11/11 but you are asking for 11/5.

Todd Black- Whatever the standard check the box is. Which is it?

Blackwell- 11/10.

Todd Black- The public hunter would be able to hunt the first 5 days of the November hunt.

Byrnes- Boyde do you want to respond?

Blackwell- In talking with Darren, I guess they have recommended approval but the problem was that he submitted the application and management plan. We received it, reviewed it and approved it. Because it was after the fact, we could not get it changed in time for this meeting. So, we have asked him to come and present that at the RAC meeting for approval to make that change.

Byrnes- You would be supportive?

Blackwell- Yes.

RAC Comment

Neville- Need to abstain from voting.

Blizzard- Being new here, I assume the number of permits is set up through history and wildlife counts when you determine how many permits.

Blackwell- Yes, and also especially on limited entry units, it goes by the proportion of permits. The overall permits available to the public vs. the size of the CWMU. Then, they are allowed to select their split and that is how the permits are proportioned out.

Byrnes- If the CWMU falls within the boundary of a limited entry unit, it is proportioned by acreage but there is also a public percentage of the permits on the CWMU.

Blizzard- In light of the concern over the deer population, is there anything happening in the CWMU that reflects change in the harvest?

Byrnes- I think Boyde can respond.

Blackwell- Currently, the CWMU's are getting less permits on the CWMU than we have on the other units proportionately already. That is already taken into consideration. The biologists were asked to look at that closely this year knowing we were going in that direction. They were supposed to take a look at those and make that comparison as well.

Blizzard- Thank You.

Thurgood- Is there any other variances where they go over the 9 to 1 ratio on the other CWMU's?

Blackwell- No, it is a 90/10 split or an 80/20 split, and 85/15 and 75/25 split. They make the choice. What they choose has an effect later on when we do our antlerless permits because the public will get the exact opposite.

Byrnes- When we set permit numbers for the antlerless on the CWMU, we kind of flip flop. The public is going to get a larger percentage of tags than the CWMU will. If they selected 50/50 in the males, then it would be 50/50 in antlerless. Because they are selecting 90/10 or 85/15, that determines the split for the antlerless animals.

Thurgood- I was just curious why it was a 39 to 4 instead of a 36 to 4.

Byrnes- If you add them together, you get 43. It ends up being a partial animal.

Thurgood- O.K.

Motion

Motion: Leonard- Accept the Division's recommendation with the proposed change for the Sardine Canyon CWMU.

Second: Van Tassell

Motion Carries: For: 9 Abstain: 1

Item 7. Landowner Permit Numbers for 2012

- Boyde Blackwell, Wildlife Program Coordinator

See Handout

Public Comment

None

RAC Comment

None

Public Questions

None

RAC Questions

None

Motion

Motion: Wall- Accept the Division's recommendation as presented.

Second: Blazzard

Motion Carries: Unanimous.

Additional Discussion

Gaskill- I think in fairness to Mr. Perry who sent us all an email, we have to discuss that topic for a minute. Not to make a motion but to at least put into the minutes that we considered it and I personally feel he has a good point. Particularly, non-residents have a distinct advantage over residents in this matter being able to apply for more than one OIAL permit every year.

Byrnes- I remember when you use to be able to put in for everything and I still have bonus points in stray categories like pronghorn and deer points. When it came around, there were some questions about that change. It does generate some revenue for the division and could potentially generate more revenue. At the time, they were trying to reduce the number of applicants also when we had a huge Utah state resident applicants for a limited resource of tags.

Blizzard- It seems like if you are only allowed to put in for one OIAL, basically it is once in a lifetime. By the time you go through the 16-18 years or whatever it takes to draw out and start on the next one, you are too old. I don't have a problem with limited the draw but it would be nice to be able to accrue some bonus points.

Byrnes- Once you finally draw a tag, you start from scratch.

Thurgood- I am pretty unlucky at drawing stuff so I would rather keep a chance of me being able to draw a sheep tag in my lifetime and not have 10,000 other people compounded the problem. It is going to take me another 30-40 years to get it.

Gaskill- What is the rationale for allowing non-residents to do that? Because it is a smaller pool or because it generates more money?

Byrnes- Anis, could you comment. I cannot remember.

Aoude- It is both. They are not keeping the residents from drawing because they are only 10% of the total permits. It allows us to generate more revenue without affecting the draw odds of residents.

Gaskill- Do they have to buy a non-resident license?

Aoude- They do. It is also \$10 dollars for each species. If you open it up, you are not more likely to draw any of those individually.

Byrnes- It is the only legal lottery in Utah.

Gaskill- I know at least one attorney that disagrees with that.

Neville- Generate more revenue.

Meeting Ends: 8:15 p.m.