

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

December 5, 2019, DNR, Boardroom

1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The meeting can be viewed live at <https://youtu.be/Dlcc40gd4r0>

Revised December 2, 2019

Thursday, December 5, 2019, 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Town of Castle Valley Request
–Alice Drogin, Town of Castle Valley | ACTION |
| 6. Statewide Deer Management Plan
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.
R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders
R657-57 – Division Variances
R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. Big Game Application Timeline
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator | INFORMATION |
| 10. Town of Castle Valley Request
—Alice Drogin, Town of Castle Valley | ACTION |
| 11. CWMU Advisory Committee Membership
- Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 12. Other Business
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Wildlife Board Motions

Following is a summary of Wildlife Board motions directing the Division to take action and the response to date:

Each Board Meeting until completed – Target Date – Bighorn Sheep MOU Report

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log that the Division give a progress report on the management plan’s lethal removal process and MOU at every board meeting until it is completed.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Jace Taylor
Action: Under Study
Status: To be presented at every board meeting until completed
Placed on Action Log: November 29, 2018

Spring 2020 – Target Date – Bear Issues

MOTION: I move that we add to the action log that the Division reconvene the working group to explore better solutions on the spring hunt, number of hounds in the field, and non-resident permit challenges.

Motion made by: Kevin Albrecht
Assigned to: Darren DeBlois
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: January 10, 2019

Fall 2020 – Target Date – Premium Fishing Areas

MOTION: To have the division look into the possibility of designating premium fishing areas - that allow artificial flies and lures only- to have increased license requirements and fees and to bring the information back during the next recommendation cycle.

Motion made by: Byron Batemen
Assigned to: Randy Oplinger
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: September 27, 2018

Wildlife Board Assignments

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

October 3, 2019, DNR Auditorium

1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at https://youtu.be/9u8ycoiCt_0

AGENDA

Thursday, October 3, 2019, Board Meeting 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda ACTION
– Byron Bateman, Chairman
2. Approval of Minutes ACTION
– Byron Bateman, Chairman
3. Old Business/Action Log CONTINGENT
– Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair
Bighorn Sheep MOU Report – Jace Taylor
4. DWR Update INFORMATION
– Mike Fowlks, DWR Director
5. Fishing Informational INFORMATIONAL
– Craig Walker, Sportfish Assistant Chief
6. R657-59 Private Fish Ponds Rule Amendments ACTION
– Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sportfish Coordinator
7. Bighorn Sheep Unit Management Plans ACTION
– Jace Taylor, Bighorn Sheep/Mountain Goat Biologist
8. Conservation Permit Audit ACTION
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
9. Conservation Permit Annual Report INFORMATIONAL
– Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief
10. Conservation Permit Variance Request ACTION
– Darren DeBlois, Game Mammals Program Coordinator
11. Fee Review INFORMATIONAL
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
12. 2020 RAC/Board Dates ACTION
– Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator
13. Wildlife Board Stipulations ACTION
– Greg Hansen, Assistant Attorney General
14. Other Business CONTINGENT
– Byron Bateman, Chairman

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act - Persons needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) for this meeting, should contact Staci Coons at 801-538-4718, giving her at least five working days' notice.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
October 3, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda for the October 3 Wildlife meeting.

2) Approval of Minutes (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 22, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.

3) R657-59 Private Fish Ponds Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve R657-59 Private Fish Ponds Rule Amendments with the updated definition except for the exclusion of Washington County.

4) Bighorn Sheep Unit Management Plans (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Bighorn Sheep Unit Management Plans as presented with revised language for the following units: Antelope Island, Nine Mile, Book Cliffs Rattlesnake, Oquirrh/Stansbury, and Uinta Mountain.

5) Conservation Permit Audit (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented.

6) Conservation Permit Variance Request (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Variance Request as presented.

7) 2020 RAC/Board Dates

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2020 RAC/Board Dates with the date adjustments.

8) Wildlife Board Stipulations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation to reduce Craig B. Cowan's suspension to 20 months.

9) Other Business (**Contingent**)

The Board agreed to send Kevin Albrecht and Randy Dearth to the 2020 mid-winter WAFWA conference in Monterey, California.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
October 3, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman – Chair	Karl Hirst
Kevin Albrecht – Vice-Chair	Donnie Hunter
Mike Fowlks – Exec Secretary	Randy Dearth
	Wade Heaton
	Bret Selman

RAC Chairs

Central – Brock McMillan
Southern – Brayden Richmond
Southeastern – Trisha Hedin
Northeastern – Brett Prevedel
Northern – Justin Oliver

Division Personnel

Mike Canning	Paul Gedge	Dax Mangus
Ashley Green	Mike Christensen	Randy Wood
Robin Cahoon	Staci Coons	Riley Peck
Jason Vernon	Thu Vo-Wood	Guy Wallace
Miles Hanberg	Greg Hansen	Teresa Griffin
Chris Wood	Marty Bushman	Jim Christensen
Kevin Bunnell	Faith Jolley	Austin Grimes
Drew Cushing	Craig Walker	Trina Hedrick
Rick Olson	Darren DeBloois	Chris Penne
Justin Shannon	Jace Taylor	Lindy Varney
Kenny Johnson	Randy Oplinger	

Public Present

Roger Wilson	Troy Justensen – SFW
Bryce Pilling	Ken Strong – SFW
Peggy Bateman	Spencer Gibbons – Utah Farm Bureau
Robert Judd	Troy Forrest – UDAF
Wade Garrett	Miles Moretti – MDF

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
October 3, 2019, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
https://youtu.be/9u8ycoiCt_0

- 00:00:08** Chairman Bateman called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, explained the meeting procedure, and introduced Board and RAC members.
- 00:3:00** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda for the October 3 Wildlife meeting.
- 00:03:27** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 22, 2019 Wildlife Board Meeting.
- 00:03:55** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
Jace Taylor updated the Board on the completion of the bighorn sheep MOU.
- 00:05:18** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**
Mike Fowlks updated the Board on hunts and season dates, licensing sales, habitat projects, aquatics programs and restocking, and law enforcement recruitment.
- 00:09:23** **5) Fishing Informational (Informational)**
Craig Walker presented two fishing informationals. The first is "Tailoring Angler Opportunities to Meet Angler Needs".
The second presentation is "Simplifying COR for FishingTournaments".
- 00:33:03**
- 00:29:34** **Board/RAC Questions**
The board asked about performance measures in relation to meeting public needs, expressed concerns/caution for suggested changes, and nonresident gaps.
- 00:42:52** The board asked about backlog, tournament request count, COR automation process.
- 00:45:45** **6) R657-59 Private Fish Ponds Rule Amendments(Action)**
Randy Oplinger presented the rule amendments.
- 00:54:52** **Board/RAC Questions**
The board asked if the COR online process could be incorporated into this and definition clarification.

00:59:56 RAC Recommendations

01:04:36 All RACs, with exception of Southern RAC, unanimously passed the rule amendments. Southern RAC did not have a quorum.

01:00:16 Public Comments

Public comments accepted at this time.

01:06:42 Board Discussion

Chairman Bateman summarized the RAC motions. The Board discussed the automation process for COR, verbiage changes and Washington County exclusion after RAC votes, and discharging water in rural areas.

The following motion was made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept R657-59 Private Fish Ponds Rule Amendments with the updated definition except for the exclusion of Washington County.

01:14:37 7) Bighorn Sheep Unit Management Plans (Action)

Jace Taylor presented the unit management plans.

01:25:08 Board/RAC Questions

The board asked about the sheep management plan cycle and baiting.

01:28:21 RAC Recommendations

Central RAC unanimously passed the management plans. Northern RAC also unanimously passed the management plans with a stipulation. Southeastern and Northeastern RACs passed the plans with varying dissent and language changes. Southern RAC did not have a quorum.

Jace addressed the language changes and other board questions.

01:46:24 Public Comments

Public comments accepted at this time.

01:51:41 Board Discussion

Chairman Bateman summarized the RAC motions and the Board discussed.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Bighorn Sheep Unit Management Plans as presented with revised language for the following units: Antelope Island, Nine Mile, Book Cliffs Rattlesnake, Oquirrh/Stansbury, and Uinta Mountain.

01:56:01 8) Conservation Permit Audit (Action)

Kenny Johnson presented the audit.

02:04:20 Public Comments

Public comments accepted at this time.

02:06:56 Board Discussion

The Board expressed appreciation for the transparency of the program.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Audit as presented.

02:09:02 9) Conservation Permit Annual Report (Informational)

Justin Shannon presented the annual report.

02:15:28 10) Conservation Permit Variance Request (Action)

Darren DeBlois presented the variance.

02:18:00 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Variance Request as presented.

02:18:32 11) Fee Review (Informational)

Kenny presented the fee review.

02:22:03 12) 2020 RAC/Board Dates (Action)

Staci Coons presented the 2020 proposed meeting dates.

02:24:19 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2020 RAC/Board Dates with the date adjustments.

02:25:46 13) Wildlife Board Stipulations (Action)

Greg Hansen presented the stipulation for Craig B. Cowan.

02:27:42 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the stipulation to reduce Craig B. Cowan's suspension to 20 months.

02:29:06 **14) Other Business (Contingent)**

Mike Fowlks discussed WAFWA 2020 and mid-winter WAFWA in Monterey, California. The Board agreed to send Kevin Albrecht and Randy Dearth to mid-winter WAFWA.

02:30:56 Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

**Regional Advisory Council Meetings
November 2019
Summary of Motions**

Statewide Deer Management Plan

CRO **Motion:** To remove the word “plate” out of the document and just use the word “skull” where there is no brain tissue or matter.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the Deer Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

NRO **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board add clean deer skulls (no brain tissue) to the items that may be imported to Utah from CWD positive states.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board require previous year target buck to doe ratios be achieved on the unit before .5% additional tags are allocated to the late muzzleloader hunts for the year. If not achieved, only a maximum of 5 permits may be added to the late muzzleloader hunt for under performing units.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board require DWR to educate the public on proper disposal of deer from CWD contaminated units in Utah.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board convert late muzzleloader deer hunts into HAMS hunts.

Motion Passed: For:7 Against: 2 Abstain:1

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the Deer Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

SRO **Motion:** To add a third tier of 21-25 Bucks per 100 does as an option for General Season units.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To change the language of the plan for the late season muzzleloader hunts from “set at” to “no more than” 0.05.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To change the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read “clean skulls” instead of “clean skull plates”.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To keep the Statewide Deer Management Plan at 5 years instead of a 7 year plan.

Motion Passed: 7 in favor; 3 opposed

Motion: Accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

SERO

Motion: To change the buck to doe ratio to 18-20 on the San Juan/Abajo unit

Motion Passed: 5-2 with 2 abstaining

Motion: Accept the remainder of the plan as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

NERO

MOTION to accept the Statewide Mule Deer Management Plan as presented with the exception to set those late season deer hunts to a minimum of five, and not to exceed .25%; and to provide the opportunity to have that as a HAMS hunt and not specifically muzzleloading only.

Motion Passed: 4 in favor, 3 opposed

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

CRO

Motion: To remove the word “plate” out of the document and just use the word “skull” where there is no brain tissue or matter.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To accept the balance of the Division’s recommendations as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

NRO

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board align the rule with the preceding motion to allow clean deer skulls (no brain tissue) be added to the items that may be imported to Utah from CWD positive states.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board align the rule with the preceding motion to convert late muzzleloader hunts into HAMS hunts.

Motion Passed: For: 7 Against :2 Abstain:1

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the BBIOAL presentation.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

- SRO** **Motion:** To modify the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read “clean skulls” instead of “clean skull plates”.
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- Motion:** To combine the Willard Peak Mountain Goat hunts into a single hunt.
Motion Passed: 7-2
- Motion:** To accept the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented.
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- Motion:** For the RAC Board to review and consider increasing the number of Cougar permits on the Mineral Mountains.
Motion Passed: 8-1
- SERO** **Motion:** To not pass the extended archery hunt proposed in the Green River Valley
Motion Passed: 7 in favor with 2 abstaining
- Motion:** To change the verbiage in the state wide mule deer plan so that late season muzzleloader permits can be UP TO ½ percent of the total permits, in all units.
Motion Passed: 9 in favor with 1 abstaining
- Motion:** To accept the remainder of the plan as presented
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- NERO** **Motion:** To accept the Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL proposal as presented by the Division.
Motion Passed: 6-1

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020

- CRO** **Motion:** To not approve the proposal to add 640 acres and the additional permit for the Junction Valley CWMU.
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- Motion:** To accept the balance of the Division’s recommendations as presented.
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- NRO** **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board decline the request for inclusion of public land and additional permit for Junction Valley CWMU.
Motion Passed: Unanimous
- Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the CWMU/LOA presentation.
Motion Passes: Unanimously.
- SRO** **Motion:** To pass the CWMU Management Plan and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020 as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

SERO **Motion:** Due to lack of information, pass the CWMU operator's requests (Ash Jenkins) on to the Wildlife Board

Motion Passed: 6 in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstentions

Motion: To accept the remainder of the plan as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

NERO **Motion:** To accept the CWMU proposal as presented by the Division.

Motion Passed: 6-1

Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.

R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders

R657-57 – Division Variances

R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures

CRO **Motion:** To accept the surrender portion of the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To accept the dedicated hunter portion of the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passes: 7 to 2

Motion: To ask the Division to consider adding the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: TO accept the Division's general season preference-point recommendation as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendation to change the waiting period for buck deer from two years to five years.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Motion: To leave the youth any-bull group application to only two youth

Motion Passes: 8 to 1

Motion: To accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

NRO **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board provide one youth permit for management buck hunts when two permits are approved. Follow previous youth allocation formula when greater than two permits are approved.

Motion Passed: For: 8 Against: 3

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the balance of the presentation.

Motion Passed: Unanimous.

SRO **Motion:** To accept the Proposed Rule Amendments to Address Point Creep, Lost Opportunity and Equity in the Hunt Drawing Process as presented.

Motion Passed: 7-2

SERO **Motion:** For OIAL and limited entry permits, change the penalty of someone turning in a tag less than 30 days, to losing a point and incurring a one year waiting period.

Motion Passed: 7 to 1 with 2 abstaining

Motion: To accept the remainder of the presentation as presented.

Motion Passed: 9 in favor with 1 abstaining

NERO **Motion:** To approve the Divisions presentation as presented with the exception of the Division adding an exception to include employment issues within the 30-day window.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

Town of Castle Valley Request

SERO **Motion:** To accept the Town of Castle Valley's proposed hunting restrictions, with the inclusion of shotguns and cleaning up verbiage so that it doesn't contradict existing state laws.

Motion Passed: 7 to 3

**Northern Regional Advisory Council
November 13, 2019
Weber County Commission Chambers
Ogden, Utah**

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:00p.m.

RAC Present

Ryan Brown- At Large
Paul Chase- Forest Service
Junior Goring-Agric.
Randy Hutchison-At Large
Christopher Hoagstrom- Noncon.
Emily Jensco- BLM
Aaron Johnson_ Sportsman
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter - Sportsman
Kevin McLeod- At Large
Justin Oliver- Chair
Casey Snider- Elected

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Hayley Smith
Dave Rich
Eric Anderson
Covy Jones
Lindy Varney
David Beveridge
Randy Wood
Chad Wilson
Justin Dolling
Jim Christensen
Krystal Tucker
Brock Thornley
Ben Nadolski

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman
Bret Selman

RAC Excused

David Earl-Agric.
Darren Parry- Shoshone Nation
Kristin Purdy-Noncon.

RAC Unexcused

Agenda:

Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
Approval of Agenda and Sept 4, 2019 Minutes
Wildlife Board Update
Regional Update
Statewide Deer Management Plan
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020
Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.
- R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders
- R657-57 – Division Variances
- R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures
Big Game Application Timeline

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

Justin Oliver- Chair

Agenda Approved

Item 2. Approval of Sept 4, 2019 Minutes

-Justin Oliver-Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

-Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Private Fishpond Rule Amendments- Motion was made and second that they approve with an update definition: except for the exclusion of Washington County, which passed unanimously.

Big Horn Sheep Unit Management Plan- Motion made to accept plans as presented with the revised language for the following units: Antelope Island, Nine Mile, Bookcliffs, Oquirrh Stansbury and Uintah mountains which passed unanimously.

Conservation Permit Audit- Motion to accept as presented and passed unanimously.

Conservation Permit Variance Request- Motion to approve as presented which passed unanimously.

New 2020 meeting dates- Meeting in Weber County and dates should be published soon.

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Great Salt Lake Eco System Program- Brine shrimp companies have harvested a little over 27 million pounds of brine shrimp cysts since October 1st opener. On their way to surpassing any of the harvest seasons we have had on the lake. We do cyst counts to measure the density and decide whether to keep the season open. Those counts are coming in at about 100 cysts per liter. Our objective is about 25 cysts per liter. Marshes along the Great Salt Lake had a great pheasant opener and continues to be a popular program. Swans have arrived and have hit public shooting grounds pretty hard. Treated 1,400 acres of phragmites from the air and covered 500 acres from the ground. They feel they were able to assault phragmites this year given the new marsh masters we have that are great machines that allow for various effective ground treatment.

Wildlife Section- Post season deer classifications. Pronghorn and mule deer capture on Antelope Island to track movements and do disease testing. Continue with pheasant releases throughout the balance of the pheasant hunt.

Outreach Section- Stocking pheasants on our walk-in access properties. Plans for Hardware Ranch Elk Festival on December 11th. Sleigh rides start December 6th through the first week of February.

Law Enforcement- Slow deer hunt this year for early rifle and general rifle. Aquatic evasive species has come to an end. Sending people to Lake Powell to help on that effort and cover some key reservoirs in the north.

Habitat Section- New machine to plant bitter brush and sage brush. Moved 30 beaver as part of the water restoration initiative projects to restore valuable habitat throughout the region.

Aquatics- Completing mussel survey at Cutler Reservoir. Fall season is rapidly wrapping up and going into winter report writing.

Justin Oliver- This is the first meeting we received emails and comments from the public. We received 196 comments which was overwhelming. Some were good but there were quite a few that were offensive. I hope everyone will realize that we volunteer our time, we are not paid to do this. We do this because we want to make a difference. It is disheartening and frustrating when people are calling us names and we really have no control over a lot of this and we just want to help and make a difference. We appreciate the comments but please keep it professional and nice.

Statewide Deer Management Plan

-Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Lee Tracy- Do we include the dates of the infected deer in order to determine whether or not they came from other states? If you look at the charts, you see most of the infected deer are either next to Colorado or close to Wyoming. Do we include dates that we have noticed they are infected? We don't know whether they were infected here or in Colorado.

Covy Jones- I think I understand your question. These are all hunter harvested samples. There is a way to test live deer, it is not a good test. These are all deer harvested primarily during rifle hunt at the end of October in Utah. Some were harvested on depredation hunts which could be earlier in the year. It is not just deer coming from Colorado, we have areas in the state that are positive.

Kevin Norman- On the muzzleloader recommendation, in the RAC packet, it says either ½ a percent or 5 permits whichever is greater. Was that a miss on your presentation or you changed your stance on that a little bit?

Covy Jones- That is the way it is written in the plan. If you have a unit with few permits, like the thousand lakes, it would have a minimum of 5 permits. It is .5% or 5 permits is how it is currently written.

Kevin Norman- If there is a struggling unit, do you have the authority to make it only 5 permits, even though you gave out 6,000 permits?

Covy Jones- If that is a change that we want to make, we would have to make the recommendation to change that here. How it is currently written, we would not be able to do that.

Christopher Hatch- How much habitat improvement is done on opportunity hunts or general season units vs. the limited entry premium hunts on average? What percentage?

Covy Jones- I don't know. We can get you those numbers. I know that most of that habitat work is done in the southern region of the state. Most of that is done on general season units. That is probably because of the ease and willingness of federal agencies to do the work with the division.

Heather Rasmussen- Unfamiliar with CWD. On the presentation, it talks about mule deer and elk populations affected by this. Is this a transferrable disease between hooved animals or can it get into predators? If so, would the population change if predators would be affected as well?

Covy Jones- It is found in elk. Outside of elk and deer, there have been studies done. One study said it was transferred and the other study said it wasn't. As far as predators go, there is no evidence that shows it was transferred to a predator. We have chosen, as a state, to manage mule deer because it is more prevalent in mule deer. We have only had 2 positives since 2003 with elk. It wouldn't make sense to manage it with elk. If you manage it with mule deer, hopefully you will keep it away from the elk.

John Beesley- If we are drawing permits prior to knowing what the winter kill is and allocating tags to an area, how does that work with management when we know we had a tremendous winter kill this last year. Yet, tags were allocated prior to us knowing how detrimental the winter kill was?

Covy Jones- That is a good question. In Utah, we don't manage buck populations anywhere near a biological threshold. Biologically, you only need 5-7 bucks per hundred doe's to fertilize every doe. Everything above that is surplus. In Utah, we manage our very lowest general seasons at 15-17. For years, we have not run into a biological threshold. In watching survival, we don't know the exact survival, but we have a pretty good idea of what survival is going to be when we start to do this. The data we get in December on fat, we are now starting to be able to correlate that a lot better and are predicting survival now in December. We manage quite a bit above it to have a buffer to not impact the population by hunting.

Ross Worthington- With the habitat management and focusing on summer ranges, is there any plan as to how grazing is impacting those summer ranges and how to work around that. What is the impact by feral horses at the west end?

Covy Jones- Grazing can be a good thing for mule deer. Horses are probably a little bit different. Horses have top teeth, so they pull a lot of stuff up. We are concerned about the impacts of horses. It is a tough problem. We will work on these issues. We will set aside grass banks to mitigate impacts of large-scale projects.

RAC Questions

Mike Laughter- When it discusses losing points when drawing a buck/deer permit, could you be more specific?

Covy Jones- Wendy will present that but we discussed it as a committee. We were asked if we could support it if a permit is obtained through the draw over the counter, could you support losing points with very few exceptions. We talked as a committee and ended up deciding we could support it. The demand for hunting in Utah is increasing and as we see that, I think everyone wants to hunt as much as they can. To help level the playing field, if you choose to hunt deer that year, you don't get a point. We closed a lot of loopholes with the second choice. We have enough pressure that if you want to hunt, you spend your points.

Mike Laughter- This is general season?

Covy Jones- Yes. If you hunt general season, you lose your points. That is the recommendation, not a rule change.

Mike Laughter- Does the division have the authority to put impact fees where developments are going in for the purpose of habitat enhancement?

Covy Jones- I don't think so. We have mitigation funds from oil and gas development but not from community developments.

Ryan Brown- With sage grouse, there are mitigation opportunities and can make recommendations as to how those evolve. We don't have any regulatory mechanism to require and impact fee.

Covy Jones- A lot of that is voluntary, right Justin.

Justin Dolling- On private land, it is voluntary. On public land, I think there is a little of a nexus there.

Kevin McLeod- In the points loss, does that include accumulated points or just the point for that year.

Covy Jones- Accumulated but we better let Lindy get into that.

Justin Oliver- As we get ready to make motions, is this something that needs to be addressed on this agenda item?

Covy Jones- No. This is just support for that in the plan. It is not a rule change.

Randy Hutchison- On the late season muzzleloader hunt, was there any consideration into making that a hams hunt?

Covy Jones- There was some talk about making it a hams hunt. The latest is can ever go is November 11th. We have had a lot of positive comments on this hunt, but people would like to see it moved a little later. It is not a rut hunt for big bucks. The committee felt comfortable leaving it as we have it for muzzleloaders which is with a scope.

Ryan Brown- When you talk about the CWD, there was a footnote about feeding a baiting and limiting that. Can you elaborate on what that would look like?

Covy Jones- After we wrote this, there were some things we took back to the committee and to public survey. We asked the public how they felt about baiting? The majority was supportive. The mule deer committee voted to do something about baiting as well. The division went back and we started to write a rule and our intent was to bring it to this RAC that eliminated baiting. In writing a good rule to eliminate baiting, we realized what we would have to do is prohibit placing an attractant for big game. When you step back and look at that, you have eliminated baiting and feeding. We realized we had not had the conversation about feeding yet. We felt like we had not done the work and did not want to slide something through that would affect individuals that feed without asking the question and doing the work. As far as the biology goes, feeding of big game is bad. It is more than just CWD. There is data that shows range and habitat damage. It congregates population damage. There are problems with feeding and baiting. You will probably see a recommendation in the future from the division. It just needs more work.

Ryan Brown- Putting that in with the CWD, is that something to test the waters and take a step in that direction?

Covy Jones- It is to let the public know, that we are moving forward in that direction. For disease and habitat concerns. There are always social and ethical concerns.

Justin Oliver- As far as the late muzzleloader hunts, it says 1/2 a percent, that is not adding hunts in addition to correct? That is taking from the general pool and moving them?

Covy Jones- No, it is not because those are limited entry permits so it would be in addition to general season. This is a social issue. You are not going to take harvest on 1/2 percent.

Randy Hutchison- You have mentioned the late muzzle hunt is up to November 11th, correct?

Covy Jones- That is the latest it could go with the way it is currently written.

Randy Hutchison- What concerns do you have about the amount of time? Hunting starts late August through November 11th. That is a lot of pressure.

Covy Jones- It is, and I get that comment a lot. Pushing deer in the winter in deep snow, there is no doubt that is not a great idea. Whether we are the predator or something else, they always have pressure. It would be hard to quantify the impacts of a hunt when there are other types of recreation on the landscape. It does not change that there are hikers, runner, backpackers, etc. The bigger impact is the increase of human population in the state, not the time spent hunting.

Randy Hutchison- I am a bird hunter. I will not go into the Utah mountains during hunts. Taking an additional 2 weeks away where I will not hunt Utah mountains.

Covy Jones- That is one aspect I did not consider. I am probably more comfortable with big game hunting. There is probably a portion of our population that it affects.

Randy Hutchison- When people are hunting, it does drive away other recreational opportunities by choice. I choose not to take my dog up during hunting season. Others may choose to not go hiking or backpacking so it does have an impact.

Public Comment

Jeremy Anderson- Mule Deer Foundation- I was on this committee and want to thank Covy. Technology helps us learn things that are hard to swallow. Appreciate the diversity of the group. We support this strategy and mule deer plan.

Kevin Norman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Supports the divisions recommendations with the exception that we would like to leave the late muzzleloader hunt as it is now with the 18-20 buck to doe ratio hunts being in that late muzzleloader hunt. Leave the 15-17 units out of that hunt. There are units like the Cache that, right now, if this was to go through it would be 33 permits the way it is written for late season muzzleloader. There needs to be some safeguards in place if this does go through to protect the herds. I agree that we should make this a hams hunt.

Chris Hatch- Echo what Kevin just said. I understand wanting to create opportunities for these limited entry late season muzzleloader hunts. From my experience in the field this year, especially on the Cache, it is in bad shape. I am on the fence as far as creating these late season muzzleloader hunts on all the units but if it was to be approved, my suggestion would be to make it a low success.

Ben Lowder-Utah Archery Association- Support this recommendation as presented by the DWR. I sat on this committee and would like to echo sentiments that Jeremy mentioned. Concerning the late season muzzleloader hunts, I think they are a great thing. We know there is demand for limited entry deer. This strategy essentially creates an entirely new limited entry hunt in the state. These hunts are extremely popular. There is a clause in the plan and also a rule change coming up in the next presentation about importation of carcass and skulls from CWD states. The way it is written says that if you are bringing a skull back from a CWD state, it has to be plated. The central region RAC did not like that and the way it is written would eliminate bringing back a whole skull. The central region made the recommendation to change that to be a cleaned skull, rather than a skull plate.

Troy Justensen- I had the opportunity to sit on this committee representing SFW. This public process is where things are brought up that maybe were missed before. I support the plan. I would ask the division to go back on this late muzzleloader and come up with some way to write it, so it doesn't read .5 percent or 5 permits, whichever is greater. I would rather leave that up to the discretion of the biologist to where we can adjust that number. Maybe we should look at rules on units that we have CWD in the state. If we are concerned about that, why are we overlooking the carcasses on those units.

Public Survey

Justin Dolling- Results of the online survey. 41.5% support the plan. 26.8% were opposed to the plan. 31.7% were neutral.

RAC Comment

Mike Laughter- I encourage you to look at a way to address CWD on those units.

Ryan Brown- I appreciate the comments about the possibility of a HAMS unit. Making the late muzzleloader hunt more of a primitive hunt. I like those comments and the ones that came through electronically referenced that.

Aaron Johnson- Making the muzzleloader hunt more of a primitive weapon. Is that something that needs to be done on this agenda item?

Covy Jones- A year ago, we were approached by the public to determine what a primitive weapon hunt would look like. We put together a group and went through options and came up with something and then totally scrapped it. We made something so complicated that no one would be able to follow it and it was not a good recommendation. We went back and came up with the handgun, archery, shotgun, muzzleloader hunt.

Aaron Johnson- Could we make a motion to make this a hams hunt like what was suggested for late season muzzleloader?

Covy Jones- It is a strategy in the plan so you would recommend the strategy in the plan to support late season muzzleloader hunts as hams hunt.

Aaron Johnson- That would have to be changed in the rule?

Covy Jones- You would change the plan and there is also the recommendation that follows that too.

Justin Oliver- It was mentioned that in the central RAC that they decided to change the rule as far as the clean skull plate to an entire skull for something like a European mount and could that be done?

Covy Jones- That is fine. The divisions concern is that we don't want any brain matter to come in. If it is a clean skull, it would pose the same threat as a skull cap which is minimal. It comes when you bring in the brain matter. We could work on something that would allow us to do that if that is the direction the RAC wanted to go.

Aaron Johnson- Change the wording if you bring in a green skull, that it needs to be a skull plate. However, if it is cleaned or taxidermy, it can be brought in and is not a violation of the law. I don't know if that would fix it or not.

Covy Jones- If the goal is to tell the division to allow either a clean skull plate or clean skull, we could work on the language as long as you made the motion.

Randy Hutchison- Is that safe?

Covy Jones- There are ways where you can probably make it safe. The problem is the protein is highly stable. It will survive a lot. Cooking it does not change it or make it go away. The material needs to be removed. There are ways to probably do it but beetling it is probably one of the better ways.

Justin Oliver- If I had a 3rd season tag in Colorado and I'm hunting near Grand Junction and kill a deer Saturday evening and go back to camp and load it up, if I choose not to take the skull cap, I have to stay there at camp and find a way to remove all brain matter and have it cleaned out before bringing it back.

Covy Jones- Honestly, this is a hard thing to enforce. At the same time, I feel passionately about it. If it is a clean skull, I think it is probably fine.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Change the language a clean skull with no brain matter.

Second- Ryan Brown

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Motion- Kevin McLeod- Allow the division to have the authority to control the number of permits on the late muzzleloader hunts.

Ryan Brown- I would rather limit it by making it more of a primitive weapon sort of hunt.

Kevin McLeod- Regardless of what kind of hunt it is, whether it is multi-weapon or muzzleloader, I still think the division should have written in that plan the authority to change the number of permits available based on their biological data.

Justin Oliver- If it were to go to a ham, the number could increase correct?

Covy Jones- Yes, can I explain the rationale and then the RAC can do what they think. This is completely social. They are limited by the number of general season permits. That is why it was tied back to half a percent of whatever the general season permits are. As buck doe ratios increase or decrease, those permits increase or decrease and adjust the number appropriately. When we did this, there was a strong feeling that, among committee members, the rationale was if we are going to have unit by unit management across the state, every unit has to play ball. Every unit is somebody's back yard. It ends up being inconsistent and it is hard to put in a draw and manage for the division. If a unit is struggling, those permits are going to go down. If a unit is doing well, general season permits will go up and late season permits will go up.

Emily Jenco- If we passed this motion, would the biologist most likely still do this because it is tied back to the general

Covy Jones- No, if you took this language out of the plan, you are trying to give the biologist more tools, but you are really giving less guidance. It would end up very erratic. Some units would have 2-3% general season permits and some units with none. It comes back to everybody playing ball and it is consistent and fair. It also needs to be statewide and adjusts based on the unit. If there were a concern, one way we considered writing this as a committee was if a unit is not meeting its minimum buck doe ratio objective, it would automatically drop to 5 permits. That is another way that would be fair and consistent for the division.

Justin Oliver- That would be based on a 3-year average.

Covy Jones- You can base it on one year if you want to.

Justin Oliver- We can make a motion to base it on last years buck to doe ratio and not on a 3-year average?

Covy Jones- You could.

Kevin McLeod- Motion withdrawn

Motion- Randy Hutchison- With the late season muzzleloader, if the unit is not meeting the buck to doe ratio from the previous year, maximum number of permits given can only be 5.

Second-Kevin McLeod

Discussion on the motion

Casey Snider- Last year, we had a higher ratio. This year, we have a lower ratio. This year we have less deer, would you be basing it on a high year from last year. Am I doing that correct?

Covy Jones- This year, the buck/doe ratio will probably plummet from last year. I think you mean from the previous year, not a whole year in advance. Right now, we would take 2019 buck/doe ratio to recommend for 2020. The reason why is just that it would be more reactive this way, less smooth. It is social and limited entry. We are ok with taking drastic measures than we would on a general season permit. I understand that rationale.

Casey Snider- Last year, you would have had higher buck/doe ratio than this year. As you released this years permits and based it on last years numbers, you would have had more tags this year even though numbers are down. On a 3-year average, you are looking at trends over time to see where populations are headed.

Covy Jones- 3-year average tends to smooth and make us less reactive. This would make us more reactive.

Aaron Johnson- On the late season muzzleloader, the unit must meet buck to doe ratios or default to the 5 permits using a single year to determine buck to doe ratio.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Paul Chase- I'm still thinking about units in the state positive with CWD and what we want to do with those?

Justin Oliver- If someone in Manti were to go and kill a deer, that would mean that before you could bring it home to West Haven, would you have to debone it or take it to a shop there?

Covy Jones- Not debone it but you would have to quarter it and skull cap it. I think one of the better ways to handle in state positive units would be to direct the division about proper disposal education. There are proper disposal methods. It gets harder when you talk about in state. If you limit it to a unit, it is harder.

Paul Chase- Is there a biological reason we would want to follow somebody from out of state?

Covy Jones- I think the answer is yes. It is harder to implement in state and harder to enforce. It is probably to push more education.

Kevin McLeod- A hunter may not even know that the deer is infected until it is tested.

Covy Jones- They don't know. There are a lot of deer that are asymptomatic. There is an incubation period and it just takes time. If you hunt one of those units, we could provide a set of disposal methods. It might not be the best but might be most efficient. That language could be added.

Motion- Paul Chase- Division to create public outreach and educate on the proper disposal on CWD units.

Second- Christopher Hoagstrom

Discussion on the Motion

Randy Hutchison- (cannot hear comment)

Covy Jones- Yes, we have a system now that will flood your inbox.

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Ryan Brown- Remind me what the acronym HAMS stands for? Handgun, archery, muzzleloader, shotgun. If we made a motion to change it to a HAMS, then all the muzzleloader guys still have their second muzzleloader season they are running around with.

Covy Jones- The caveat is no scopes.

Motion- Ryan Brown- Make the late season muzzleloader hunt a HAMS hunt.

Second- Randy Hutchison

Discussion on the Motion

Paul Chase- Explain process and how we got to where we were with the muzzleloader hunt plan?

Covy Jones- We talked about making this one of the HAMS hunts with the committee. There was not a lot of support at that time. Public opinion on restrictions on technology came back and 47% were opposed to restrictions. General hunting public said they did not want it, so we left it as a muzzleloader hunt with optics.

Ryan Brown- We talked, and you pointed out once something is given, it is hard to pull it back. In my mind, looking at expanding this across all general season units, my thought would be to try it as a HAMS hunt for a year or two and see what the reaction is. We can always go back and make it a second muzzleloader season as opposed to after a couple of years saying we are going to covert it back to a HAMS unit. I would like to see it be HAMS first as we are looking at expanding, knowing in the future there would be a process to expand to a second muzzleloader season.

Covy Jones- And that is a fair point. Either way, these would be limited entry hunts on general season units.

Motion Passes: For: 7, Against: 2, Abstain: 1

Mike Laughter- It's less appealing. I wouldn't burn 17 points on a HAMS hunt.

Ryan Brown- Definition of muzzleloader for this year would not have to go to an external ignition firearm. You could just take a scope off your modern firearm.

Paul Chase- I'm with Mike but also part of the mule deer committee and was involved with the process.

Emily Jensco- Based on that slide with the public input, that it is fairly split, I am representing the BLM and I'm leaving it as abstained. Switch to no and defer to the division.

Motion

Motion- Kevin McLeod- Accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Discussion on the motion

Ryan Brown- That means that those motions that passed, still pass and then do the remainder.

Motion Passes-Unanimous

Item 6. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Lee Tracy- On that state parks issue, it states that we are allowed to hunt on certain units. All the other units are closed except certain units. Now you are telling us all parks are open except for certain units. What is the reason for changing and how are you going to change the law? We have to go to the parks department website to find out what the rules are?

Covy Jones- Parks already changed this and took it to their board and they changed it. We are just recommending to change our rule to match what parks rule says. You would have to read their rule if you had a question if a park was open or closed.

Ross Worthington- Is the youth hunt for any bull still planned for that 3rd week in September like it usually is? The tags that are used for that, does that come out of the 15,000 allotted or are they in addition to? As I understand it, it has little or no impact on the counts they are looking for with target numbers?

Covy Jones- It is the same season dates on the youth bull hunts. Numbers are set in the plan which is 500 additional permits. They are not taking out of any other quotas.

Jon Beesley- Could we add that in the proclamation of the state parks that are open to hunt?

Covy Jones- We will definitely have something in the proclamation that tells the public where to go. It really is just a change in philosophy of trying to be more accepting of more activities. It does open a few more parks.

Chris Hatch- It has been brought up in the wildlife board meetings before regarding the issue of the tag application time period and wanting at least tag recommendation numbers. Not necessarily approved numbers. I looked at application dates and they have not been extended or changed. Looking at the history of when recommendations have been put out before, the recommendations have usually come out about a week later. Wondering if the division has looked at possibly extending the tag application period?

Covy Jones- That frustration is shared by a lot of hunters. Lindy is going to present and informational on this tonight and what our timeline is. We are looking at ways to streamline what we do in order to be able to have it work. We are probably not there yet. We have thought of e-tagging. Everything has to fall in line. We need all these stats before making a recommendation. Lindy lays this out and will show a timeline. If we can do a few things and have a few more technological advances, it could help us get recommendations out sooner. That is what we are working towards but aren't quite there yet.

James Archer- With the growth in Summit County, has there been any consideration of expanding the extended Wasatch hunt?

Covy Jones- I just want to remind the RAC that I am ok answering anything from a statewide perspective but if it is a regional perspective, the regional biologists are here and would like to answer those questions.

Eric Anderson- I cover the East Canyon unit which covers the northern part of Summit County. I have been watching that closely. It is coming to head now that there is another development in Morgan County also. There is some concern there

with development in that county with depredation issues. It is being looked at to increase that, most of that unit to extended archery.

Lee Tracy- On those new extended archery areas, are they specific to sex? Are we able to take bucks as well as doe's?

Covy Jones- Yes, it will be the same as the other extended archery. Either sex.

Tim Giles- Concerning the extended archery, I know the boundaries are changing. As a hunter, when I am up in the mountains trying to decide where the boundary is, I don't have it on my GPS. I am relying on a paper map and trying to navigate. Is there a chance of getting something on GPS?

Covy Jones- Yes, there are different ways you can do that. I use Onyx and it will show the unit.

Tim Giles- The onyx shows the extended archery unit boundaries.

Covy Jones- We did create a website so that you can get it on your phone but if you didn't have service, it wouldn't work. Are you asking the division to work on a mobile download for a phone? I think we could work on that.

Tim Giles- I will pull that up on my iPad or something for the extended archery boundaries. There are actually kind of vague. It will cut across one side of the ridge to the other.

Justin Oliver- So you are asking them to enhance their maps and make sure they are defined?

Tim Giles- Yes, I can't tell you how many times I have been within a 20-yard shot of a deer and I am questioning if I am in the unit or not. I will look at my map and see a line that goes across and it is not following the ridge. It is really confusing.

Covy Jones- In areas you have concerns, let's work with district biologists to make sure we have good boundaries first. Then, as an agency we are always working to provide better information to the public and I can bring that back.

Jeremy Anderson- On the HAMS hunts that you presented on the Green River Valley and Morgan. Curious what the Kaparowitz decision was?

Covy Jones- The rationale is super low deer densities and providing opportunity in an area that does not get much hunting pressure. That time of year, it could have some bucks and offer opportunity. Other times of the year, the hunting is not that good on the Kaparowitz.

RAC Questions

Kevin McLeod- There are a lot of people that are concerned with this long-range stuff. In regard to rule, is there anything in our wildlife rules and regulations that require a hunter that attempts to take an animal by shooting at it, to make a reasonable effort or to go to the last spot that they saw the animal and check?

Covy Jones- They do have to make reasonable effort to recover the animal. That is in rule. I understand the concern and share some of the concern. Hunting ethics have always been hard to regulate. That does not mean it is not a problem.

Kevin McLeod- I looked for it and could not find it. Where is it at?

Covy Jones- I will find it and get it to you.

Emily Jensco- When you talked about adding contiguous public land to some of these units, I did not zoom in on the maps. Are there any issues with public access? I hear you saying we are extending it from ridgelines. Is there anything we should be aware of for access?

Eric Anderson- This was on top of the Wasatch Front/Davis County area. There are no other concerns there. Talking to enforcement officers, they did not realize it included all public lands. It is putting everyone in order and keeping honest people honest. There is very little access from the east side, it is mostly CWMU's over there. Mostly from Farmington Canyon or Bountiful.

Justin Oliver- Was it the Morgan/South Rich HAMS hunt that was added?

Eric Anderson- Correct.

Justin Oliver- Is that a limited entry?

Eric Anderson- The HAMS will be a limited entry but will be for a general unit.

Justin Oliver- It will go as limited entry, ok.

Covy Jones- This is a very limited opportunity. Very few of these permits.

Public Comment

Tim Giles- You don't get your results on your application for your tags. You get 5 choices and a lot of times you might get a unit you have never hunted before. I got Monticello and I needed to spend time to get to know the country because I had never been down there before. It does not give you much time to get down there before season starts. Is there a chance to get draw results about a month sooner? For HAMS limited entry hunts, if you draw a tag but don't fill your tag during archery hunt, consider having a traditional hunt for late season to give a second opportunity.

Ben Lowder- Utah Archery Association- Appreciate the work that has been put in. Support the recommendations as presented with one exception concerning the CWD with the skull plate vs. skull. Would like to see the rule change align with the plan concerning CWD skull plates. Eliminate the nanny hunt on the Ogden/Willard Peak mountain goat hunt. Tags have been reduced on the billy hunts. Currently, there are 2 billy hunts on that unit and I think it warrants discussion on whether those 2 hunts are necessary and if we should combine it into one hunt at this time?

Chris Hatch- Thank Covy and the RAC for what you do. I didn't see anything on the agenda that I oppose or disagreed with. I spend a lot of time on the Willard Peak mountain goat area. I have observed a lot of mountain goats over the years. I have been applying for that unit for my OIAL. I had no idea that the tags were going to get cut. Had I known that before I applied, I would have chosen a different unit. I agree that nanny unit needs to be shut down. I would really like to see those tag recommendations before they apply.

Ross Worthington- Echo the same to all who spend time and dedication to doing this. Regarding the deer plan, it was a little frustrating. There are things the public are recommending, and I hope the RAC would consider if the public wants something changed. Late muzzleloader is largely accepted by the public. I understand what you are trying to look at, but you do represent the people. Youth any bull or any elk hunt coincides with season dates. We are the only state that does not give archery hunters opportunity to hunt the rut of the elk. Those dates use to be later or earlier. I would love to see that hunt moved back. Why not make that hunt eligible for youth to hunt any seasons?

Troy Justensen-Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the divisions recommendations. HAMS hunt has been 3 years in the process. Moving away from technology and providing opportunity.

Public Survey

Justin Dolling- Online survey found that 48% supported the proposal, 20.3% were opposed and 31.7% were neutral.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- I echo what Kevin said about ethics. I agree with Covy, it is extremely hard to regulate ethics. Going forward, I don't know if that is something we do in hunter education. It is not just rifles; it is kids taking 150-yard shots across the Weber River on neighboring property. I don't know how to fix it but maybe it is something educational.

Mike Laughter- Should we address the CWD and the skull plate first? We already have a motion there.

Aaron Johnson- Do we need to? If it passes on the first motion made, do we need to address it here?

Covy Jones- Probably because that is a plan. This is the rule. The motion could be to align the rule with the plan.

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Align the rule with the plan concerning CWD skull plates.

Second- Ryan Brown

Motion Passes-Unanimous

Motion

Covy Jones- Just remember that in the deer plan, you switched all the late season muzzleloader hunts to HAMS hunts. I would say to address that as a motion.

Justin Oliver- Since we made a change during the management plan, we would need to align this together.

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Align the HAMS hunts to be consistent with the late muzzleloader hunt.

Second- Ryan Brown

Motion Passes: For: 7, Against: 2, Abstain:1

Paul Chase- Same as before.

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Accept the remainder of Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented.

Second- Christopher Hoagstrom

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Justin Oliver- Change of procedure. Could not hear some comments made. Talk directly into microphone.

Item 7. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020

- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Ross Worthington- The tags that are allotted on bucks and bulls are 90% private and 10% public correct?

Chad Wilson- On elk and deer they have different options. Generally speaking, they choose the 90/10 option, but they have other ones so antlerless elk can go private too. If they choose 90/10 hen 100% of antlerless will go to the public.

Ross Worthington- Those total number of tags include both sexes? Antlerless and bucks and bulls correct?

Chad Wilson- No, the recommendation is just bucks and bulls. In the spring, we will do antlerless.

Ross Worthington- The tag allotments on these numbers do not include antlerless?

Chad Wilson- No, that is just buck and bull.

RAC Questions

Justin Oliver- Acreage increase that went from public ground to help enforce boundary? Can you explain that a little bit more please?

Chad Wilson- It is a section that is probably actually been run this way since inception of the CWMU. On our paperwork, it never claimed the acreage as being public. It is a cliff area that is BLM and it drops off and is 360 acres elongated. That cliff makes an easy enforceable boundary and has a fence along the top of it. It would align with how the practice of the private land has been up to this point.

Justin Oliver- Is there public access to that acreage?

Chad Wilson- Yes, you can access it. It is steep so if you went down in, you are probably not coming back out up the top. You are coming out the bottom and trespassing.

Justin Oliver- You could legally enter the property and hunt it and go back out legally?

Chad Wilson-Yes.

Justin Oliver- We would be essentially taking public property and opportunity away on this?

Chad Wilson- Yes. There is potential. Because of the terrain, this area is not hunted very much. It potentially could add another tag for public hunter on a better hunt. You can look at that both ways.

Justin Oliver- Is it not hunted very much because that information is given by the CWMU operator?

Chad Wilson- Yes, he said he has never seen anybody hunt it.

Mike Laughter- Have you seen the property?

Chad Wilson- I have not been up on it directly but have seen it on a map.

Justin Oliver- Its is hard to think about that when I have not been there. I struggle trying to take property away from the public to help enforce something.

Randy Hutchison- How common is it to have public land inside a CWMU?

Chad Wilson- In Box Elder, it is fairly common. A lot of those decisions were made 20-30 years ago. The climate has changed in my mind, as far as what we are doing. We try to stay away from it as much as we can. We are just following rule here.

Randy Hutchison- Are there any types of offsets or compensation? In this case there is the one tag but what about these other ones that have been operating forever?

Chad Wilson- In rule, it says the public has to be compensated. It does not state exactly how but we have a permit calculator that we can put in the percent of the public land in that CWMU and it will spit out how many extra tags that the CWMU would have to give up. In this scenario, that actually comes out to zero tags over the 3 years. In my mind, that was not compensating the public. I said you have to give up at least one tag. Sometimes, other CWMU's will have trade lands to trade private land for their public land.

Randy Hutchison- If there is land traded out, how does the public know where that land it and how to get access to use it?

Chad Wilson- It is on our hunt planner. If you do the CWMU map, there will be a box there that says trade lands. It is something, as a division, we can do better to make readily accessible. I agree with you. We need to make that better informed to the public.

Ryan Brown- Did I hear right that if you go 90/10 on bucks and bulls, 100% of cow tags go to public?

Chad Wilson- Yes, 100% of all antlerless, deer or elk.

Kevin McLeod- In reading the feedback on the survey, I think it was the highest disapproval rating in all of the categories. A lot of the comments were related to how public hunters are treated on CWMU's. On a bull tag, if a person draws a bull tag, what is the regulation on how they should be treated as far as a paid hunter.

Chad Wilson- It says it needs to be a comparable hunting opportunity. In each management plan, the operator and biologist hash out to make sure that is a comparable and the CWMU will offer that comparable hunting opportunity. We also have a CWMU advisory committee that meets once a year and hears all complaints. We have that system to allow for complaints and hopefully that addresses any bad experiences.

Kevin McLeod- If the paid hunter gets a guide, should a public draw hunter get a guide?

Chad Wilson- Yes, usually they have that option. Sometimes they may have to pay for that guide, the private hunter pays for it.

Kevin McLeod- It could be based on whichever CWMU and how they want to manage that? It is not a set rule?

Chad Wilson- Right, in rule it says they have to explain how it is comparable hunting opportunity.

Mike Laughter- I sit on that committee. We only addressed 2 complaints this year. We met twice and only had 2 complaints that came before our board. We can take action for probationary period. We can recommend all kinds of things to protect our public guys. Our committee is very in tune with how public hunters should be treated.

Randy Hutchison- I talk with a lot of people and have done research. I appreciate information sent out on satisfaction. The program is unpopular. Interested to see feedback from the public. I agree with some of it. There were a lot of positives too, but I was looking at the 3-year trends. The ones that were negative, were negative all 3 years and always on the public. That indicates a problem and I know there is a board to review it. How many people get those tags that actually know what the process is?

Chad Wilson- I have been in position for 3 months so that was something that happened before. In that scenario, that 92% of CWMU have a 3.5 rating or better.

Randy Hutchison- 8% on the 3-year average?

Chad Wilson- I believe it was. You combine those together because I believe Antelope Creek was the first one they sent out and it had a rating of 5 then 3 so I flagged it because it had one year low and went back up to 5. There are bad CWMU's out there that need to do better but also bad public hunters that don't give them a chance.

Justin Oliver- Generally the people that had a good experience don't always report, it's the ones that had a terrible experience that seem to report. I did look at the numbers and it did not reflect how many people hunted on the CWMU owners property that year.

Chad Wilson- You get some that don't report.

Kevin McLeod- I think the public needs to be better educated on CWMU's. I know it is hard to do. There is a huge benefit with the access. The perspective of the public, in general, is that they don't like the program. If we could do a better education program on CWMU's and what they do for the animals in the state.

Chad Wilson- I agree, 92% are happy. There is hesitation to put in for CWMU's because they have a negative perception. I think people who are taking advantage and hunting it are enjoying it and having a good experience.

Public Comment

Chris Hatch- Approve the tag recommendations for the CWMU. Suggestions to make hunt more attractive and popular. Hunters know the 1 tag is going to go random, it will not go to max point or high point and they won't apply for that. Is there a way to strategically make it happen every other year so they can get 2 tags? Is there a cap on how many CWMU's? I was blown away about the number of CWMU's in northern Utah.

Kevin Norman- There are a lot of CWMU's that have forest ground included in them that are accessible. It stems back from many years ago, before we had technology like we have today, it was the easy way to mark a boundary. We need to take a look at including public accessible ground in these CWMU's. If you go ahead with this one, someone will be mad that they can no longer hunt where they have hunted for 20 years. The technology is out there to separate it with the boundaries that it is. It does not sit right with me that it can be included in a CWMU when it is accessible public ground.

Jon Beesley- In regard to public land, the gentleman here from the DNR stated that they do have to compensate the public somehow. I would like to see that as you are required to give up a certain amount of tags or something to compensate and not just be broad. I echo what the last gentleman said about if we can access it, leave it be. Counts going towards objective on CWMU's is hard for me to stomach because I hunt the northern area and we know how many animals Deseret holds and how many they hold through the year. For those numbers to go towards the public count is a farce. I would like to see where the CWMU counts do not directly affect the number you want to see on public ground.

Mike Laughter- Chad said he had a calculator that determines, is it the value of the property or huntable acres. You said you worked it out and it didn't even equate to one tag? To answer the gentleman's question about the 300 acres. If it is accessible and holds game, does your calculator figure huntable acres?

Chad Wilson- If there are public acres in it, then its valid.

Ross Worthington- A lot of the public frustration comes when you look at tag numbers. Does the number of tags go to the public vs. private? I appreciate this program and the opportunity it gives the public, but this is a dollar's game. While the land is the private landowners, the animals are the publics. That is where there needs to be something looked at, specifically on the bull elk and deer on allotment of tags to the public. You mentioned if they do the 90/10, all the antlerless go to the public. What happens to the units that don't do the 90/10? CWMU's are not eligible to hunt with a private landowner tag. Outfitters with private land or CWMU's won't let you on that land, even if it is not the CWMU but they are happy to sell you a \$2,000 tag to go hunt it. Where the frustration from the public comes from is if they are getting their fair share for what they are giving up?

Justin Oliver- (Comment Card from Mike Dent)- His comment was regarding baiting and trail cams. This item was going to be discussed but it was put on hold.

Covy Jones- We intend to address that. The division does not have any statutory authority over trail cams. We regulate take. It is outside of our authority. Regulating baiting is something we intend to take on in the future.

Ryan Brown- What is the relationship between trail cams and drones? Who made the rule that drones can't be used in hunting? A drone seems like a trail cam that flies.

Covy Jones- The legislature gave the division authority to regulate drones.

Public Survey

Justin Dolling- 23.6% support, 30.9% oppose and 45.5% are neutral.

Justin Oliver- As we hear these numbers, it could be one item they are against, but we don't know. Its hard to figure out what is causing the negativity towards the CWMU program.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- Is there any plan to get a committee together to meet and address some of these concerns that were brought up?

Chad Wilson- I read through the comments and a lot are the splits. We open up those plans periodically to review. Being 3 months in, I don't know when that plan is supposed to be up for review. That would be the appropriate time to address.

Aaron Johnson- Encourage you to get a committee together and discuss it. It is a dollar's game and I don't want to short any landowner the opportunity to make money. I think it is a good program and I support is 100%. If the public is this dissatisfied, maybe there is some things to be done to make it better.

Chad Wilson- When that rule opens up, we will do a committee.

Paul Chase- All the comments I read going through the online ones, was on tag allocation. That is probably beyond what we can take on tonight.

Matthew Klar- It seems to me that the public perception is that these are going to non-residents and they can charge what they want on the open market. That turns out to not really be true at all. For the bucks and bulls' tags, the 65% of those are purchased by residents. By and large, residents are getting 80-85% of tags. The question coming up is that the public wants access to these lands for free, rather than pay a trespass fee. The for-sale vouchers are still being purchased by residents. I don't know that it is fair to expect these landowners to give free public access more than they do right now. Non CWMU's are welcome to charge trespass fees which is the same principle. They should be able to charge a fee to allow access.

Ryan Brown- I think it is advantageous. If we start to go away with it, instead of 10% going to public, it would just shut down and no one but property owners' friends or family who drew the general season tags would get to hunt it. This way, at least some of the public gets to hunt these lands. For all the dissatisfaction, I think it is still a very good program. We need to speak in defense of it.

Chad Wilson- If you look at the northern region, I use to be the biologist over East Canyon/Morgan South Rich. Those elk populations in those areas would be significantly lower if it was not for the CWMU program. They help with neighboring depredation problems. It has allowed for a significant more elk populations because of the program.

Justin Oliver- There was a lot of positive charitable things that come from CWMU programs. There are countless stories of them allowing people to come in, less fortunate or disabled.

Covy Jones- We continue having this debate. We just talk about public hunter opportunities on CWMU's which is one thing. Very grateful for that and public hunter opportunity on private lands by drawing a tag in the public process. The benefits that come from the CWMU program do not end there. A lot of this land is highly developable, valuable and has better uses than what it is currently being used as. CWMU provides enough revenue and incentive to keep it open. Not just for mule deer and elk, but for other wildlife. It allows us to live in densely populated areas and have wildlife and wild

lands outside our doors. We can talk about public opportunity and wish tags were different, but that is a very myopic view. You have to expand that view to what we really get out of the program and it is more than a few hunters here and there. It is open space, wildlife habitat, increased populations and other benefits that come along with that.

Randy Hutchison- I say that you are 100% right. The public does not like this program and I agree with things that have been said. There are good things that come of this, but the good things are not known. I would never want the program to go away, it just needs to be updated and changed or you will never get public support. Not just in theory but in practice.

Ryan Brown- I would be fascinated to know of all the owners and operators of the CWMU's, if it shifted much beyond the 90/10 split, how many would stay enrolled in it?

Justin Oliver- The leases on the CWMU's keep driving up. Landowners are benefiting more than the CWMU operators. Just because you have property, there are a lot of costs entailed. I fear if it went away, we would be looking at ground being developed. It's hard to please everyone. It is a great program and people are learning more about them.

Emily Jenco- I see the value in the program. Just like Covy said about how the management plan has a lot of social perception. Those 500 acres in particular are an example that if we remove those as we move forward, the social perception of that by just removing them. It is 500 acres and a cliff, but I don't know if the trade off of 1 permit is worth it for public perception.

Matthew Klar- Would it be possible to have this information as part of the annual presentation? The resident vs. non-resident overall rating? I think the public would be more supportive if the information was readily accessible.

Chad Wilson- We can look into doing that. That was part of my plan when starting this year. I didn't have the time to get that information out but next year is our big year of renewals. I would have to check but I would at least give it to the biologist for their consideration. It states in rule that you look at the satisfaction rating of each CWMU. I think it is something that can be looked at.

Casey Snider- I share the sentiment of those who spoke about public ground being captured in a private CWMU. Concerns about that as a precedent. Are you able to provide that information? What public parcels are captured in the CWMU so we can discuss that acreage as also part of the renewal process? At this time, with updates and technology, it is worth looking at and pulling public parcels out and allowing public access.

Chad Wilson- We will have those discussions.

Casey Snider- It would be helpful. It is a broader conversation and I think we are starting tonight with an expansion. This is something worth looking at over time.

Chad Wilson- I was the biologist over that CWMU, it had not gone through the public process. I felt like it needed to go through this process so this discussion could be had.

Justin Oliver- Has there been decisions made as to adding public property into a CWMU that has not gone through the public process? Is that common procedure in the past?

Chad Wilson- Not when I was the biologist. I can't speak for the other ones. Most that have public property in them, were done many years ago. Technology was a lot different to make enforceable borders.

Kevin McLeod- I handled security for a CWMU for about 10 years. This particular CWMU had a weird border. Part of it was on a cliff and made a horseshoe and came in. There was public property inside that horseshoe. It was a nightmare. The tradeoff was to run that, in agreement with the forest service and the DWR, to straighten that border and give the public access rather than run into the border of the CWMU and go back because they could not cross 100 yards of the CWMU. I can see why there are certain situations that it is better for the public and the CWMU as well as the enforcers to have those boundaries better defined and easier to follow. As long as it can be shown that it does benefit, and there is a tradeoff, I see how that can benefit both.

Casey Snider- If we are going to do a renewal on a CWMU, we should look at this as a RAC and make a determination if it is beneficial or not? If you are going to have a renewal and you are going to have public property captured, it should be defensible. If this plays out and it pleases the public, we move forward. If there are circumstances where changes need to be made with technology that exists, we should also be looking at making those adjustments as a contingency on having the CWMU renewed. That is why I want that information provided.

Chad Wilson- I would have to go back and look at the rule closer to see when that rule opens up.

Justin Oliver- When Matt mentioned the 65% that hunt CWMU's from Utah, I didn't think about that number of people that are out of the general season tags. I think that is something else that can be shared a little bit more that I haven't thought about until today.

Junior Goring- You mess with that 90/10 rule, it will become considerably less attractive to landowners with CWMU's.

Chad Wilson- There is a section that is up high that is most of that 300 acres and then another parcel surrounds it that is 14 acres. I do have a thumb drive with the map, but I don't know if you want to consider both separate or put it in together?

Justin Oliver- We can include that 14 or do we feel comfortable not accepting that as presented.

Motion

Motion-Ryan Brown- Deny Junction Valley 1 permit as a trade for public land as it has been presented.

Second- Emily Jensco

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 3

Aaron Johnson- (Cannot hear comment regarding opposition to motion)

Kevin McLeod- I've just run into it and it just makes sense.

Junior Goring- (Cannot hear comment regarding opposition to motion)

Motion

Motion-Mike Laughter- Accept the remainder of CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Associations Permit Numbers for 2020 as presented.

Second- Junior Goring

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Item 8. Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.

R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders

R657-57 – Division Variances

R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures

- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Justin Oliver- This is so much information. I would invite the division employees to please think of this as we are putting these things together. I feel there is no way to give this justice without being here until 1:00 in the morning. I don't think we have been given a fair advantage, in our position, to try and make this decision tonight. As we are making these plans and doing the RAC meetings, spit it out. I would rather come another night than be here all night. This is very valuable, important things but this is a lot.

Ryan Brown- (Cannot hear comment)

Justin Oliver- I may have overstepped my bounds. According to my emails, there are a lot of questions.

Public Questions

Chris Hatch- Is it possible that the closing of that loophole and the way the draw structure changed when drawing these tags, do you think that was so recent that it has caused frustration? Because people are applying differently, or strategies had to change? I noticed that some hunters just refuse to give themselves other options, whether it is different hunts or different weapons. They are stuck on one hunt and will wait 20 years to draw. Do you think that could play a role in some of the frustration as well?

Lindy Varney- Yes and no. I know there is some frustration when we changed the draw structure to where you lose your points if you draw on the 2nd through 5th choice. Perception I have received is that they applaud that because now they are actually putting the one choice but drawing out every other year now. People are burning their points. I have also seen where people are only putting one choice and now, we are having leftover permits. Numbers are starting to go back up because they want to hold off and know they can buy that over the counter permit. It is that loophole that they have found another way to draw on a permit every year. There is some frustration, but I think the only way to get rid of the full frustration is everyone draw a permit every year. That is ultimately what they want which we cannot do.

Ross Worthington- Has the division ever explored, with the issue of point creep, the allotment of tags of 50 to the highest and 50 to the random draw. We talk about how long it takes someone to draw.

Lindy Varney- Just for the balance points, we do the 50% to the max point holders. We thought about increasing that higher but the other opposite to that is it decreases the changes of the person that is just applying for the first time. We have considered that an option. This year, if you had an odd number of permits, we now give that to the max point holder vs. the random point holder. That is what the rule states to do so we put that in place. That did allow a lot higher point holders to draw out.

(Unknown Name)- We still had 50 tags that were not distributed but the people that gave you 30 days' notice. Is 30 days enough? Should there be a penalty for turning your tag back in.

Lindy Varney- The reason they did not get re-allocated back out is because we are issuing those that are 30 days out when there is still 2 weeks left before the hunt starts. The reason we went with 30 days is because that is when most people have the permit in their possession. If you go longer, we don't have draw results out. You have to have the permit in your possession to surrender it. Also, the rules states you get a refund minus the \$25 handling fee if you surrender your permit 30 days or more before the hunt starts.

Ben Lowder- You just mentioned that this year we started giving, on the odd number of permits, the odd one goes to bonus points. That is new this year. If there is only 1 permit, what happens in that scenario?

Lindy Varney- That still just goes random. We don't just give it to the max point holder. Everyone has a chance.

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- In years past, some sportsmen have expressed concern about non-resident. A non-resident can apply for every big game species each year. Some of the sportsmen say that is not fair. Was any thought given to that or why that was not changed?

Lindy Varney- In reality, that will lower your draw odds because everyone has a point for that species. The reason that was put in place years ago to allow non-residents is because typically, we only have one or two permits for that species. Especially the OIAL hunts, we only offer one or two deserts or Rockies. We thought we would let non-residents build up points for all of them, so they have a chance to hunt in Utah. If every resident is able to apply for those hunts for every species, you just made it harder for everyone to draw out. That is the reason why we did not entertain that idea.

Aaron Johnson- I agree with that. The sportsmen were wondering why they get all the chances.

Lindy Varney- I get that question every year. Once I explain the draw odds of it, they don't want that.

Kevin McLeod- Losing bonus points if you purchase a tag. I have 12 points for mule deer, if I buy a general season tag, I lose those 12 points?

Lindy Varney- No, we have a bonus point system and a preference point system. Your limited entry deer and elk are bonus points. If you do purchase one that are leftover from the draw, it is in rule that you lose your points. I am applying that to general season. If you purchase a general season, you lose a general season. People are confused by the two different point systems.

Casey Snider- Is there no way to give youth a chance to participate at a higher percentage in these tags?

Lindy Varney- The wildlife board does not approve enough quota.

Casey Snider- If there is 3 tags and 30%.

Lindy Varney- 2019 management deer on the Ponsegaunt to give to youth and 65 and older. On the Henry's, we didn't at all. It is challenging.

Casey Snider- Why couldn't we figure it out to round up? You are at .65, if you do 30% of 2, give or take. There is value in having a youth draw a tag and have a chance to compete at a higher level.

Lindy Varney- I agree and we do offer a lot of opportunity for youth to hunt in Utah. This is the only limited entry hunt that has a youth allocated to them. They obtain limited entry points when applying for this hunt. From what I understand, this is one of the hardest hunts out there. We give 30% to the youth and those who are 65 and older. There have been times where we have had to confiscate those animals because they shot the wrong deer. If the wildlife board approved 3 permits, it is a different story.

Casey Snider- Half of those units would still qualify.

Lindy Varney- Yes, they do but the rule states that management hunt.

Casey Snider- We can address this later.

Public Comment

Jon Beesley- Amazing work. I do know a family member who turned his tag in 2 days prior to the hunt. I voiced my opinion to him and was very disappointed. The odds are pretty low and didn't realize they were 4%. Would love to see that 30 days bumped up to where there is more opportunity.

Ross Worthington- You will get 4 tags in a lifetime if you are lucky. If you draw a deer tag and wait 5 years, you put in for elk. Where it has gone to a 5 year on deer and elk, that point creep, would it be worth considering making it a limited entry buck or bull points. The OIAL may limit that a little bit. That will take more people out of the pool and be able to apply which will help that point creep. I agree with 30 days, there is too many tags being lost. I would prefer to see that you lose all your points.

Kevin Norman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Accept the recommendations as presented with one exception. Would like to leave the general season deer and dedicated hunter deer. Can still apply for both. Expressed that they feel the dedicated hunter program gets things taken away all the time and soon no one will want to be involved. It is such a valuable program.

Brad Buchanan- Thank Lindy. This is not a bonus point system issue. It is not a preference point system issue. There are more applicants than tags. We have loopholes in the system that will help this. You are not going to be able to change this. You can take it all the way and people are not going to be able to draw tags still. There are loopholes where the system is being abused. There are legitimate reasons tags need to be turned back and those reasons are being addressed. You apply for tags every year and things are going to happen along the way. You know there is a risk when you put in for a tag. Support these recommendations.

Chris Hatch- Point creep video. After taking time to think about it, it is all fair. Some of these changes maybe should have come years ago. I don't agree with someone turning in their tag and getting their points back. I understand this is an investment. When the number of applicants outnumbers the resource, there is going to be problems. Leftover tags decreasing over the years. Consider other options for hunting. Spreading out applicants like HAM hunts for better chances for premium tags. Burn points on expo tags or remove the 200 expo tags and put back in drawing to help point creep.

Jeremy Anderson-Mule Deer Foundation- Point creep has been a discussion for many years. It is a drop in the bucket. Commend Lindy. Need to learn this is opportunity.

Ben Lowder-Utah Archery Association- Discussed at length at board meeting. We support the majority of recommendations but 3 items we have issue with. Surrendering of the permit, we believe the current recommendation and swings the pendulum too far. We are not opposed but maybe there is a compromise. We suggest that outside 30 days, it stays status quo as it is now. Rather than losing all your points, you can give back your points, but you don't gain a point. General season deer and dedicated hunter, we are not opposed to the idea, but we believe it should be another hunt choice. A combining of the two systems. It is possible to do this in a year or two. Losing preference points, if you obtain a general season tag. We do not think you should be penalized for picking up a tag that no one else wants.

Aaron Johnson- Is that true? (Remainder of comment not audible)

Lindy Varney- On a cow elk, yes. Last year, there was 110. It is a general season permit. If it is a limited entry bull elk, then no. Just the cow elk.

Public Survey

Justin Dolling- 42.3% support, 27.6% opposed, 30.1% neutral.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- These guys turning in their tags, if that tag is not allocated to someone else, I think they should lose their points. My idea is you can turn your tag in 60 days in advance but if the DWR is not able to allocate that tag, you lose your points. That is the gamble to take in turning in your tag. There should be an exception for military and things like that. That may cause more work for you.

Justin Oliver- I know a few max points holders who will break their leg to keep their points. They are that valuable.

Randy Hutchison- I like what you are doing. I think these things are going to cause problems for a lot of people. These are band aids for right now. I strongly suggest getting rid of purchasing points.

Justin Oliver- The southern RAC went through this and did it in 7 motions.

Matthew Klar- I think we probably should not do that. This is never going to get anywhere as a problem. The public support is at 80% for this proposal. There are a couple things we talked about and maybe we can tweak them a little bit. I would be interested in hearing which individual items we would want to discuss rather than voting on that. I like the idea of not being able to get your points back if they can't reallocate the tag. That would be something I would be interested in discussing as a separate item.

Justin Oliver- I don't want something to get past because we are worried about going home. If you are passionate about something and have an idea, I want your motion.

Casey Snider- Motion that we reject the change as proposed by the DWR specifically in regard to youth. In the situation where there is less than a 30% that could be allocated to youth, we guarantee a youth hunter 1 tag.

Motion

Motion-Casey Snider- Management Mule Deer tags on authorize an alternative if there is more than 2 tags, 1 goes to youth.

Matthew Klar- If there is only 1, it will go to the youth.

Casey Snider- If there is no situation where there was only 1 tag, all those situations were 2. I am willing to entertain a minimum, if there is only 1 tag, it is fair to go to everyone.

Lindy Varney- It needs to go to random to everyone.

Casey Snider- But if there are 2 tags, 1 should go to the youth. Under the current rule, that tag would qualify.

Justin Oliver- That would be on all of these management tags correct?

Lindy Varney- Yes, just on the Henry's and Ponsegaunt. It will be a programming challenge.

Casey Snider- If you can do math to give out thousands of tags, you can figure this out.

Lindy Varney- It is doable. It would be a programming change.

Second- Kevin McLeod

Discussion on Motion

Aaron Johnson- There are a lot of programs and opportunities for youth. Just because you draw the tag does not mean your kid can't come and experience that. I thought the old guys should get tags, as much as the youth. I like what you proposed and there are plenty of other opportunities for youth.

Kevin McLeod- I mentor a grandchild every year for deer. If I drew that permit, I would mentor a grandchild. I am for kids getting out and being able to do it. I like this idea.

Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 3

Paul Chase- There is plenty of other opportunities to get tags. Support the divisions proposal.

Mike Laughter- (could not hear opposition comment)

Aaron Johnson- I already stated my position.

Motion- Matthew Klar- If a hunter voluntarily surrenders a tag and it cannot be reallocated, their points cannot be reinstated.

Lindy Varney- It is a good idea. Issues are that hunters think they are getting their point reinstated because the tag is being reallocated. Even if you tell them that there is a chance, they still think it will get reallocated. We will be dealing with hunters thinking they are getting points back. If its not reallocated, will they want that permit back? Once a permit is surrendered, we can un-surrender it.

Mike Laughter- As soon as they find out they are going to lose their points; this whole thing goes away.

Lindy Varney- Would we say that we have 2 weeks to get that permit reallocated? We call on permits until that hunt starts. We may end up calling 50 people for one permit. That is the one issue I have.

Aaron Johnson- I guess you would have to have a cut off time, like 2 or 5 days before the hunt. If you can't allocate it, do you give it back?

Lindy Varney- Sometimes we have already processed the refund if they surrender it. There is a lot of administration issues with that proposal. It would be a headache for the hunters.

Aaron Johnson- Is it something we can consider going forward? Next year or the year after?

Lindy Varney- We can think about it more, but it was on the table this year as an option and we felt it had too many cons.

Matthew Klar- You don't think that having people lose that year's points is going to be incentive because they will not draw for the next 5-6 years.

Lindy Varney- I hope it will be enough because if you lose 1 point, it can set you back 10 years. Once people are understanding what it can do, they won't want to be put back 10 years because its not the right condition. It would be a lot of education about what would happen.

Matthew Klar- I'm not aware of any other state that lets you voluntarily turn tags back in and get points back.

Lindy Varney- Nevada is all.

Second- Aaron Johnson

Discussion on the Motion

Justin Oliver- If someone turns tag back in within 30 days and it was not able to be reallocated that they would lose their points.

Paul Chase- Is this to turn back voluntarily past 30 days.

Matthew Klar- Within 30 days.

Ryan Brown- I thought we were talking about if you voluntarily surrender it outside of the reasons in any window of time.

Matthew Klar- That is what I meant is within that 30-day window. If I'm understanding correctly, people are not receiving the tags 90 days in advance. It is 45 days or so. They would have the opportunity to turn it back in when they got it but can't go scout and then turn it back in.

Casey Snider- Losing that year's point is not incentive enough. You are wanting to wipe it clean.

Christopher Hoagstrom- You are saying if it is greater than 30 days, the rule suggested applies. Inside of 30 days, all points are lost? What period of time, is it inside or outside of 30 days?

Linda Varney- Inside. Would they still lose the point for the current year? Or do they get all of their bonus points back? If we reallocate that permit back out, do we give all points back, even for the current year?

Matthew Klar- Now, it is not one per the current year. Yes, I am fine with that. They can keep their bonus points.

Covy Jones- This is an administrative nightmare. At the end of the day, the divisions recommendation is that if you turn it in before 30 days you lose your point for that year and go back into the pool. If you turn it in after 30 days, you lose all your points but can start putting in again that next year. The public will not know if they get points back or not. This defines clear boundaries. I don't think we can administer what you are asking us to do.

Randy Hutchison- This needs to be scary and clear cut.

Justin Oliver- We have a motion on the table.

Matthew Klar- What are the rules, can we modify?

Justin Oliver- Matt, would you like to withdraw that motion?

Matthew Klar- Yes, because of administrative hangover.

Justin Dolling- If it is within a 30-day period you lose all bonus points. You get a point for the current year.

Matthew Klar- The division is saying you don't get the one point but keep cumulative points.

Lindy Varney- If you surrender when there is more than 30 days within the hunt start, you will get your bonus points, the ones used to draw that permit. You will not get a point for the current year if you chose to surrender that opportunity. If you surrender less than 30 days, you don't get any points back. We will waive that waiting period so they can apply next year for the same species.

Emily Jensco- I heard you say that you guys are aware that this is not necessarily the solution, but it is what you are proposing right now. You have been talking about other solutions for this issue.

Lindy Varney- I think this will be a big deterrent. I have been working in this program for a decade and I know how valuable that one year can make when you are drawing a permit.

Emily Jensco- If it doesn't, you will continue collecting data.

Kevin McLeod- I will be back saying I'm sorry.

Motion-Randy Hutchison- Accept the remainder of the proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.

Second-Kevin McLeod

Ryan Brown- If you aren't successful in the draw and you buy a leftover tag, as we are about to vote on, you are giving up all those points?

Lindy Varney- Correct, giving up preference points for that species. Not bonus points.

Ryan Brown- Can you elaborate bonus vs. preference.

Lindy Varney- Limited entry and OIAL limited species have bonus points. Those permits are issued 50% to max point holders and 50% to everyone else. They have a waiting period attached to them. They usually have a lower number of permits to those hunts because it is more of a quality hunt. Preference hunt is a quantity hunts. We give those permits to the hunters that have the highest preference points. If you have the most preference points, you will get a permit. We will take out the 4th tier and then people with 3 points, then 2 points and so forth. Those are general season permits.

Ryan Brown- Those are what you are surrendering when you buy a leftover tag.

Lindy Varney- Those are the points I am talking about losing.

Motion Passes-Unanimous

Item 9. Big Game Application Timeline

- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Comment

Ryan Brown- As you were talking about technology, I would like to thank the division for the app. I find that app so user friendly to have and keep track of my license as I am out doing different wildlife activities. Anything you can do to build on that good foundation is wonderful.

Meeting Ends-11:31p.m.

DRAFT

RAC AGENDA – November 2019



- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval of Agenda
- RAC Chair 2. Approval of Minutes
- RAC Chair 3. Old Business
- RAC Chair 4. Regional Update
- DWR Regional Supervisor 5. Statewide Deer Management Plan
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator 6. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator 7. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020
- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator 8. Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process.
 R657-42 – Fees, Exchanges and Surrenders
 R657-57 – Division Variances
 R657-62 – Drawing Application Procedures
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator 9. Big Game Application Timeline
- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator 10. Town of Castle Valley Request – Southeastern Region Only
- Alice Drogin, Town of Castle Valley | <p>INFORMATIONAL</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>INFORMATIONAL</p> <p>ACTION</p> |
|--|--|

Meeting Locations

CR RAC – Nov. 12th 5:30 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Room
1115 N. Main Street, Springville

SER RAC – Nov. 20th 6:30 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St, Green River

NR RAC – Nov. 13th 6:00 PM
Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd, Ogden

NER RAC – Nov. 21st 5:30 PM
Uintah County Conference Center
313 E. 200 S, Vernal

SR RAC – Nov. 19th 5:00 PM
Cedar City Middle School
2215 W. Royal Hunte Dr, Cedar

Board Meeting – Dec. 5th - 9:00 AM
DNR Boardroom
1594 West North Temple, SLC

Motion Summary

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written

2) Approval of Minutes

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written

3) Statewide Deer Management Plan

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To remove the word “plate” out of the document and just use the word “skull” where there is no brain tissue or matter.

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ken Strong and failed 3 to 6

MOTION: To maintain the late season muzzleloader hunts that exist on 18-20 that are over objective. (Follow the current plan)

In Favor: Mike, Ken, Steve

Opposed: Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Eric, Christine

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Eric Reid - MOTION WITHDRAWN

MOTION: To modify the CWD plan to prohibit the transfer of carcasses with CWD positive management units within the state.

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Eric Reid and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the balance of the Division’s recommendations as presented.

4) Bucks, Bulls, & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Eric Reid and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To remove the word “plate” from the CWD rule and include “skull” meaning no brain tissue or matter.

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Christine Schmitz and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the balance of the Division’s recommendations as presented.

5) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020
and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Josh Lenart and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To not approve the proposal to add 640 acres and the additional permit for the Junction Valley CWMU.

The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Luke Decker and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

6) Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and Equity in the hunt drawing process.

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the surrender portion of the Division's recommendations as presented.

The following motion was made by Eric Reid, seconded by Danny Potts and passed 7 to 2.

MOTION: To accept the dedicated hunter portion of the Division's recommendations As presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Eric, Christine

Opposed: Steve Lund

Abstained: Ken Strong

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To ask the Division to consider adding the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw.

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's general season preference-point recommendation as presented.

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendation to change the waiting period for buck deer from two years to five years.

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Danny Potts and passed 8 to 1.

MOTION: To leave the youth any-bull group application to only two youth.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed: Ken

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

Central Region Advisory Council
1115 North Main St, Springville – Conference Room
November 12, 2019 @ 5:30 p.m.

Members Present

Ben Lowder, Co-Chair
Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive
Steve Lund, Elected Official
Mike Christensen, At-Large
Ken Strong, Sportsmen
Joshua Lenart, Sportsmen
Luke Decker, USFS
Eric Reid, BLM
Scott Jensen, At-Large

Members Absent

Jacob Steele, Native American
Brock McMillan, excused
A J Mower, excused

Others Present

Jason Vernon, Central Region Supervisor
Karl Hirst, Wildlife Board
John Bair, former Wildlife Board Chair
John Fairchild. Former CRO Regional Supervisor

1) Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)

Ben Lowder, Co-Chair

We're going to get started. Welcome to the Central Region RAC meeting. We are starting an hour early tonight due to the length of the agenda and the input we expect to receive. By way of introduction, my name is Ben Lowder. I'm the vice-chair. Brock McMillian, our chair has decided to go wrestle mouton sheep in Hawaii this week so I am filling in. Hopefully he makes it back safely. As an introduction to the meeting, there are agendas on the table out there feel free to grab one. The way that this meeting will work is on each of these agenda items the DWR will give a presentation after which RAC members will be allowed to ask questions. After the RAC asks questions, we'll open it up to public questions. After public questions, it will then be opened to public comment. We are going to be limiting everybody both individuals and groups to three minutes on public comment tonight. I understand we have a timer that will be visible. We are going to be strict on that. After public comment, the DWR will have an opportunity to give any clarification if they need and then the RAC will discuss and vote on a recommendation to send to the wildlife board. Speaking of the wildlife board, I don't see Carl here. I don't know if he's coming tonight. I don't see any wildlife board representation here yet. He may be on his way. We do have a new RAC member tonight. Luke Decker from the Forest Service and from what I understand he is our permanent Forest Service Rep at this point until he's not. Anything I am missing? Let's go around and do introductions. Thank you. Does everyone have a copy of the agenda in front of them? I will look for a motion to approve the agenda. Motion by Ken seconded by Scott. All in favor? Alright, wildlife board update.

VOTING

Motion was made by Ken Strong to accept the agenda and minutes as written

Seconded by Danny Potts

Motion passed unanimously

2) Wildlife Board Meeting Update and Old Business (Informational)

Ben Lowder, Co-Chair

I did not attend the wildlife board meeting. I do have a list of motions and how they were voted on so, I'll go through those really quick. They approved the agenda. There was a motion to approve the private fish ponds rule amendments with updated definition exception for the exclusion of Washington County. That was passed. There were the bighorn sheep unit management plans. The motion was to accept the bighorn sheep management plans as presented with revised language for Antelope Island, Nine Mile, Book Cliffs, Rattlesnake, Oquirrh Stansbury and Uintah Mountains. That was passed unanimously. There was a conservation permit audit. That was passed unanimously. There was a conservation permit variance request which was passed unanimously. Do you have any additional information on that variance request?

Jason Vernon – I don't.

Ben Lowder –

Alright. There was a motion to accept the 2020 RAC and board dates. With some date adjustments, that passed unanimously. So, the schedule for these meetings I'm assuming is already published. There was a motion to approve the stipulation for an individual suspension to 20 months which was passed unanimously. In addition, the board has agreed to send Kevin Albrecht and Randy Durth to the 2020 mid-winter WAFWA conference in California. Any questions on that? We'll have a regional update and I will turn that over to Jason.

3) Regional Update (Informational)

Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor

Thank you, Ben. Before I start the regional roundup, over the last week you've probably been inundated with e-mails from public comment from our online process. I think our region had over 150 comments that came in which is pretty amazing. I don't know if we expected that kind of response. Initially, our plan was to have those batched on a daily basis so that you didn't see all of the e-mails that came in. You would just get one e-mail at the end of the day that would have all of those e-mails batched inside of it. That turned out to be problematic for our internet people so we had to change that and it ended up with you seeing all those e-mails every day. I don't know if we're going to be able to work through that challenge of being able to batch it or not so as I was talking with Staci today, one of the options that you have as RAC members is to continue to get those e-mails as they cycle through or we can pull you off of that shared list and send you the summary that all of you got this afternoon around noon so that you would still have the pie charts that showed all of the information and broke it down from support to non-support. Attached to that are also all the comments through the e-mails that we received. So, maybe what I'll do is let you think about how you'd like to have that happen at the next RAC meeting and then I'll touch base with each of you individually to make sure you're either on or off of the list. One of the other things that I think I spoke with several people about was when we initially talked about having public comment, we thought we would have names and telephone numbers and e-mails associated with each of those comments. On this go around, that didn't happen. That was omitted from the fields. They had the opportunity to put it in there but they didn't have to put it in there. On the next go around, and moving forward if you don't submit your name and your phone number and e-mail then you won't be able to submit a comment online. They are going to be requiring you to identify yourself for these public comments. Hopefully, you had an opportunity to read through that. I know we just got those comments today and I think that's pretty quick to have to look through those and then come prepared a few hours later to discuss that. I also spoke with them today and we're going to be cutting off our comment period earlier so that we can get the comments out to you sooner so that you have more time than just a few hours to look those over. I appreciate your patience as we work through the system that is new to us and

new to you. I think that we're learning. I think the comment process was a success. We had a lot of people commenting. Maybe before I move on to the roundup, are there any questions or concerns from the RAC members on how that went on this go around? What would you like to see different or improved?

RAC Member – I appreciate getting comments earlier in the week so we have time to digest those. The summaries are spectacular. That really cuts down the amount of time it takes to get through it but if I got those today, it wouldn't have done a bit of good. I think cutting off the comments a little bit earlier would be great and some sort of summary document we could get a couple days ahead of time would be great. I think there is still value for most of us in getting at least batches of those periodically as they come in.

Ken – Jason, I appreciated it too. I took time to answer or make a comment thanking people for being interested if everybody that put their e-mail in and I'll be glad to see that they have to have their e-mail and name on them from now on.

Jason – Alright. I appreciate your patience and I'll get with each of you after and figure out how you'd like to see those coming through in the future. I'd like to welcome Luke Decker to our RAC. He's the new district ranger for Spanish Fork district. Thank you for being here. We appreciate you attending tonight. Of course, you'll be the new permanent member of the RAC. Just a couple of things as we get ready for our regional roundup... I'll try to be brief I know we've got a lot to talk about tonight.

I'll start off with our outreach section. A week from this Thursday on November 21 there will be a late season waterfowl hunting seminar. It will be taught by one of our staff here in the office. It will be in this room or this facility starting around 6:00 p.m. So, if you want some pointers and tips on hunting waterfowl late in the season that would be a great opportunity to come and learn from him.

For our habitat section... We're slowly getting fires that occurred this summer seeded. We've got several fires that have been aerial seeded and we have one more that will be seeded this mid-month. Probably next week. We've got several bullhog projects going throughout the region where we're masticating pinion and juniper trees. Opening it up for sage grouse and for mule deer. We do have several dedicated hunter projects that will be happening in the next couple of weeks. We'll be planting shrubs on some of our WMA's: Timpanogos WMA, Santaquin, Wallsburg, Lavan WMA- we're getting more plants out on the ground, almost 5,000 plants for wildlife.

For our wildlife section... They are starting deer classifications, the post deer hunt classifications to put together their recommendations for next spring. We've done quite a few pheasant releases throughout the state on our wildlife.utah.gov webpage where you can find a map that shows where we have put the pheasant releases. Those releases are happening weekly so if you'd like to go and find a good place to hunt go look at those maps and they have a dot on there where we're dropping pheasants off. Our biologists are finishing up the spring turkey recommendations. We also spent time the opening weekend of the deer hunt at check stations. We found that the first Saturday was a bit slower than we normally see at the check stations. But Sunday and Monday picked up quite a bit. We did send out an e-mail a few days before the hunt began to hunters that were going to be hunting in areas that we wanted to collect CWD samples. We actually had quite a few hunters that came off the mountain and took care of their deer in town and then would bring the head up to the check station. We had good success on getting samples.

Our aquatics section... About three weeks ago we sampled the Middle Provo River, above Deer Creek up to the white bridge or just below Jordanelle Reservoir. We spent three days sampling that. We sampled thousands of fish in there. It's always amazing in a small 600-foot section of river how many fish we pick

up in those. We had great volunteers. Anglers and guides are on there and I think they're maybe some of the ones that were most surprised seeing all the fish that they didn't realize were in some of those sections. It's a great opportunity to get out with those folks. As you recall, last summer we had the large fires up on the Nebo and up above Diamond Fork. Over the last couple of weeks, we've been doing some habitat restoration on those. On Nebo Creek we did some directional tree felling. So, trees that were in place near the river, we cut and had them fall strategically within the river to reduce erosion and downcutting on those streams. We also planted about 1200 cottonwood trees on Diamond Fork. Diamond Forks river bottoms are really important especially for the turkey population there. So, we wanted to make sure we got some more trees in the bottom to stabilize those bottoms.

From our law enforcement section, we did hold an administrative checkpoint at Strawberry Reservoir, on the last Sunday of the deer hunt. If you recall, on that Sunday a storm came in and blew in really cold so I don't think we had as many people on the ground as we might have but we did end up writing several violations for both wildlife and fish. They report that they had a lot of hunters out in the field for the pheasant opening. That was good to see. That is all I have to share with you unless you have any specific questions for me. Excellent.

Ben – Thanks, Jason. Next on our agenda is the statewide deer management plan. Let's get started. Before we jump into that presentation, I'd imagine many if not all of you are here to give some public input. To do so, you'll need to fill out one of these yellow comment cards. They're on the table right outside the door. Fill it out and bring it up to either side of the table up here. Make sure you put which agenda topic you want to discuss and whether you want to address the RAC.

4) Statewide Deer Management Plan
Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Eric – Back about the 700 acres of habitat improvements, do you use those habitat improvements specifically for one species or do you take in consideration, for instance sage grouse, because that's a big part of what we're dealing with... and saying of these acres is also mule deer habitat improvements and count those numbers towards that as well.

Covy – That's a really good question. Very rarely have I seen a project that is just targeted at one species. So, we take the whole species approach as say, how do we set this back? A lot of what we're trying to do is realize that early seral or freshly disturbed habitats are more productive on average than late seral. So, when we set these back, we end up being beneficial for all types of wildlife. Although mule deer are the most important.

Steve – I don't know where you do this in the RMP but you grew up in Castle Dale and I grew up in Manti, it was almost a moral that you didn't kill a doe. If you did, you were going to hear about it for the rest of your life. Now, one of the questions I have is how do we educate the youth in your RMP to realize that there is a moral when it comes to hunting animals, when it comes to hunting deer. We've got to make sure it's not, take a 1,000-yard shot at a spike if you can't see it.

Covy – Those are two questions. One, we need to do a better job at educating the public on mule deer management. I strongly believe that. We just started a podcast a little while ago and I hope

to get out and get on that and also get on other media and explain what the division wants to do. The truth is we haven't done a lot of active management of deer populations for years because it is socially unacceptable. We manage elk pretty actively but managing mule deer has been a lot harder. So, we do see these big peaks and these big valleys. At the end of the day we do hope to spend more time educating more people and showing... here is the data, here's what it shows, we know that deer that come in that are this skinny aren't going to make it. At that point the only options that we have are to either reduce the number of deer on the landscape or improve the habitat or both. We want to make the bucket bigger everywhere we can, improve that habitat, carry more deer. Sometimes, you physically can't do that anymore. So, it takes both. The other part of your question is one that I struggle with myself. It is really hard to recommend a rule to ethics? I mean, we do it sometimes but I think you're right with current technology there are a lot of folks that feel like the way we're hunting, not just deer but big game in general is a little bit unethical. We asked this question in the survey, we said, do you want to be limited on any technology.

Steve – While you're looking at that... As far as the technology is concerned that's one issue but the other issue is, I really struggle with people that don't mind shooting a deer and don't worry about tracking it if they wounded it. That's a real problem for hunters that didn't grow up realizing that.

Covy – I think it is all ethics and morals and saying, hey here is how we hunt deer. Here is what we do when we take a shot we go look. If we hit, we track. We spend the time to find out, we go to work to recover. Kent, do you remember what question that was? Technology restrictions... The green is, "I would not support limiting technology in any way", scopes, weapon types. As we wrote this we looked back at the public survey. There is pretty strong sentiment of, let it be. I think we need to continue to look at it and make sure we are saying, you know, as an agency just because we don't limit them doesn't mean we can't say take an ethical shot. If you can't shoot 1,000 yards, don't.

Mike – Couple of questions Covy, on the lose the points if you get a buck tag that's recommended there, what tags would you lose your points on?

Covy – This is just a recommendation in the plan. Lindy will address it. Hers is rule and mine is just support for the rule change.

Mike – So, maybe better to address it there?

Covy – Probably better to address it with Lindy.

Scott – That was a comment I was going to make. I remember going to the mule deer meetings and that one sort of snuck up on me. I don't remember deciding that we were going to lose preference points if a hunter acquired a buck deer permit. That was a bit of a surprise to see it on the screen.

Ben – Scott, Troy and I were discussing this earlier today and I don't remember discussing that, granted we had a lot of meetings.

Covy – It was at the second to last meeting. I think we took a vote on it. Lindy actually stood up and asked everybody if they could support it.

Scott – Guess we didn't know what we were supporting at the time. We'll find that out in a minute.

Covy – Well, the discussion was with point creep and everything we are dealing with point creep, if we continue to have loopholes and then the other side is, hey address point creep, what it means is that somebody's loophole gets closed and that's really hard if it's your loophole.

Scott – On the CWD disease presentation, you mentioned late season hunts that target older age class animals, is that something that would be in addition to these muzzleloader hunts that are proposed now?

Covy – Yes. We didn't call any of these this year so, this would be a targeted rifle hunt because we specifically have a hot spot and we know where some of these hotspots are around the state. We know there are a few fields in Sanpete where we're going to get a CWD positive deer every year so, saying hey targeted hunt, here are the areas we want to really reduce deer or harvest prime age class bucks in this area. After a buck makes it past six it doesn't have that same propensity. It seems like 4-6 is where they are twice as likely, past six it drops down. Probably because they're not doing a lot of the breeding anymore. So, 4-6 super social, doing a lot of the breeding and pushing the other bucks around, they get a little older and tired they stay at home instead of going out looking for does.

Mike – So, Covy on the CWD on the skull plate, what's a clean skull plate?

Covy – One without any brain matter.

Mike – So, could we change that to say skull and not skull plate? As long as the brain matter is removed, I know a lot of Utah hunters go to Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico that are all CWD positive and they harvest deer and they want to do a European mount when they come home. Not everyone wants to cut their skull plate off.

Covy – That is a fair point. If it came in without the brain matter it probably wouldn't pose a lot of concern for the division. So, if it was a clean skull without any brain matter, we could probably make that recommended change. We'd have to change the rule too. That's in my next presentation. I don't see that as being one... what we don't want is spinal fluid and brain matter. We don't want those- where it's concentrated so, if you can bring it without that, cool.

Eric – On CWD, you talk a lot about the bucks but, if it's fatal to deer I would assume the does would have that as well. Then, if you're in a population where one doe keeps it and you kill a buck that has it and another buck breeds, it's going to continue to be prevalent and still increase. Is there any consideration of controlling it with the does as well in a highly concentrated area

that maybe you would talk about? A lot of it seemed that it was just dealing with the bucks in particular.

Covy – That’s a really good question. So, that’s another one of the strategies. The other strategy is lower overall population density. So, that would mean does as well. I think it’s important to say that we’re not getting this out of our state. It’s never going to leave. So far, it hasn’t crossed I-15. The members of the mule deer committee, we brought in some guest speakers from Colorado that have really dealt with some of this and it was pretty eye opening, I hope. This is a bad thing, we have it, we don’t want it to increase in prevalence. Right now, in Utah we’re somewhere between 1% and 5% on all of our units. I would guess that a lot of our units are probably around 1%. You go over to the LaSals, it’s probably closer to the 2-5%. Right now, it’s really low. We just want to keep it there.

Joshua – Just a quick question as a follow-up on Mike’s question. I understood the CWD is an appendix to the plan, so, you’re making a recommendation sometime in the future to not allow skull plates to be brought into the state. By adopting the plan now, it wouldn’t make that rule change now, right?

Covy – The rule change is coming. It’s later. It’s actually in my presentation, that there is a rule change to align that part of the plan to rule. This is just a strategy in the plan and everybody knows that when we get a plan, we try to work through and address the strategies but we’re not employing any of these, right now. We had enough change.

Scott – Remind me, do we have regulations regarding moving deer between CWD positive units in the state?

Covy – We have policies, oh you mean for our hunters. No, we don’t. There should be. That’s a fair point.

Mike – How easy is it for you to get permit cuts passed before the wildlife board and RAC’s? In your experience?

Covy – Permit cuts are usually easier to pass.

Mike – And increases, are they more difficult?

Covy – Yep.

Mike – I love the idea of dynamic management. I love that. I think it’s incredible but it only works if it goes both ways.

Covy – That’s a really fair point. So, when we bring those increases, Mike I’ll count on you to support those. When we talk about this to be completely frank, one of the things that I really struggle with is, we grew 100,000 deer. We grew 100,000 deer in the state and everybody who remembers 2016 remembers how awesome it was. We increased like 2,000 permits. Again, this is education on our part but you can’t save mule deer. You can’t put them on a shelf and save them. You’re going to have them for a time and then as it ebbs and flows, you’re going to lose a lot of those. As we fall off that peak and lose a lot of those, it’s hard to look at some of these units and say, we could have really increased buck permits and we didn’t or weren’t allowed to. Now we’re on a downward cycle so that’s easy, cutting is easy.

Ben – Covy, wasn't one of the clauses you added to the plan to address that says that if there are overcrowding issues, we're going to address that by redistribution of permits as opposed to cuts? I don't remember if you touched on that.

Covy – That is a fair point and I didn't touch on that. So, one of the problems we had over the past plan is every time we brought an increase it was either crowding or perceived crowding that folks came in opposition to the majority of the time, they'd come and say if you increase permits here it won't handle another hunter. We just can't get another hunter on the landscape and if you go through with this increase, it's dangerous. We can't have this. So, we did address this with a strategy in the plan that says, now we're going to recommend it and if there are concerns about crowding, we should address those with weapon splits or additional seasons because we have that additional early rifle season where we can funnel some permits. We could also say, instead of being 20% archery, 20% muzzleloader and 60% rifle, we'll go 30% archery, 30% muzzleloader and reduce the rifle. So, we can have this increase and overall, it's not an increase in rifle permits.

Ben – I have some of the same concerns as you do, does that help address your concern?

Mike – Yeah. I foresee it'll be an issue in the future and we'll just deal with it when it comes.

Questions from the Public

None

Jason Vernon stating recap of online comment percentages

What I wanted to do is when it comes to the public comment period during each of the presentations, I'm going to quickly go over that pie chart that you saw in the packet that you got today. I'll identify how many opposed, supported or were neutral and then if you want to look at the specific comments, those were provided to you in the e-mail. For the record, for the mule deer management plan, online we had 52% that supported the proposal, 24% were neutral and we had 23% that were opposed to the proposal. We had 151 e-mails that came through.

Ben – We're going to get started on the public comment portion. Again, if you have a comment on this agenda topic, fill out one of these yellow comment cards and bring it up to the tables. You'll be limited to three minutes. State your name and who you represent and then give your comments.

Comments from the Public

Jeremy Anderson/MDF – I want to thank Covy for inviting me to the mule deer working group. I sat in on that and found it extremely, well I learned a lot. I've sat on many committees before, nothing this size or magnitude. I want to address the public and the RAC and make sure they all understand. It was a group of well-rounded individuals. I was in there for a few minutes and trying to understand why this guy is in here and why is this guy in here and I learned a lot from the farmer, the sportsman. It was good stuff and I want you to understand that we took everything serious, not all of us agreed on certain topics but we talked them out sometimes until way beyond Jason's timeframe that was allocated for it. It was a great group of guys and gals and I felt like the end product that he just produced there is about exactly what we talked about and with that I would say the Mule Deer Foundation supports it in full. Thank you.

John Bair/SFW – Do I get the minute and a half left by Jeremy?

Ben – No. But before you go, I want to take a quick second to recognize Carl Hurst. He's a current wildlife board member. John you triggered this also, there are a lot of people here tonight that are either former wildlife board, former RAC, former DWR employees so, it's good to see you guys. Thanks. Go ahead John.

John Bair/SFW – I'm here tonight representing Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife. I appreciate everybody's time and effort that they put into this mule deer plan. We had a meeting the other night. Covy came and presented it to our fulfillment committee and after the presentation we spent about two hours beating each other up. To say it got heated and intense would be an understatement. Of course, if we all agreed with each other all the time, someone isn't doing their job. There was only one thing that really was a catch for anybody on our fulfillment committee and that was the increasing of the late season muzzleloader deer. There were those of us that argued one way and others that argued the other and we went around and around and ultimately, they realized I didn't have a vote so they just went around me. They voted to keep it the same and not increase it. Not that anybody is necessarily opposed to increased opportunity but they felt like the timing was bad after a deer hunt like we've had and for a matter of principle, we couldn't support increasing pressure on the deer herd in any way at this time. Of course, that varied a little bit depending on where guys were from in the state but our committee did vote to support everything except for the increase of the late season muzzleloader. They asked that we leave that the same until we have better deer numbers and then look at doing that. The one other thing that we did talk about a lot was that we'd like to see the division and the mule deer plan correlated more closely with predators. There isn't one of us in here that had cows or sheep or horses or even kids sitting around the table that doesn't look at the mouths we have to feed and correlate that with the groceries in the fridge or the hay in the barn. We feel like we need to do a better job of that with our deer and our predators. Deer are the groceries for all those predators out there and we need to make sure that we balance the number of predators with available deer. We all know what that means. We all know that means big fights in this meeting to come but we feel like that is important. I appreciate the divisions work and the RAC's work and like I said, we support the plan 100% with the exception of the late muzzleloader. Thank you.

Richard Hansen – I sat there for a lot of years and I know some of you. It's good to see you again. After sitting there for a lot of years and hearing all the different reasons for low deer, all the habitat restoration, the 10's of thousands of acres have been done that have possibly helped to grow more deer and increase our populations. It comes down to one thing. After experiencing the worst deer hunt, I've ever seen in my life on the Nebo unit, the number of deer, etc., etc. It comes down to predators. I don't care if you increase winter range by a million acres in this state, if you don't have the deer, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. If you don't do something about bears and cougars and their numbers, you're not going to increase deer. I don't care what you do. Mother nature is going to take her piece. We're predators, we'll have to suffer those consequences when there aren't deer numbers out there or those of us that just really like to see them. So, my hope is that somehow, you'll be able to do that, to increase the number of predator animals that are taken off the landscape. It's just like John said, that's the groceries for cougars and bears. Before I left this RAC, we got a report and I think it was out of Oregon or Washington that had done the collar thing for several years and what they found out was a lactating female cougar will kill two and a half deer per week. That's a lot of deer. That's a lot of deer! As far as numbers of deer, when I look at the numbers on the website, there's not that many deer on the Nebo. Not even close. I would bet you that you could do it for a year and you would never count that many deer, ever. You could count the same deer twice and it wouldn't happen. My hope is that the deer management plan will include more predator take. Reduce the number of predators, make it year-round, let the limited entry guys have their time and then allow people

to buy tags so that if they are out on a deer hunt, they can kill a cougar. That's what I'd like to bring to the forefront and I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Hal Black – I live in Mapleton and when I moved there in 1975 most of you know there were four LDS wards and remember the Springville stake. There's now 28 wards and three stakes and the other day the politicians are saying we need to keep Mapleton rural. At my age I don't care how many people I offend here tonight but the most stupid thing that you biologists or hunters can say is ever use the word "fair chase" again, ever. It wasn't a fair chase in the (?) when guys were able to eliminate a lot of animals with not any of the technology we have today. Let me just go over these technologies. All of us are guilty, some of you more so than others. We have camo, gloves, hats, shirts, underwear everywhere camo, which is new, cameras are year-round now on wildlife. All of these are technologies which need to be considered. These rifle hunts, now that are shooting these long distances. Covy you or someone suggested that you couldn't hit a deer at 1,000 yards. That is the most egregious example of non-fair chase I can think of. Bows and arrows, some say we should have open sites. I didn't know there... we should just have an open site season with just rifles and no scopes. Black powder shooting 200-500 yards, optics that are incredible, scent masking, 4x4's used to be good now we have side by sides, horses, just warm clothing and shoes keep some guys in the field longer. I don't know how to word it but I asked my wife when I left, "what is a gang banger?" I don't know what it is but I think if you applied some to guide services where there's 20 or 30 people involved in trying to find a deer for a given individual. These are gang banger hunters, I think. Baiting, I know is going to be talked about later. I see deer when I hunt on the Abajo's and there's always a lot of deer and Mr. Bair and a lot of you, the best I can figure out, these cougars and bears do not like fawns and does because they are there in great numbers. The only reason there are few bucks is because of our technologies on the rifle hunt, the bow hunt and the muzzleloader hunt. Either that or the bucks just hide out when the season starts. So, you might use pit traps to go with these technologies when used in the past and that's the way I started to think of these things and snares because all of these technologies can lead your job as managers to a heck of a job. Thanks.

Troy Justensen – I'm representing myself and I sat on the mule deer committee. I had John give SFW's recommendations. The recommendations that he gave represents the feelings of our fulfillment committee which makes it about 17 chapters throughout the state. As an individual I sat on this deer committee and voted to support the plan and I felt it important that I separate those two and I do support the plan. I appreciate the time and effort that everybody put into it. Do I think the plan is perfect? No but I think it's better than the last plan that we had. Covy, I think we did miss a couple of areas. One of which is the CWD, where it is now that we probably ought to have the same thing as what we've had in other states that you've got to leave the carcass, whatever else if we're really concerned about that we ought to implement the same type of things there. The other thing I would ask too is, since this plan has got out, I've heard a large concern especially from the North half of the state on this late muzzleloader hunt. With the deer herd struggling particularly on the Cache, their fear is that it's going to put them further in the hole. So, what they wanted us to do is actually look at possibly some different triggers to the number of permits that go there. But as a whole I just want to stand and say I support the Division's recommendations on this deer plan and thank you.

Covy – Just one point of clarification. I probably didn't explain very well and that is to Richard's point, that is, that for the first time ever in wildlife management with collar technology, we're getting cause specific mortality and I say that and what the really means is that we collar over 800 mule deer a year and every time one dies, we have a biologist there on the ground within 48 hours picking up, doing CSI and finding out what killed that deer. So, when we look at it, we can go back and say, ok, in this unit, they are all coming in December fat, they should be living but we have lower adult doe survival and why. We can

look at the factors. Is it roadkill? Is it predators? What is causing this population to be suppressed? And we do have populations in the state where we can show that it's probably top down. We have some areas where we can look at it and say, we need to take some actions here and reduce predators for a time in order for the deer to rebound. Healthy deer, healthy predators, everybody is happy. Just kind of explaining it, that's how the plan works. It tells us to continue to do these studies, continue to look at cause specific mortality and what it really means is tie deer back to their landscapes and their predators. So, it's in the plan.

RAC Discussion

Ben – Let's bring this back for the RAC for discussion. I had the opportunity to sit on this committee as well. I've set on quite a few committees over the last decade or so. This is probably the best committee I've ever been a part of. The reason I say that is our first three or four meetings were all education. We learned a lot. We had Randy Larson give us a presentation on the collar studies. We had some folks come in from Colorado and spend an entire night with us discussing CWD. I learned a lot there. There were various other things that we learned along the way before we even started discussing the plan. It was a very well put together committee and I applaud Covy and the DWR for the job that they did there. So, I wrote down a couple of comments that I heard that I think we should probably discuss and address. Mike you mentioned the skull plates. I'm in agreement with you. I think maybe that needs to be flushed out a little bit. The late season muzzleloader hunt and predators. Predators, Covy there's some language in the plan already that kind of addresses more so than we have in the past, right? Concerning predators?

Covy – Absolutely. As part of this, the committee felt like we probably need to take a look at... we manage predators two ways. One according to their plan, the cougar or bear plan but the other way to manage predators is with a predator management policy. So, one of the things that I committed to do with the committee is after we took this through, to take a hard look at the predator management policy along with the data that we currently have and we probably have some triggers that are out of date and get the right trigger in there to be able to manage predators when it matters.

Ben – I want to touch on the late season muzzleloader deer plan. The committee was really excited about these. I didn't know how popular these hunts were until a couple of weeks ago I had a discussion on the rifle deer hunt in Southern Utah. Somebody pointed out to me and I've gone and verified this, the Pine Valley unit took 17 points this year to draw. You can draw a Book Cliffs rifle tag with 12. It's not just the... that's the highest points it takes to draw any of these late November hunts. But there's currently 11 of these units that have these late season muzzleloader hunts and of those 11, eight of them are taking double digits, 11 points or more to draw. That tells me that these hunts are desired. They are very popular. So, I'm surprised to hear some feedback in opposition to them. I understand the concern on the Cache. Covy pointed out our largest unit in the state, we'd issue 40 tags with this recommendation. That's just not that many. It's not that significant. Anyway, that's my opinion. I'll open it up now to the RAC for discussion.

Mike – Since we were talking about the late season muzzleloader hunt, two years ago when we sat up at the Jr. High in the auditorium, we had more people than I've seen in years at a RAC. Not quite this many, but there was a lot and there were a lot of people who had never been to a RAC before. Every one of those people that stood up there talked out against the late season muzzleloader tags which were proposed to be put on every unit. For some reason, I can't shake that out of my mind. Those were people that drove from a long way away to come have their say and that was just two years ago. I understand that it's a low number but it's also a time of year when on these general season hunts these deer get hunted so hard and

then we're going to throw another hunt on top of them in the end. It just feels almost... reading through a lot of the comments, I don't see one comment that came in online that was for that but there were quite a few that were against it. I don't think biologically it matters a lot but I think socially it does.

Ben – So I want to address two things you brought up. One, the online comments. There's a lot of people that didn't give an increase comment as opposed to just support, oppose or neutral so if they supported the plan without additional comment, to me that's support. Two, I remember the meeting two years ago and you're right there was a lot of opposition there. For the time, the recommendation was to put these hunts on all the units and from what I recall the negative feedback was not that they didn't want the hunts but rather that it was outside the current plan.

Mike – That is how Brock and I killed the motion. So, Brock and I talked about that. But the public that got up and talked, they didn't talk about it being outside the plan. They talked about not wanting it on their unit in their backyard as we talk about. So, I'm somewhat against those still. We're going to hunt them with a muzzleloader that can shoot 500 yards and I know that everybody laughs at that but it's happening. It's even increased over that. I know that biologically it's probably not going to make a difference. Most likely but it is going to take, these guys aren't hunting two points, you don't spend 17 points or 12 points to go shoot a two point. They are targeting the cream of the crop that's left after those deer have been hunted for three months.

Ben – I like what you touched on there. They're not after two points and you're right. They are after trophy deer and I don't think there's anything wrong with that. That reminds me of a sentiment from the mule deer committee when we were discussing these very hunts. There was a certain person on the committee that would rather have one of these tags in their backyard than a Henry's deer tag in October because they would rather be hunting their backyard and they know their backyard and not the Henry's. I think like I just mentioned that the points, maybe not the Henrys point but to a lot of limited entry units, that's very real. People would rather hunt these hunts in their backyard than a lot of our limited entry hunts.

Josh – To clarify, if I remember the conversation from the committee, it's only on units over objective and it's .5%. It took the committee a long time to get to that .5 because there was a lot of back and forth and I felt like the .5 was a compromise that most of the people in the room got to.

Mike – That for me is the only saving grace with this if it gets passed that it's .5 on every unit that it can't be finagled on this unit or that unit. If a unit is at 12 bucks per 100 does or 14 bucks per 100 does, they still get a late muzzleloader tag on that unit.

Ben – The committee felt very much the same. It's .5% laid out in the plan for a reason. That's so that you can't have your pet unit where you do more or less on a unit and as far as when you go under objective this is the trigger. If you fall under objective, it gets reduced to five.

Mike – Not as how it reads. It goes to five on a unit like the Thousand Lakes that only get 300 tags and that would only be 1.5 tags.

Ben – It goes up to five if half a percent is less but Covy I thought we dropped to five if we went under objective.

Covy – No. Where we finally settled was, if they don't have enough permits to hit five, five would be the minimum but they should be able to handle .5% of the number of general season permits regardless of where they were in their buck/doe ratio. This is a social issue. Biologically, not detectable.

Ken – I could go either way on this. What I hear the most is point creep and "I'm never going to draw a tag in my life." What it does is eliminate a lot of people out of the pool when they put in for that. So, I think that's something that needs to be taken into consideration.

Mike – I agree with that, if you can give out 40 tags at a 80% success rate you can give out twice as many tags at a 40% success rate for general season. But I don't want to debate it all night because I know everybody's got their feelings on it but I just wanted to go that route.

Ben – I'd like to have Covy address that comment because he and I were discussing it earlier. Covy, if you can give double the tags in general season versus what we are giving on these hunts. It seems like we talked about this earlier and it's not really the case.

Covy – Well, mathematically yes, realistically no. Mike, you asked that with your previous question, how hard is it to increase permits. It's pretty hard sometimes, when you know you have the bucks there and you make a recommendation and there's still a million reasons why we as hunters are pretty selfish. So, if you just look at the numbers that's accurate. If you pull back and say no. Another thing to remember is that these are two different point systems. This is basically adding another Book Cliffs to the state of Utah which is our largest limited entry unit. That's what it would do.

Ben – And that is significant in the realm of drawing a limited entry deer tag.

Covy – Just to speak to the way the division sees this is there's a lot of, "hey don't make any more limited entry units but please provide limited entry opportunity and while you're at it address point creep and I want to hunt limited entry more often and I want to hunt general season and I want this but don't increase permits." So, we're stuck saying, ok and we get different creative ideas to address these and this is one way to address some of that. That's what it is.

Scott – So I support this on the deer committee for that reason. You draw so many additional permits and it's a great opportunity, it's untapped it seems like but I am really concerned about this as well. I guess I see it from the public perspective as somebody that doesn't want this. When they talk about opportunity, they want an opportunity to draw a permit but then once they get a permit, they want an opportunity to harvest a buck too and for a lot of those guys harvesting a two point isn't that great of an opportunity. What's hunter success? Something like 30-40% across the board? So, 60% of the guys out there are just dreaming all year long for that next chance to go after that big buck that got away from them this year. So, if we're killing those big bucks at the end of the year and they didn't see that big buck to dream about next year, that's a long year.

Danny – Just to put my two-cents-worth in, I just think that it's an awful lot of pressure, continuous pressure on these poor animals and the downside is that some of these older trophy bucks, they're doing the rut thing then they're doing all that and then the chasing and all of that then they've got to go into a winter like this last winter, we may lose some of those animals that may have ended up on somebody's wall simply because they didn't make it through the winter. They were just so stressed out and I'm sure that you can address that a little big Covy but when you're a nine-year-old buck, that's tough, right.

Covy – So I am going to try and be as sensitive as I can here. The truth is deer, you know you've got predators that are born with forward facing canines and deer that are born with flat teeth and eyes on the side of their head, something is always trying to kill them. I hear that all the time that we put so much pressure on these animals, so does everything else. They were born running from something.

Danny – And that is my point. You're adding one more thing. You know the straw that broke the camel's back.

Covy – Maybe it matters, maybe it doesn't. what we do know is they have been hunted this way for a long time. We used to hunt in the heart of the rut. This hunt is recommended to end the first of November. I don't know if that's a good reason.

Danny – In terms of the ethics of hunting does, I occasionally do herd control and unfortunately, I shoot fawns 50/50%. So, males are expendable on this plan essentially, so I may not be doing as good of a job, I may be irresponsible in putting down Bambi's for a Bambi barbeque. However, the ethics of harvesting those, I shot one Bambi out of a swing set behind a guy's house, shooting Bambi out of a kids swing set that was a good dead rest but my point is that the whole philosophy of meat hunting versus trophy hunting, we can deal with that through the hunter education program and I think that we're doing some of that. We can do a better job there and I think that we need to move on from, not just podcasts and not just internet and all of that but I think magazines can really help too. I know that several magazines that may not be hunter oriented, something like The Catalyst magazine that's got all of these millennials coming to for information and so, I think we can deal with some of these meat issues. It's not that they don't want to eat well, they want to eat extremely well and I teach classes to that end and I'm amazed at how they increase in the numbers of younger people who want to get into hunting and want to get into fishing but we need to get to them in the right way. So, social media is a great way but also these magazines like Utah Stories and others have some pretty good stuff that I think the division could round that out with some of the information. Sorry for the long speech but I think that that is important. We need to get to those people.

Eric – So, Covy I was thinking about the comment about social aspect versus the biological aspect which being in the public land agency is very tough to deal with if you're going to manage a species by emotion. In your plan, do these late season hunts, are they tied to the objective the biology side of it, we're going to control the population, we're going to try to achieve or maintain the objective or is this just another social side to appease a group to have another hunt or another opportunity to draw a tag?

Covy – So, they are tied to general season buck permits in a way because they're allocated based on percentage of those permits. So, as that number adjusts these permits would adjust too. I think that's the best I can answer. We never hunt bucks at any biological threshold. We just don't. We would have to push them way, way back to 5-7 bucks per 100 does to hit a biological threshold and we are always well above that. We've only hit that on a few units in history over time since the state started managing mule deer. We're way above what we need to be.

Eric – So, I applaud the Division for actually looking at the dynamics of the herds and how that goes and the best way to manage that and not on the social pressures thing which we deal with all the time too. I support the plan for those reasons that it's at least got some science behind it, yet trying to meet the needs of the general public in the same sense which is very tough to do.

Danny – One more comment. I don't think it is fair to talk about predator control when we're managing deer by controlling females and yet when we talk about cougars for some reason, we want to allow this

trophy hunting for older Tom's. That's just two faced in my opinion. I'm just trying to represent my clientele. You know, it was said before two and a half deer per... those are the critters that are eating all the deer, the lactating females so, I have no problem whatsoever if we're harvesting female cougars. None whatsoever, even if they've got young. I have no problem with that. I'm just saying that if we want to control predators, we need to control them the same way we're controlling deer and elk.

VOTING

Motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ken Strong to remove the word "plate" out of the document and just use the word "skull" where there is no brain tissue or matter.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ken Strong to maintain the late season muzzleloader hunts that exist on 18-20 that are over objective. (Follow the current plan)

In Favor: Mike, Ken, Steve

Opposed: Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Eric, Christine

Abstained:

Motion fails 3 to 6

Motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Eric Reid to modify the CWD plan to prohibit the transfer of carcasses with CWD positive management units within the state.

Discussion here between Mike, Scott, Ben, Eric and Covy prior to voting

?? – Covy, how would that affect CWD sampling moving forward in the CWD plan?

Covy – On years where we sampled those units, because they won't be sampled every year anymore it'll be every five years, we would have to have localized check stations. So, we could do it.

?? – So, you also had recommendations somewhere I remember reading for appropriate disposal of infected or potentially infected carcasses. Was that in the CWD plan or is that somewhere else? And one of the options was double bagging the head and putting it in the landfill. Maybe that would be permissible to move the head across the units so you could sample as long as it was disposed of properly.

Covy – I think at the end of the day if you want us to come up with the language to address this, that's what we would do, come up with the language and address it.

Mike – Before I vote, what's the penalty for breaking that?

Covy – Never hunting again. (ha ha) It's one of those things that we've really struggled with. We may impose, I believe the way it's worded in the rule if I'm correct, there will be a rule change coming in my next presentation that we may impose a fine or fee before you're allowed to put in for the draw again.

Ben – I understand the sentiment from outside of Utah. I understand the sentiment within Utah. I think the schematics of it gets very difficult because you are talking about a hunter and let's be honest a lot of our hunters know how to take care of an animal. There's a lot of people that don't know how to take care of an animal, that probably don't know how to quarter an animal. So, that puts them having to be in a

remote unit in the state, having to find a butcher locally within that unit, find a taxidermist within that unit. I don't like it because I like the sentiment, the schematics are difficult. Any other discussion?

Eric – In the CWD plan itself it says, “the import of deer, elk, moose carcasses from known infection areas is prohibited”. That can be defined as it doesn't say an import from out of state. That could be an import from a county or area so in the plans itself it states it as import from a known infected area.

Ben – So, if I hear what you're saying the motion is unnecessary because it's already...

Eric – It could be other than just needs to be clarified because the plan states that it's from the neighboring state.

Joshua – Biologically this one is a no brainer. I think it would be a social nightmare to try to tell somebody from Utah that they can't transfer it. I mean, I don't have the solution or the answer but this would be an almost impossible sell to the public. Telling them they can't bring it from Wyoming is a different story.

Scott – Maybe the best solution is education on appropriate disposal. Let's kill that motion. Do we need to vote it down or what?

Ben – I think you just need to withdraw.

Scott – I withdraw that motion.

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Eric Reid to accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passed unanimously

- 5) **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline
And Rule Amendments**
Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Ben – You and I discussed this already but I just want to throw it out there. Willard Peak mountain goat, the recommendation was to eliminate the nanny hunt. Currently there are two Billy hunts. Any reason not to combine them into one?

Covy – I don't think the Division would have heartburn about combining them back into one. There are advantages and disadvantages. One is leaving two hunts on the books doesn't confuse the public as much that's the advantage. The disadvantage is they get shorter seasons and the later season obviously, gets more of a chance of weather but also better chance of hair and right now, we don't need both of those hunts in order to meet the goals. It was split because of crowding issues. Too many hunters on the landscape. The goats hang out in a very small area.

Ben – The one unit I've seen in the state where there was actually a legitimate issue. I hunted that unit when there was only one but before we split it and there were 39 tags. That was in a two-mile span.

Covy – And we will not have 39 tags next year.

Scott – So I am looking at the Wasatch Front extended archery area map for deer and elk and the current outline is cut off North of Orem. I thought we had an extension that went all the way down to Hobble Creek and up over...

Covy – It should go down into Hobble Creek until October 15. If that map is wrong, lets get after it and get the right map on there. I believe it could be wrong. It's a map error but it needs to be fixed so let's talk.

Scott – Same for elk. I think that both maps are showing the boundaries prior to last year's extension.

Covy – OK. We need to fix those. Those have been fixed a couple of times and they have reverted back and I don't know why. We tell our tech guys that they revert back, they look at us like we're idiots but it's happened twice now. So, I don't know what's going on but we'll get on it. One thing I forgot to mention is if you have unit specific questions for the central region, their staff is here and they love to answer those. Any central region questions we'll leave for them and the rest of the stuff, I'll happily take.

Questions from the Public

Tim Pilling - Why do we have that antler selling restriction season? I don't know if it's enforceable.

Matt Briggs – One of the reasons we have that restriction is we run into issues with people hunting when nobody else can hunt. Meaning, they are hunting at night or out of season, things like that. It's trying to restrict their ability to sell their animals. It has nothing to do with the shed antlers. Those can be picked up and sold. It's to try to stop some of the sales and activities that go on taking some of these big animals out of season.

Covy – Matt, tell me if I'm wrong. If you shoot something and sell it before we can seize it or make a case. So, some of it is trying to say, during the season when we're hunting animals you've got to hold onto it.

Tim Pilling – It's starting to get a little harder with social media because everybody puts what they do on social media now.

Matt Briggs – Social media is great for some of our cases.

Tim Pilling – (Asks question but is not speaking into the microphone)

Matt Briggs – We'll have to go on there and look. Some of it's going to deal with the mountain heads too. That's going to be your difference.

Tim Pilling – (Asks question but is not speaking into the microphone)

Matt Briggs – We have those restrictions that we look at to reduce the sale of those animals. We deal mostly with the green hides and green heads. The heads have... it's trying to reduce the poaching on the landscape.

Jason Vernon stating recap of online comment percentages

Once again from the online public comment, we had 60% of the comments that were in support of this proposal, 21% we neutral and 18% we opposed to this proposal.

Comments from the Public

John Bair – Just speaking for myself. I'll be quick and I appreciate the Division's work on this. I know that this can be a hot topic but I think they have done a really good job of going around with their proposals and trying to work out the bugs beforehand. I think they have done a really good job growing opportunity where it's to be had. I like the addition of the extended archery units and the OIAL units like on the buffalo. I think Covy has done a good job and the division has done a really good job on that. I'm excited for his future proposals when he's going to come and tell us how to start helping us get some of these elk hunts out of the rut and some of these rifle tags just so we can maybe move away from that. I know I'm part of the problem there because I helped push those at one time but I guess the older I get the more I think that's not the way to do it. For this round, I think Covy has done a really good job and I think we should pass it as written. Thank you.

Tim Pilling – I will just start with what I'd recommend to that RAC that we make a motion to make the use of cameras illegal. It's currently in the state statute it's just not in the proclamation. So, I wanted to get that out before I ran out of time. The other item I heard a lot of comments about is trying to educate the public. I know Arizona and New Mexico have a fair chase in the proclamation so it's there for everybody to read and understand and learn. I think that would help the younger hunters understand what fair chase is about. I've heard some sentiment towards that. I think baiting is a bigger problem right now because it does a lot of things. It concentrates the deer; it concentrates prime aged bucks. We talked about the concern if you concentrate on prime aged bucks. It has social issues; it has ethical and biological issues. So, there's a lot of things I think if you look at the reasons not to do it, every interior Western state baiting mule deer and elk and antelope it's illegal in every state. So, I think that says a lot biologically. If every state has made it illegal why is Utah leaving it legal? Those are my two options. I've got a lot of data in the power plant. I don't know if you had a chance to read it but we have a lot of hunting opportunities and I don't think we need to simplify and expedite mortality on a big deer by baiting him in with various... apples seem to be their food of choice. The deer are very susceptible to apples in late August. Starting actually in July and it creates a lot of conflict issues. I don't think it's a good way to portray our mule deer hunting in Utah. Thanks.

Greg Bird/Utah Wild Sheep – We agree and support the Division's recommendations on all the matters and we particularly commend them with changing some of these sheep units to put some pressure in areas that we need pressure in to take advantage of sheep that we're not currently hunting. We appreciate everything that you have done.

Troy Justensen/SFW – The SFW supports the Division’s recommendations. We’re really excited about the hams(?) hunts. This has been three years in the works to provide some opportunity in areas that haven’t seen opportunity before. There’s been a lot of talk tonight about the use of technology and this is kind of a step back to go back to the way we used to hunt, so to speak. So, I’m excited about that to see how it works out. I’d like to thank the division and Covy for the time they put into this and especially like Greg pointed out with the sheep, addressing some of the issues we have. We do support this 100% Thank you.

Covy – The big game rule is open right now. Tim Pilling mentioned baiting. He did mention cameras just to correct that. The division does not have any statutory authority over cameras. We have statutory authority over the take of big game and cameras do not qualify as take. So, the legislature would have to give us that authority before we could do anything to address that. We do have statutory authority over baiting. It’s spelled out clearly in code. To this point, we have not addressed as an agency, baiting. We took a really hard look at this. It’s one of the questions we asked in our mule deer survey. It’s also one of the questions that we brought before the committee and had them take a vote on as to what they wanted to do. The committee came back and it wasn’t unanimous but the vote was it’s time to take action on this. There are good biological and social reasons to ban baiting. We wrote a rule and what we realized when we wrote it is that in order to have a good baiting rule you have to address feeding. If you don’t, you don’t address the biological concerns. If you can place feed out, you don’t address the congregation of wildlife, the negative impacts on habitat, the possible disease impacts, the competition of bucks and how that can hurt fawns. We always hear about winter feeding. What you don’t hear is that feeding deer in the winter can kill your fawns because bucks always eat first. So, in order to write a good rule, we looked at it and realized we’d prohibit feeding and we hadn’t had those discussions yet so as an agency we didn’t feel like we could come and make this recommendation to ban baiting and slide it through and say, by the way we banned feeding too. We don’t want to do things like that. We want to be open and transparent. That doesn’t mean that this isn’t one of the things that we’ll be working on probably this coming year and working through some hard issues. Frankly, we’ve got some egg on our face too. We’ve fed at Hardware since the 1940’s. For us those were good reasons to feed. I don’t know if the risk is still worth the reward up there. So, we’ve got some issues to work through at this time. The big game rule is open and that is why Tim came and asked to make a recommendation change but at this time the division just didn’t feel like we could write a rule to ban baiting without banning feeding and we hadn’t had those discussions.

RAC Discussion

Ben – Let’s bring this back to the RAC for discussion.

Mike – So you have this on your plate to address within the next year. Is that what you are saying?

Covy – That’s the goal, Mike. We want to come and make the strongest argument we can and have the discussions that we need to have. I will tell you it is not a homerun. It’s going to be a fight.

Mike – And I know the Wildlife Board has asked to bring back an informational item on baiting. Have you done that?

Covy – Yes. I brought it back and said, this is what other states look like. It’s banned in every Western state in some form or another except for Oregon and Utah. Oregon looked into it a couple of years ago and I think if you banned it early, it’s one of those things like drones, when we banned drones everyone laughed at us. They said, you’re banning hunting with drones, who’s going to use a drone? Well if you tried to do that today and people started hunting with drones, I think it would be a different thing and

that's kind of where we are with baiting. It's a fight but it's one that we're willing to really look at and take on.

Ken - I have looked at this baiting issue for some time. I have a home in Kanab. I spend a lot of time in Southern Utah. During the deer hunt, I hunted down there this year. You've got all those little communities down there. You've got Duck Creek, Swanes Creek, Strawberry Valley, a whole bunch of them and they sit out there on the hunts and they put big barrels of stuff in their driveway to attract all of the deer they can to come in there to protect them from the hunters. These are small communities but probably 100+ people. I saw 92 deer in one driveway feeding out of a barrel. So, you've got that issue. I spent much of my time in the last few years doing away with some of the rules and regulations that could not be enforced and I really wonder how you can enforce this. Of course, in the past we've fed deer, elk, turkeys. I go down to Sutherlands in the evening in the winter and there might be 50-60 deer on a bale of hay. How are you going to stop all of this from taking place? You take a rancher or a CWMU and they bait and there is a problem with that. However, how am I going to stop Calvin Crandall from putting apples out for his cows? Or apricots or corn? Because it's on his property he's got the right to feed his apples when he wants. So, I don't know how you could ever enforce it. That's just my opinion.

Covy – Is that a question of what we would do? We would exempt normal agricultural actions. You can tell when something is a normal agricultural action and when it's not. But yeah, our intent would never be to hurt private landowners or the industries that they run on their private land. It's tough, Ken. As you can I didn't bring it tonight because it's pretty complicated.

Ken – Like I said, I have spent a lot of time in Swanes Creek and there were 92 deer on a barrel in the guys driveway. Every house had deer in it and they're standing out there making sure you don't shoot any of their deer. The deer are in the driveways, they're in the bird feeders. They are in everything and they're congregating to whatever it is. So, I just don't know how you can ever enforce it.

Ben – So I think this great however, given that baiting not part of the recommendation and we believe it's coming soon as a recommendation I don't know if there's a whole lot of merit in continuing that discussion tonight.

Josh – Covy, so is there a timeline? My one concern is and I totally appreciate baiting vs feeding and the challenge that that is going to be to address but it would be nice to know a time horizon for when we can expect this because I think it's important to take into account the mule deer committees recommendation also the public support. I'm just curious to what timeline you would foresee.

Covy –The goal will be within the next year. I don't want to commit to that absolutely and say we'll have it ready but that's the goal.

Mike – And I had the same concern, would it be beneficial if the RAC voted as an informational item for the board to look at baiting because that would get the board to have to address it also. I think that would be just an informational thing. Not that we're voting to ban baiting.

Ken – It might not be a bad idea but I think they have already given that issue to Covy to look at it. They've already directed the division to look at baiting so I think that's already been done.

Ben – Karl would that be beneficial to the board?

Karl – (Speaking from the audience, can't make out what he is saying.)

Ben – I don't know if it'll be more or Brock that will be representing at the board meeting but we'll make sure that's represented as well.

Danny – Two. I am encouraged by the enlarged area for the Wasatch archery. That's huge. It's always been a rob that these people in Salt Lake City for instance who want to hunt in the morning before they go to work and in they put an animal down they'll call in sick but I think that will be huge for all of those people. Also, I really support the three scopeless hunts. That is just huge. It allows me to not have to carry a great big rifle with a scope on it but I can carry a handgun and a contender and shoot grouse, I'm just kidding. But I can carry my shotgun and do multiple species on my hunts.

Eric – I don't know if I missed this on the comment side but there were a couple comments concerning youth hunts and one of those was actually using that new early five-day hunt as making it a youth only period. I don't know if Covy or if you guys can speak to how much that interest was on that early five-day hunt for those of us that may have drawn that. Of course, I believe this is the first year so you probably don't have any kind of survey stuff in there.

Covy – It is the second year. It's been a really favorable hunt. People have really liked it. The truth is a large portion of our permits in general season are already allocated to youth. Before we draw any adults, we draw 20% of every hunt for youth. So, they get the first crack at the permits then we throw them back in and draw again with everybody else. So, our concern is if we... we like you put that on the record... but if we allocate anymore to the youth, we're going to really start to dip into the opportunity we can offer for the dad or mom or aunt or whoever is taking that youth out hunting. We don't want to impact that opportunity either. If a dad or mom or aunt or uncle, if you draw a permit you can mentor a youth too. So, you can give them that early season rifle if you want to. You can get a youth tag like seven ways from Sunday. They have a lot of opportunity right now. I wish I were younger.

Eric – It's hard to tell you kid why they didn't draw a tag. We experienced that with our family too. I got a couple of girls that have not drawn tags for a couple of years. I'm the only one that draws a tag and I'm thinking that really bit me there. So, I'm always looking for an opportunity to increase youth hunting and giving my tag up to my kid is well worth it on that end. But there were a couple comments that came in that way. Of course, Covy goes to the other guy that commented that if we continue to cater to the youth, that is not a good thing. So, there's another comment there that would go.

Ben – So, to add to what Covy said. We give the youth a ton of opportunity already and to address some of your comments, I pulled up odds a few months ago because I wanted to see how big on an issue it was with youth. Personally, the division actually published odds around youth draws which was nice. In the dedicated hunter program, a youth can draw pretty much any unit. I see Lindy agreeing with me. She knows her stuff. I believe that. Even outside of that, there's a set of permits that are issued to the youth that are not part of the draw that are then set aside and allocated as over the counter after the draw. They are archery permits but it's just for the youth. If a youth wants to hunt deer in Utah every year, they can. There is a way. It may not always be the unit and the hunt that they prefer but there is a way that youth can hunt every year. One thing that I want to remind the RAC we should probably address since we debated this quite a bit in the mule deer plan is the CWD recommendation, the skull plates. If we're done with discussion, I think we might be ready for a motion.

VOTING

Motion made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Eric Reid to remove the word “plate” from the CWD rule and include “skull” meaning no brain tissue or matter.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Christine Schmitz to accept the balance of the Division’s recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passed unanimously

**6) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association
Permit Numbers for 2020**

Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Scott – Can you clarify this Junction Valley public land addition? Is there a map for that?

Chad – I do not have a map but will get one for you.

Scott – It looked like 640 acres being added. So, basically a public section. That concerns me a bit. Why are we adding a public section to a CWMU?

Chad – Like I said, there are three reasons you can add a public land. One is an enforceable boundary.

Scott – Are there boundary issues right now?

Chad – Yeah.

Scott – If it’s a boundary issue it tells me that there’s public guys hunting in it. It’s probably somebody’s little honey hole. There are probably five guys hunting it so, if we’re going to get one permit then we’re giving up maybe five guys opportunity for their perfect spot. I don’t like it.

Chad – I agree. I hate doing it.

Mike – I just have two quick questions. One your moose permits splits are you following the COR through your COR permit cycle to base the 60/40 off of?

Chad – Yes, well I’m not sure I follow you.

Mike – So, when a moose CWMU signs up for their COR the permit cycle is for that 3-year COR. Within the three years they have to maintain 40% of the permits go to the public hunter then when they renew it needs to follow the same line.

Chad – There is a provision in there. So, the public never goes under 40% but there's a new provision in that rule that... so some of them just have one tag a year so it goes public, private, public then the next three years will actually allow it to kind of extend out so then it would go private, public private. So, after that six years it would be a 50/50 split. It is still maintaining above 40%?

Mike – And do you follow that through? Then the other question I had was on the landowner association. Whoever received the vouchers to sell, they are supposed to allow a public hunter on... a comparable number. Does the DWR audit that to make sure that is occurring?

Chad – Yeah. I've been in the job for three months. I don't know how well that has been audited or not. My plans are to audit it and to put it in hunt planner of this is a LOA and they have to allow the same number. It's my plan to follow through with that and make sure we get more access.

Steve – I want to go back to the public boundary that we were talking about. The 640 acres. Tell me about the topography of that.

Chad – It's a really cliffy area.

Steve – If it's 640 acres, is it actually a section or is it elongated?

Chad – It's elongated.

Steve – In a simplistic world if it was 640 acres there was an actual section it would be flat or at least accessible to public hunters. It would probably impractical to use that as a boundary is that correct? Let's assume that it was a section, 640 acres. If it were an actual section that was accessible by hunter and one that was easily hunted it probably wouldn't have been included in this. Is that correct?

Chad – Right, yeah.

Steve – But where it's elongated the way it is in a cliffy area, tell me a little bit about that topography.

Chad – So, that's pretty much what it is. There is a cliff line and that's where it goes up to... I suppose a guy could go but they aren't going to come out the way they went in.

Steve – For somebody that's trying to manage a CWMU if you have other hunters that come in that aren't allowed to be hunting in that CWMU it probably makes sense to say well, this is our boundary right up here. This cliff area that you can see, even though it's public ground that is our boundary. Does that make sense? It's probably going to avoid a conflict.

Chad – It's a good visual, easy for everybody to understand.

Eric – How was this first communicated with the BLM because that's one of our biggest complaints that we get, why are they closing public land access especially BLM. How is that included? Then I have a couple other questions I don't know if you want to answer that first.

Chad – I agree with you and I had this conversation with SITLA. Frankly, that's probably something we can do better to communicate on those things. That's something we need to find out a mechanism of at least having the discussion and communication.

Eric – Alright. To follow along with that in the rule itself it says the Wildlife Board may approve the issuance of a COR for a CWMU provided that the property exhibits enforceable boundaries, clearly identifiable to the public and private hunters. So, in rule two there that is basically saying that it has to be the private land, continuous acres have to be enforceable and clearly identified. That would be the private side. Then it goes down into rule four and it says that they can then include public land as long as there is an explanation of the purpose for it being included and an explanation as to how the public is compensated by the inclusion of the public land. I don't think that just one tag gives that a valid reason for the compensation side of it. I'm trying to figure out how a private landowner can say that that public

land is more valuable to me than it is to the public especially on our end when we're saying you can't close...that's our biggest complaint, how come that guy has a gate locked on that road going into public lands. I mean I can understand hiking but it's still public land and that's an issue.

Chad – Right. I guess that's exactly it. It would be a hunt boundary. We wouldn't be closing public land it would be accessible for everything except... Junction Valley is at least a deer CWMU maybe elk.

Eric – But it's closing public access during that time for the... Scott's mentioned it somebody likes to hunt there. For the reason that anybody would want to hunt around a CWMU because they've got wildlife that are hanging out there. The chance that one of them comes across.

Chad – You're right. If you had a deer tag you wouldn't be hunting that land for deer but you could access it for whatever else you want to access it for. Let me address the compensation part. So the percentage of public land in that CWMU wouldn't even... we have a calculator that spits that out and it wouldn't even be a tag every three years. So, comparable wise it's just not very much of the CWMU. That's why the one tag every three years because of how low of a percentage it is.

Scott – So it is one tag every three years? Not one tag every year?

Chad – Yes, one tag every three years. Because I think it was less than 1%.

Steve – I looked at the acreage and you're right. Acreage wise it's a small contribution but there's just no way.

Eric – I'm still having a hard time with this especially because it's BLM because it's not defined anywhere in the definition what public land, whether it's SITLA, BLM, Forest Service, now we know it's all of those that can be in there. Also, it says in writing the plan that the operator must have a plan itself that defines all of those. Is there a place where the general public or even the public land officers can see these plans that they write that say this is why we have included these areas and why we feel it's important to have public land in the boundaries?

Chad – Yes, it is in our management plan. They don't go into great detail. It's more of a check in a box of the three ways that it fits in. On that plan you would just check the box of enforceable boundary.

Eric – The table that had the percentages, the moose one was the 60/40 because there was only one option for that one but in the elk and deer there's four different options. Who selects those options because it seems like it's just number one, the 90/10. Is there any other time that any of those other options would be chosen?

Chad – There are. So, it's usually with elk. So, they'll choose if... a lot of them, we require a certain amount of harvest out of them for antlerless elk and a lot of them feel like they can't get that harvest with public elk hunters out of a random draw so they'll actually choose a lower split so they can get a portion of those antlerless permits. But 90/10 on both of them is for sure the most popular.

Mike – One clarification there...for Eric's understanding. If a unit, let's say an elk CWMU only had five permits, they could choose an 80/20 split because they have to give one to the public and then they can get a bunch of the cow tags. It doesn't benefit them at all to go 90/10 because they are already at 80/20. So, that's actually a large reason why a lot of your elk go that low.

Eric – Where it says a CWMU permit does not entitle the holder to hunt on any other public lands or private lands... how is that enforced? I know down on the Pavaunt unit there's a piece of private ground

up there and I can almost guarantee that not every CWMU permit holder is staying on Pavaunt Ensign up on top of the Pauvent. So, that's a comment we hear all the time. You know, how is that enforces, who enforces it, how can you enforce it?

Chad – It is a tough one, a law enforcement issue. It would be like any of our other boundaries. Probably tips and people knowing of where other people are hunting and the CWMUs have to allow access to our law enforcement. That is part of the management plan. So, they have access to patrol it but a lot of times that's a numbers game of we don't have a lot of CO's and a lot of ground to cover. Realistically for that to be enforced it would be more people that are out and know the area and know where CWMU people can and can't be. If they are reported it'll be investigated thoroughly.

Eric – I sympathize with that because we have one LEO to cover four million acres in our office. I can completely sympathize with that aspect. Still the public land included in and restricted from public access is a hard one for me especially if it's not being communicated through our offices and I'm sure the Forest Service would feel the same way if a block was chunked out that they weren't aware of. How is that to where we can say, yeah, we agree with that concept.

Chad – To be frank with you, the reason why I brought this one to the committee is because I was actually the biologist over that unit before I came here and I told the operator, I want this to go through the public process we're not going to sneak this in. I think this needs to be heard and needs to be discussed here and it needs to be decided upon here.

Mike – How long has Junction Valley been a CWMU?

Chad – It's been a while.

Mike – So, if it hasn't been an issue until now...

Chad – So, to give you a little more background on that I think that the CWMU had been enforcing it and practicing it this way up until this point. Talking to the operator, he says it's always been the boundary and it got brought to our attention this last year that on our records it hadn't been. It probably had. A lot of times there's grazing allotments and other things like that and they sometimes honestly just don't know. So, it probably had. It's probably been like that the whole time but I still thought it was worth bringing it through the public process to hash it out here.

Danny – Chad, I just want to support your decision but there are other reasons to do that same kind of thing relative to these management units and the public. One resulted from a fire back in the early 1970's and they put a D9 cat as a fire break and it just happened to be fairly close to a boundary between the public and the management unit so it was just a negotiation between the division and the landowner back then and it's worked. So, possession is 9/10ths of the law, I think. So, the public had been using that as the boundary but extremely obvious it's like a cliff almost of right, left... I encourage you to continue to do that but to open it up to more opportunities like that where one or the other will benefit. The landowner would benefit because he didn't have nearly as much trespass and the public would benefit because they got a dozed trail all the way from one end of the state park to the other.

Josh – On a separate topic, Chad I really appreciated you showing us that hunter satisfaction information. I think anecdotally we hear that CWMU's kind of get a bad rap and in fact in the comments that we got for the overall plan people were talking about CWMU's and I think your survey shows that most people are pretty happy. I love to see people hunting on private land, whether it's Walk in Access or blocked management. My question is, you identified out of the five-point scale two are receiving a score of one, three is receiving a score of two and then 14 others were flagged. I'm not thinking about one individual hunter here who had a bad experience. How do you improve the overall perception of the CWMU program by enforcing these bad actors to clean up their act or see you later?

Chad – We have a CWMU advisory committee that meets every year. So, it's one of those things being a new guy, right? I started putting that thing together for my own purposes. I had no idea that it would come into light like this. Essentially, I'm going to go through those lists and look at satisfaction. In the rule it says satisfaction rating should be taken into account. We're going to start looking at those satisfaction ratings and bringing them to the advisory committee to see what we can do to help those guys have the public have a better experience.

Josh – If the overall program is better perceived then you are drawing people out of the main lottery into the CWMU lottery and I think it's win/win but you can't have this perception of, "we got bad dates or we got the short straw" so it's more of a comment than a question.

Chad – And it is tough because people put in for a CWMU because they have that perception. People who have hunted a CWMU generally have a different perception. How do you get everybody to hunt a CWMU? I don't know, that's tough. Most of them are treated very well and they have a very good experience. There's probably an educational component there.

Questions from the Public

Brody Jarvis – My question is about that Junction Valley CWMU. You said part of the reason for a distinguishable boundary, right? Is it not something that the DWR can say, you guys need to have your boundaries marked? All private landowners have to have it if they want to keep people out without having agricultural land. If it's just regular land that's has a fence on it and there's no posted signs, there's no law saying you can't hunt it, right? They have to post it so why do the CWMU's not have their boundaries marked as well?

Chad – That is part of the reason, it would be a very difficult area to mark. I had that discussion with him. If it doesn't pass, then they are absolutely expected to have a boundary marked where their private land is.

Comments from the Public

None

Jason Vernon stating recap of online comment percentages

For this we had 32% in support of the proposal, there was 51% neutral and almost 17% that were opposed to what was presented by Chad.

RAC Discussion

None

VOTING

Motion made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Josh Lenart to not approve the proposal to add 640 acres and the additional permit for the Junction Valley CWMU.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Motion made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Luke Decker to accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

7) Proposed rule amendments to address point creek, lost opportunities and Equity in the hunt drawing process

Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Scott – On your surrender slide you listed 2016, 2017, 2018 and the last two years were much better for reallocation than 2016. In 2016 it looked like there were roughly 300 permits that were returned and only 150 made it back out.

Lindy – The reason why is we actually had two employees that year that do reallocations had to be hospitalized so we didn't have the staff.

Scott – So, it was kind of a quirk in the data. Do you expect the data to be more similar to the last two years?

Lindy – If you look at the three years prior to 2016 it follows the same kind of trend. 2016 like I said we had two employees not working.

Scott – I guess I didn't realize the youth archery tags are above and beyond the quota for the unit.

Lindy – Yes. So, those ones that we sell in July, the youth only, those are above and beyond 20% of the archery quota. Those aren't through the draw. It's been that way five or six years now.

Ben – I think those existed prior. There's 1000 permits statewide prior to going to 30 units. Then when we went to 30 units it was allocated per unit. So, it's been a while.

Scott – Always youth tags?

Lindy – Yes.

Eric – For the forfeiting your points where it says you apply for a tag and if you don't draw then you are able to somehow get online and get one of the over the counter tags, you're saying you're going to lose your bonus point that you would have gotten for the application that you didn't draw?

Lindy – Yes. You would.

Eric – If they are willing to go someplace else that meets the objectives there why would you penalize them for taking that extra effort and then being skilled enough to get on the computer to buy one of those over the counter tags?

Lindy – I agree. What's happening is people are applying, you know when we changed the draw structure a couple of years ago to, you lose your points no matter what hunt choice you draw out on, what happened is the remaining permits did go back up because people are now selecting one hunt choice. Then they are buying one over the counter because they know they might as well get a Box Elder or Chalk Creek and go hunt the extended or go hunt that unit for a couple of days. It's kind of a strategy, they are saying, well I'm going to bank these points for several years but I'm still going to go hunt and

I'm not going to get it through the draw because it's going to be left over. So, it's kind of a fairness thing. These people are still hunting when people are still waiting five- six year to draw out a permit.

Eric – I guess that goes to those who are still waiting those five years. They have the same opportunity to go do exactly what those other folks are doing. I guess that's a choice that I would be making too because I probably wouldn't go to Box Elder to go hunt.

Lindy – It is a choice. Over the years I've been tasked with trying to find ways to get these hunters through the draw so the odds can go back down to more realistically of one and two for an any legal weapon permit. Not one and four. This is just another way to, you know if you're going to hunt deer in the state of Utah you should lose your points so then everyone that hunts are on the same playing field.

Josh – How did you decide on the 30 days surrender?

Lindy – My staff and I thought about the best day for that. If you go longer than 30 days, those people have their permits in their possession so, you can't have someone surrender a permit if they don't actually have a permit in their hands. If you go less, we have a harder time getting those permits out as you saw in my graph. So, what we did was, we said, let's stick with the 30 days because people know that 30 days to get their refund if you surrender your permit with more than 30 days, you get a refund minus \$25. So, let's keep it consistent with what people know and it shows that we can get those permits back out.

Ben – Early on in your presentation you talked about getting a variance for various reasons. One of them was injured. I'm just looking for some clarification here. Are we talking about an injury prior to the hunt, injury during the hunt? Help me understand.

Lindy – So, you can surrender your permit. Ok. I've got a personal experience of surrender. I have a swan permit. I haven't been out hunting at all. Some animal decided to trip me over the weekend and break my foot. If I have a statement from my doctor saying, you are unable to participate in the activity. I can't go swan hunting now, I can't walk on it for six weeks. I have a notarized statement saying that have not been out in the field and I get all this turned in before the season ends, I can get my points reinstated. That's not changing.

Ben – That's different from an injury while in the field while hunting.

Lindy – That's just a surrender. Now we have the variance for hunters that get injured in the field.

Ben – Oh, so the example you just gave would be a surrender of your permit, not a variance for a season extension.

Lindy – Correct. Now let's say I was out swan hunting and I tripped over my dog in the field. It has to be the first day. It can't be over 24 hours after going out in the field. If you hunt more than 24 hours unfortunately we can't do anything for you. We can't reinstate your points or put it to the next year. But if it's the first day and you're out hunting and something happens where you are injured and you can no longer hunt, we go through the variance where we can. That's actually a lot more paperwork than what I would have to turn in.

Ben – So, if you haven't hunted, you surrender your permit, you get your points and so forth. If you hunt less than 24 hours then you get a season extension to the next year.

Lindy – Depending on the type of permit. If it's a swan, no. I would just get my points reinstated. But if it's my bull elk permit, yes, I'd get my points reinstated but if it's my moose permit then I could ask for a season extension.

Scott – So does that coincide with the season dates? In other words, even if you didn't hunt until the fourth day?

Lindy – Yeah, it's just like my situation. You have to make sure you have a notarized statement that you didn't go out until this day. So, if it comes back on you, like they said, "ex-girlfriends, wives, pissed off neighbors", they will report that you were out there and it happens. You have to have a notarized statement saying that you didn't go out until this day and that's when it happened. It doesn't have to be opening morning. Not everyone hunts opening morning.

Ben – Another example: let's say you broke your foot before the season started but inside that 30 days then it's a variance request

Lindy – It'd just be a surrender.

Ben – It'd be a surrender but it's a medical reason you would get your points back and gain a point?

Lindy – Yes, we would make you whole.

Ben – Choose between dedicated hunter and general season, what would it take to combine them into one system so if we're going to do that, what would it take to make dedicated hunter just another hunt choice?

Lindy – I have put some thought into this because it had been brought up by other individuals. I'd have to contact my contractor. It would take a whole rewrite of how we do general season points in general because we take that quota that is approved by the wildlife board and then we take lifetime license holders and then dedicated hunters then general season and it's all mathematical formulated. I'm not a computer girl on how this works but our contractor said it would be a whole rewrite. Is it doable? Yes. This year? No. The next issue is, I talked to our attorneys today about it because we do have general season preference points and dedicated hunter preference points so, we would have to figure out what to do with those points. We have dedicated hunters that have up to seven dedicated hunter points. They've been applying for points over the last seven years. There are 3100 people that have dedicated hunter preference points so we'd need to figure out what the best route is to deal with those. We'd need to give the public some time to say, in 2021 we're going to be changing the system so, apply or you're going to lose them. So, it would take time to do something like that. Mike – Why did the draw hunters have a lower variance

Mike – I want my ML300 points back. So, why do the draw hunters have a lower variance of one year compared to a so-called paid hunter? Why is there that discrepancy when we're trying to make everything kind of along the same...?

Lindy – The main reason why is because when we have a variance, these hunters apply through the drawing they are paying the permit fee and if we extend it to the next year and if they are still ill, because it happens, people have been doing this from 2015, that hunter has now applied again for a variance to push it into the 2020 season. If they are still sick, we can reinstate their bonus points and help them that way. If you purchase a voucher and then do this, we can't reimburse you that money that you paid the groups for that permit or that operator. It's kind of a loss because they didn't use points so we can't refund them like we can through a draw. That's the reason why there is that one to two year.

Mike – So, if I'm a lifetime license holder can I apply for the dedicated hunter and then just get my lifetime license?

Lindy – The way we have it is, you'd have to pick. Right now, lifetime license holders, if they apply for a general season permit and they want to apply as a group, they have to forfeit their lifetime permit. People do it.

Mike – So, a lifetime license holder wouldn't be able to apply for dedicated hunter, not draw that then get their lifetime permit?

Lindy – Correct.

Mike – How about your landowner mitigation permits that don't use your points would that be like landowner buck tags also?

Lindy – No, they're for like the depredation permits.

Mike – Would the landowner buck tag be... would you lose your points if you obtained one?

Lindy – Like the landowner association permits?

Mike – No. The landowner permit where only the family member can use it.

Lindy – Oh. No. You would lose your points on those.

Mike – You would lose your points.

Lindy – Yeah because those aren't mitigation permits. The mitigation permits are free. You get a voucher and the permit's free and it's to help address depredation issues for that landowner.

Mike – So, I understand like on a cow elk there's a mitigation tag that goes to the landowner and their family and those wouldn't use it but a voucher would because the voucher can be sold?

Lindy – Exactly.

Mike – I guess I don't understand why a landowner buck tag isn't transferable and it's only good for the landowner's family. So, it falls in the same category as the mitigation cow tag. If I go buy a CWMU tag, I don't lose my points.

Lindy – Not if it's a limited entry.

Mike – All CWMU are. So, if I buy a CWMU tag on Junction Valley I lose my points? A buck deer?

Lindy – Yes if it's a bull or buck you won't lose you points if you buy it.

Ben – Because its limited entry but if you bought a CWMU cow tag you'd lose your preference points.

Lindy – So, Covy we talked about the limited entry landowner ones.

Mike – It's not limited entry landowner, it's just the general season landowner that's non-transferable and non-sellable.

Covy – The rationale was that you get to hunt the whole unit. You have a deer permit that is valid for the whole unit. That takes a long time to draw and it's something we try to give back to the landowners but also recognizing that these are hard to draw and you can get it every year.

Mike – Lastly, the purpose of the four youth to apply together for the any bull, that's just housekeeping?

Lindy – To keep consistent. We allow up to four to apply in a group for anything except for that. Parents have called and said, why can't I add my third child? Because rules state you can only have two in a group for the youth any bull elk. So, it's more consistent because that's what parents know or whomever is applying for those youth.

Questions from the Public

John Bair – When someone applies for an extension, it's not a foregone conclusion that they are going to get it?

Lindy – No it's not.

John Bair – It goes through the process and during the process of going through either the committee or the board and they find out that they only hunted one day but that day they shot at three bulls and wounded two then broke their leg they're not going to get an extension.

Lindy – Probably not. On this committee that we have the for the variances, I put the variances and all the information together...

John Bair – Ben had some good questions but it's very specific to the individual and the situation. We can ask all the hypotheticals we want but it comes down to each individual and their specific situation as to whether they are going to get their points back or get a variance.

Lindy – Exactly. They're hard.

Tim Pilling – I have a couple of questions. You talked about the time period to withdraw so, with the point change you're going to make, what would the time period to withdraw extend to? Would you go into early May to withdraw your application?

Lindy – This hasn't been thought through. This is now giving me the language to start working to get towards that.. I couldn't even talk about it without changing language in the rule.

Tim Pilling – My other question is what would be the earliest a person can surrender a permit? I'm 99% for this but what is the earliest time you'd have the data where someone could surrender their permit.

Lindy – As soon as it is in your possession. So for big game, it goes out the last weekend in June. You'll have it by July 1-2. That's the earliest you could surrender.

Brody Jarvis – What is the downfall of not being able to reallocate those permits? From my point of view, I'm looking at it and I'm not trying to say the DWR cares more about money but you have already been paid once, so if that tag doesn't get reallocated, you guys aren't out on a financial thing.

Lindy – It's more of a lost opportunity because hunters have been applying for these permits for 26 years.

Brody Jarvis – When these guys waited for 26 years and they've had an unfortunate year where we've had either fires or drought, harsh winters, maybe the sheep got lung worm, they've waited a long time and they want to have a good hunt so if it comes down to it and things haven't panned out, they spent all these years... you talk about customer satisfaction well, here's a customer that's spent 22 years giving you \$10 a year every year trying to get one of these tags but I just don't see the downfall because, if you had one of these year where maybe your antler growth isn't good a lot of times that's from drought or winter

Lindy – So what's happening is each year it is increasing. I'm looking at the projection, if we keep on the same rate that we're going, right now we are already at 13% of permits being surrendered. What's going to happen in 2, 3, or 5 years from now. We're going to be at 20% if not higher for permits being surrendered that people are waiting on getting and so, now we're taking all the opportunity then if it gets that bad it's going to become a biological effect for biologists and for how we manage these animals because we're not taking the harvest. It's a vicious circle. I get your point but it's not the money. I'm looking at other things.

Brody Jarvis – When I apply in Nevada, there's another thing that will say, if there are secondary tags, are you willing to accept one of these. Is that something we could do here in Utah?

Lindy – We've looked into that. This is something that with making a deadline if you surrender more than 30 days and you keep your points, it puts more of a way that we can because our contractor was with Nevada that started that process so they know how to do it. I've read Nevada's procedure of how they

handle those. This is a step forward to maybe go in that direction. We just want to see what it looks like but it is something that we have thought of.

Ridley Griggs – On the deer waiting period, let's say I drew a limited entry deer tag this year, entered a two-year waiting period, does your proposed rule extend my waiting period to five or does it kick into effect...

Lindy – You would be grandfathered in at two years. It would go into effect for 2020 applicants that draw out.

Ridley Griggs – If I buy an over the counter private lands only antlerless permit, do I lose my points?

Lindy – Yes.

Ridley Griggs – Might there be the unintended consequence of not selling certain antlerless permits and not getting the harvest that we need and is there any way around that?

Lindy – That's the public process. The RAC can go that way but the reason why we didn't put them on the exception list is because it has turned into more of an opportunity hunt. Over 3,000 people are buying these permits and they are hunting a cow elk every year. It's a 34% success rate on these private land permits so it's a good hunt for these hunters. It's just another way to get people through the draw because a lot of people are doing both. They are applying and buying a private-lands permits so they are using both avenues.

Jeremy Anderson/MDF – You can sit for this Lindy. So, this is kind of tailing off of what Ben was talking about of the dedicated hunter. I guess I didn't realize it was that big of a problem. Is it that big of a problem that it has to go into effect this year rather than possibly waiting and doing restructuring together as a preference point?

Lindy – If that is the way the RAC wants to go to restructure it, I would leave it as is. But we've got to think of what the best way is.

Jeremy Anderson – So, it's obviously a problem though?

Lindy – Yeah, I believe so. 71% of the people that apply for dedicated hunter are doing both so, ultimately, it's about 1,000 permits that would be offered up in the general season round.

Jason Vernon stating recap of online comment percentages

From the online comments, we had 58% that supported the proposal, 22% that were neutral and 20% the opposed the proposal.

Comments from the Public

Tim Pilling – I have a couple recommendations. I'm sitting at the max points for elk and my only concern is there doesn't seem to be an opportunity now if—I'm 99% for this proposal I just think we should look at a way that if I decide in June or May that I'm not going to be able to hunt elk or as he said, the climate conditions were not favorable at all that I would be able to not lose that point because if I lost that point I'm going to way back. So, I think there are a lot of people in that situation that have 15-25 points. I do agree if you turn your tag back within 30 days of the hunt you should be penalized. I think I'd like to see us look at a way to preserve some of that equity that we built up. That's how I look at it, as equity. That would be my recommendation. Thanks.

John Bair – I have probably sat through a thousand presentations in all the years I've been going to RAC meetings and boards and I think this might be my favorite and the most necessary that I've actually looked at. There is an incredible log jam of bonus points and preference points and the more we built and the more we let people acquire these the less valuable and the more useless they become. If you go hunting and it's a hunt that you can acquire a point for, you should have to spend that point to go on that

hunt. I don't care if it's a cow tag, doe tag whatever it is. If it's a good enough tag that you're going to accept it and pay the fee and write your name on that tag and spend time in the field you should burn your points. I don't care if they are bonus, preference or whatever. I think that Lindy has done a phenomenal job at this. I think there has been more homework done on this proposal than probably any other that I've ever seen. I think she started this years ago when, and I think I probably contributed to some of her homework. I would tell her I was sorry if I thought it was ill spent but I think she has done a phenomenal job. We have got to find a way to keep points being burned so that those and when I say those, I'm talking about our kids and new people introduced to hunting, we say we want to promote hunting but then we put them behind a log jam of points that they will never get through. Anything we can do, any loophole we can close to help clear out the log jam of points to help fight point creep, we absolutely need to do it. Now, if my buddy Tim here says I'm going to draw the tag I want to make sure, if you're not sure you can always apply for another point. You don't have to get the tag, just apply for points until you are sure. I know guys that do that. So, this is one of my all-time favorite presentations. I think Lindy has done a phenomenal job. I cannot find anything in here I wouldn't vote for. I've been a little torn on the dedicated hunter general season thing, thinking we ought to let them apply for both but then she says it costs us maybe 1,000 tags. My kids might be one of those thousand people that don't get to hunt so, I think that's the thing to do also. Lindy, good job, excellent job. I would hope that the RAC would support this.

Brody Jarvis – I just ask that you guys consider in the OIAL and your premium hunts that you don't steal their points. Maybe even shorten that 30 period to two weeks or something because there are situations that happen like fires that you might not be able to foresee. I understand you can foresee droughts and harsh winters but those are people that have spent a lot time and I'm not even close to that so I don't even count in this bracket but there are people that have spent a lot of time trying to get these tags and when it comes they want a good opportunity. So, I think his name was John, he was saying that he thinks that everybody that applies with these points should burn them up. Well people that have that mentality, if they got that second chance opportunity, they are going to jump on it. If somebody called me right now and said, do you want my leftover deer tag for the Henry's, you've got two days to go hunt it, I'm jumping on the opportunity. Honestly, even if you only had a week, I think that is still plenty of time to get people on board and start reallocating those tags. I hope that you guys would look at shortening up those periods and then letting people have their points back instead of losing those points. One thing that I wanted to look up and Tim kind of touched on this. He's saying if you do lose that point, it's going to put you back so far. Just looking at the elk in general, if you had 25 points right now and you surrendered a tag and lost that point, you are going to have 66 guys applying with you the next year. You are so far behind the game at that point you've lost. I hope you guys will consider that.

Ridley Griggs – I wanted to speak in favor of the proposal where you don't get a point for next year if you surrender within 30 days. Like John mentioned, point creep is getting really bad. I have a lot of people in my age group, early-mid 20's that are interested in hunting and they ask me what it's going to take to get involved and I explain, well you can come hunt general deer with me when you draw within two or three years or you can get an antlerless deer or elk in two or three years or an if you want to hunt a bull elk maybe that's 12-15 years. To somebody that hasn't been in the game, it doesn't click. Thank goodness for general season elk. So, I think we need to address it any way that we can and just keep in mind that eventually, you should manage to please most of your customer base and most of your customer base is far below that top tier. I don't like the few at the top turning things in every year... and to keep in mind also that the tag is an opportunity for me to hunt. You are selling me an opportunity. You're not selling me a 350 bull. You're just giving me a chance and I'd like to look at it more that way.

Jason Jarvis – I just want to stand up here and thank you for all the work you do and just let you know that we do appreciate it. I have some concerns. I don't like the waiting period on the deer jumping up to five years. I spent 18 years trying to draw the deer tag that I got and I don't want to add another five years then add another 18 years to try and draw it again. That's personally a selfish standpoint and I know you guys are trying to do what you do for everybody but I just wanted to put my two cents in on not raising that up to five years on the deer.

Troy Justensen/SFW – Spoiler alert: Jazz won. The SFW supports the division recommendations with one exception. We voted to not support the change in the dedicated hunter to leave it as is for the time being. Thank you.

Jeremy Anderson/MDF – Much like what John Bair has stated, I want to thank Lindy for all this work. That had to be quite time consuming and we appreciate it. We appreciate the RAC and the Mule Deer Foundation supports this in full and thank you for your time.

RAC Discussion

Ben – I feel that this is a big proposal with several proposals within it. We've received some public comments about various pieces of it. Do we want to discuss it as a whole or break it apart? I'm leaning to breaking it apart a little bit. I see some nods of affirmation. So, what I have in my notes to break apart is the rule about surrendering of permits, the change around dedicated hunter/general season, forfeiting of points, 5 year waiting period, four youth in a group. Let's keep it in that order. Let's start with the surrendering of permits.

Ben – Given this a lot of thought and talked to several people. Some of the feedback that I have received and that I agree with, I like the intent, there's obviously a problem here that needs to be addressed. I question whether or not this is swinging the pendulum too far. Maybe a little heavy handed given the fact that we can reissue most permits with 30+ days. I might go, maybe let's get your point back. Then within 30 days, get your points back but don't gain a point. But not gaining one point is going to be very significant in most circumstances and I believe address a lot of the issues that are going on with the guy drawing the Henry's tag for eight or 10 years or the guys that gave up their sheep tags the day before the hunt. That's my take.

Ken – I think Utah has the friendliest system that they have for bonus points. All I hear about is point creep and if this is what it takes to move us through the system and give more opportunity to youth and to ourselves, I've waited forever for a lot of these tags and I may never see them in my lifetime, so to get the people out of the way ahead of me with points, I think the program is great. I like it. I like exactly what Lindy has done.

Mike – I have that same sentiment. It mirrors Colorado's turn in. I feel like if we keep allowing people to turn in their tags and gain points, we've got to make them spend their points. That's an unfortunate thing to say but if we don't do this, we could end up with 50 points. She's going to have to publish three pages to show us how many points it takes to draw the Henrys. So, I echo Ken's sentiment. I don't think that, if we lose 50 tags one year that aren't reallocated, then those people go into the draw the next year and that's 100 tags that are now out of that pool.

Josh – I want to follow up on those comments. I think the last comment that was made was really well taken. These tags are an opportunity. It's not the promise of an animal so if you've put in for 18 years and you applied in January, you were notified in May and you got your tag, it already makes exemptions for

all kinds of things. 30 days prior seems like, you've had 18 years to plan it, it's time to cut, bait, or fish. So, I agree I support the plan as laid out.

VOTING

Motion made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Ken Strong to accept the surrender portion of the recommendation as presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Ben – The next one concerning the recommendation around making you choose between general season and dedicated hunter. We received some feedback both ways from the public on this. My take on this, I see where Lindy is going with it and I've voiced this to her a week or so ago. I feel like if we're going to do this it ought to be just another hunt choice. It ought to be combined so I don't feel like we're ready for this yet. I could support this if we kicked this down the road in a year and do it right. I don't feel like we're doing it right by just making you choose.

Ken – I'm kind of mixed on this. One of the reasons is because I just finished up the dedicated hunter program and it affects me. One thing I look at is, you took away the statewide archery hunt for the dedicated hunters, we've raised up the hours, we've taken away different odds and ends and now we're going to take away a chance for them to get a bonus point when all of the things that they do is good for the division and good for wildlife. So, I kind of have an exception on this thinking that for right now we can put in for the two one them and not combine them but that's my opinion.

Mike – When this first came out, I lobbied the RAC to just make it a general season choice just like multi season elk. I think at some point it needs to be. I don't know if the answer is today or tomorrow but I'm not quite there yet on that.

Ben – I would add that the reason I feel this way is because we're talking about general season deer and general season deer. So, if I can't do them both, they should just be combined into one system.

Mike – I understand what she is saying because that's how I play the game. I put in for both then I get a point coming out of dedicated and I can draw and put in for dedicated and then I can draw my general season tag that year with a dedicated point going into next year. I totally get what she's doing and I'm willing to cut my own throat on that.

Ken – I think they've taken away, after you complete the dedicated hunter program you do not get a point now. They've taken that away.

Mike – I know but before when you apply to enter that, you can apply for a dedicated tag and a general season.

Josh – This one again just seems like a loophole to continuing the point creep up. I don't see why kicking it down the road is going to help. If you're already grandfathered in the old system then moving forward, I don't see why the...

Ben – I don't think anybody is grandfathered into anything here. I'm not saying continue to kick it down the road, I'm saying as Lindy told us to address this the way I think it should be addressed we can't do that this year. It's not possible. So, when I say kick it down the road, I'm talking next year when we can

implement it the way I believe it should be. It's not opposition for opposition's sake it's opposition for, let's do it right.

Josh – Just to allow the system to catch up with how it needs to work out.

Lindy – Correct. It would take a lot of programing and points and all that so it would take a couple of years to merge into what Ben is recommending.

Ken – Would that mean you would be able to apply for both? Or is it going to limit depending on what we do? I'm just curious.

Ben – That is up to us to decide as a RAC. I'm ready to entertain a motion on this item.

Ken – I've got one more question. If we are waiting for a year before we combine them, why are we voting on this issue right now?

Ben – Because the recommendation is right now. To make you choose between dedicated hunter and general season. My recommendation is to do it right, it should not be two separate systems, it should be combined into one system and the resources aren't available to do that this year. That couldn't be done for another year. So, if we don't address this on an item level right now, then it will get approved in the balance as recommended.

Mike – So, I guess the choice is, what you are saying is in your opinion we fix that down the road but between now and then do we allow people to apply for both or do we just allow them to apply for one.

Ben – My opinion is status quo until we fix it right. That's my opinion.

Lindy – So if we are looking down the road that Ben is thinking, what the division would recommend with doing this, if you want to just leave it as status quo, you know let them apply for both and we would come back with another recommendation of how we would like to implement it because we've got to go work with our contractor, we've got to go work with legal and notify the public of what is going on so, we would have to come back to you next year with what the plan would take and it may be another year out to put it into place. If that is the road you guys are wanting to go down that's what I am foreseeing. Or like Ken said, you can go and have them pick for the next couple of years while we still work on something like that as well.

Ben – So, I guess there's a couple of options. We could leave it status quo until we work it out as we may see fit. We could accept the recommendation to move forward with combining them. We could not approve the recommendation, stay status quo.

Motion made by Eric Reid, seconded by Danny Potts to accept the dedicated hunter portion of the Division's recommendation as presented

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Eric, Christine

Opposed: Steve Lund

Abstained: Ken Strong

Motion passes 7 to 2

Motion made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Scott Jensen to ask the Division to consider adding the dedicated hunter program as a hunt choice in the general season draw

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Ben – Alright the next one was concerning general season preference points. Basically, you obtain a tag, you lose your points. My take on this is I don't like it. I don't think you should have to burn points for picking up a tag that nobody else wanted. I especially have heartburn over the private lands cow tags. They're not a drawable tag, they are straight up over the counter, they are meant for a different use. They are not in the same system. That's my take.

Scott – I entirely agree but when you call in five minutes late, you're the 200th person in line so they are still in high demand.

?? – As somebody that's picked up a lot of these points, the leftovers because I could keep my point, the whole list bothered me. If it's a high value species like a bull elk, I don't know that I like a leftover antlerless in the Wasatch to count for the same thing. So, I actually share a similar reticence to adopt the whole list as is but I'm not necessarily ready and prepared to go through and say, this one yes and this one no.

Ben – That's kind of where I'm at. I feel like the exception list should be different than what it is and then when I started looking at it and saying, what should we make exceptions for, I get to the point of I just don't like it.

Mike – I kind of feel the same way. I think the exception list, I think it's hard to... people had five choices to try and draw it and if somebody wants to take their gamble that they are number 200 in line or number one, It's a tough one. What Bair said was pretty true though. If we're going to do it, we've got to go all in.

Ken – It is a tough one. Again, we look at point creep. It's great if we're looking at point creep but it does kind of screw an individual a little bit.

Ben – I don't know that it's going to have that big of an impact to begin with. How many Box Elder leftover deer tags are there?

Lindy – I have a thing I was going to show you but I need my curser.

Scott – It's probably not going to be huge but it is going to make a difference. I think what we're looking at right now, we're trying to clear the slate. The slate is so stacked up. We're trying to clear the slate and what we're looking at is a population growth over the next ten years that's equal to what it was the last ten years. And 5% more applicants every year are going forward. So, this is the glory days. When you're looking at, it only took you eight years to draw a general season deer tag, ten years from now we're going to be thinking, wow that was awesome. No, it might be a once in a lifetime thing. We got to get rid of points.

Covy – Can I say something here? We don't have a lot of ways to do this. We get hit all the time with, you've got to do something about point creep. Do you realize what Lindy is saying when she says that draw odds for limited entry are one in 45? Do you realize what that actually means? That means that if you start putting in today, at best you're 45 years away on average. That means that on your worst units, you're 60 years away. It doesn't mean you'll hunt deer again in 18 years if we don't make some of these changes. It means, you won't hunt deer again.

Ben – This change we're talking about right now though...

Covy – I understand this is general season but we are seven years into cow elk points on some units. Seven years to hunt a cow elk. We are five years right now to hunt deer. It just depends on where you are. I get it, there are two point systems, they are different. The difference is on preference points you always go to the max. So, if you don't start clearing that out and if you keep allowing loopholes it just keeps going like this. So, when Lindy came to myself and Justin and said, I want the exception list it's short and it was short on purpose. Because if everything is an exception it doesn't work. Thank you, I know that this is not my presentation but I've also spent a lot of time on this and it's

Lindy – If you look at the screen, this is potential loss of points that we would be affecting. So, it's not just a few hundred people that we'd be affecting. For general season deer, we would have taken around 3,000 peoples points away. It's not just Box Elder. It's more than that. For antlerless elk, 6,100 potential people. That can make a big difference in the drawing and lower those odds. Instead of one in five it can lower it to one in three if we're taking away around 6,000 people's points.

Ben – So, let's talk about those 6,100 antlerless elk. What are those tags?

Lindy – So, you've got your private lands, CWMU and mitigation it's free and fee mitigation and those are fee mitigation permits. Then leftover drawing all combined into the 6,100.

Ben – On the CWMU antlerless elk permits that you mentioned, I assume that's purchased CWMU's

Lindy – Yeah, they're private vouchers. That's only 110.

Ben – I personally have a philosophical issue there. If you're buying a tag on the free market, why does that affect my draw? It's available on the free market, it's available to anybody. It shouldn't affect my draw. That's my take. Free market and draw, they are two different things. So, for me it comes down to I just don't like it.

Ken – Yeah, but that's 11,000 hunters that it affects.

Ben – And I wonder especially when you start talking about these private land's tags and various tags, how many of those are going to be no longer purchased? I don't know the answer to that but I think that those purchases will go down.

Ken – And I would think that if a person wants to hunt, they are going to hunt. It doesn't matter. I think they will lose their points in order to buy a tag so they can hunt.

Ben – Maybe some of them, others no. I've talked to several people that are buying private lands antlerless tags because they are hunting deer on some private ground that may have an elk wonder

through it. They are buying it because they can in case they see an elk. They wouldn't continue buying them if this were to happen.

Ken – I guess the only way to find out is to try it because I think it's a great idea. My personal opinion is it frees up 11,000 points and that's a lot.

Ben – I don't think it's going to have that impact. I see those numbers; I don't think all those people are going to continue to buy those tags if this were to happen. I don't know but that's my opinion. Anyway, I think we're probably ready for a motion on this if anyone is interested in doing so.

Motion made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Ken Strong to accept the Division's general season preference-point recommendation as presented

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Ben – OK, five year waiting period on limited entry deer.

Mike – Why didn't you propose it on pronghorn also?

Lindy – It was talked about in the division but we just wanted to slowly dive into it. Not that we're opposed to going that direction but we decided we'll try to see if we can get the deer because deer is the worst draw odds. Pronghorn is one in 20 so they are getting up there too.

Mike – I like waiting periods. I think they work well so I move to approve.

Motion made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Scott Jensen to accept the Division's recommendation to change the waiting period of buck deer from two years to five-years

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

Mike – So, the youth elk tags, the odds of drawing them are one in 16. But a youth is only able to draw that for six years. So, if a group of four can draw, they are cutting down the number of families that can actually draw the tag and go. One in 16 means if you have six kids, they're not all going to draw. You might have two draws. So, my idea would be to just leave it at the group of two which it is currently which could offer that opportunity to many other families. I've got three kids. One drew when he was a youth, one did not draw and my daughter is halfway through and she hasn't drawn. So, I think it's better to spread it out to multiple families. We're not spreading it out to multiple kids but we're spreading it out to multiple families. So, my recommendation would be to just keep it at two for the group. I make a motion that we leave the youth any bull elk hunt as a group of two.

Motion made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Danny Potts to leave the youth any-bull group application to only two youth

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed: Ken

Abstained:

Motion passes 8 to 1

Motion made by Ken Strong, seconded by Scott Jensen to accept the balance of the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Mike, Luke, Scott, Josh, Danny, Ken, Steve, Eric, Christine

Opposed:

Abstained:

Motion passes unanimously

8) Big Game Application Timeline

Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator (Informational Only)

Questions from the RAC

Ben – Thanks Lindy. Can you go back two slides? While you're doing that, thank you for this presentation. This is more transparency into the application and draw process than I've ever seen. I think this is going to help answer a lot of questions. This is really good. That item on the top, March 20-April 30, is that a 41-day window? That's a big window. Is the contractor manually reviewing every application?

Lindy – No they're not. They have a computer that does it but we're still waiting for biologists' recommendations and the RAC board process. So, we're making sure we're taking our time to make sure it's accurate. But one thing you need to remember, during all of this they are getting the antlerless application ready, answering phone calls. So, this isn't the only thing that they do, they have other tasks. So, they're doing programming and doing this 24/7. We're also getting the next draw ready, doing outreach efforts with them so there are other things that we're doing that's not in this. Like I said, it's more or less we're waiting because we've got the RAC and board process. So, let's take our time and make sure that we don't exclude someone that shouldn't be excluded and exclude those ones that should be excluded.

Mike – We just approved to analyze people that don't turn their permit in within 30 days of the start.

Lindy – It doesn't affect this.

Mike – Yeah, but the mailing of the permit does affect that. Especially if they are getting it at the end of June, the first part of July an archery hunter would only have two weeks. Is there any way to move up the mailing of the permits in this system?

Lindy – We may be able to move it up by a week. We can look at that. That's just internal stuff that we could push and squeeze on that back end. That just means that we're not calling every person and saying, you owe us \$500, it's we sent you the e-mail here's your deadline and if you don't meet it then, and those are just internal processes.

Ben – Also, if somebody had to, they could have a duplicate printed, right?

Lindy – They can. Once it gets into our system, and that’s usually a week before.

Steve – So, on these duplicate applications, are some of these fraudulent or what? And do you have to sort them out by hand?

Lindy – We do. We get law enforcement involved and we look into them.

Steve – So, that just protracts us.

Lindy – Yeah. We actually reject more applications than you think because we know that it’s a fraud and sometimes, they get turned over to law enforcement. Or someone applying for someone that is deceased. We look at ages. Is there really someone that is applying that is 103 years old? Good for him if that’s the case but is that really legit. So, we’re looking at all those things.

Ben – Any other questions from the RAC? Any questions from the audience? Thank you, Lindy. That was awesome, very helpful. We’ve got one more, it’s not on the agenda but Danny has other business he wants to address.

Danny – Jason, not that I don’t love this room, this is great it’s the best room we’ve ever had these meetings in but I think to make it equitable, I think we ought to shift one of the next meetings to Salt Lake City.

Ben – That wraps up the meeting. Thank you to the public for attending and those that are still here, thank you and the RAC members.

Meeting adjourned: 10:27 pm
In attendance: 51 total 25 public, 16 DWR employees, 10 RAC members
Next board meeting: December 5, 9:00 am, DNR boardroom, Salt Lake City
Next RAC meeting: December 3, 6:30 pm, DWR Central Region Conference Room

2
5

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name Jeremy Anderson Phone Number 801-471-8254

Address 1334 owl lane Eagle Mountain, UT 84005

Who are you representing? self group Mule Deer Foundation

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #5

COMMENTS MDF is in support of the Division's
Statewide mule deer mgmt plan

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

5

Date 11-12-19

Name John Baird Phone Number _____

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group S.F.W.

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #5 Deer Plan

COMMENTS NO LATE MUZZY Hunt increase
Leave it as it is. Support the rest
of the plan.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

5

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name Richard Hansen Phone Number 660-0129

Address 1350 N 600 E Nephi UT

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #5 Statewide Deer Mgt

COMMENTS The real reason for low deer population numbers

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date _____

Name Hal Black Phone Number 801 380 9970

Address ~~3440~~ 355 W 2000 N, Mapleton, 84664

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? technology / hunting

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date Nov 12 - 19

Name Troy Justensen Phone Number _____

Address 2494 Remuda Dr

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 5

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

6

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name John Barr Phone Number _____

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #6

COMMENTS Support DWR

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

24
6

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/12/19

Name Tim Pilling Phone Number 801-599-8200

Address 927 Millstream Way Bountiful, UT 84010

Who are you representing? self group various numbers

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? RULES

COMMENTS DISCUSSION ON SWIFTING
AND FAIR CHASE

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

16

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/12/19

Name Greg Bird Phone Number 801 310 4962

Address 740 E 400 N. Springville

Who are you representing? self group UWSF

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 6

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

8

Date 11-12-08

Name Troy Justensen Phone Number _____

Address 2484 Remuda Dr

Who are you representing? self group SFW

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 8

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

9

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name John Barr Phone Number _____

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? # 8

COMMENTS Support DWR

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

2

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/12/19

Name Tim Pilling Phone Number 801-599-8200

Address 927 Millstream Way Bountiful, UT

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Point CRIP

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.



COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name Brode Jarvis Phone Number 801 473 7762

Address 325 E 400 s Santaquin

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 30 day tag surrendering

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date Nov 12

Name Ridley Griggs Phone Number 801-809-7921

Address 1850 N University Ave

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Rule amendments for point creep

COMMENTS I support loss of points if you
surrender within 30 days.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

8

Date 11-13-19

Name Jason Phone Number 801 921 9864

Address 325 E 400 So Santaguin

Who are you representing? self group

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? ~~Waiting period~~ waiting period

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name Troy Phone Number _____

Address 2494 Rowden Dr

Who are you representing? self group SFW

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 6

COMMENTS _____

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

6

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11-12-19

Name JEREMY ANDERSON Phone Number 801-471-8254

Address 1334 owl lane Em, UT 84005

Who are you representing? self group MDF

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 9

COMMENTS Approve & support as written

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Items 5 + 8

Date 11-12-19

Name James Taylor

Phone Number 435-230-2817

Address 375 N 280 W Salem UT

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Mule deer plan, point creep adjustments

COMMENTS I support the proposed changes to the mule deer plan as well as the corrections to adjust point creep. Specifically I agree with the 30 day rule, and losing points if you receive a permit.

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
CEDAR CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
2215 W. ROYAL HUNTE DRIVE
CEDAR CITY, UT**

November 19, 2019 5:00 p.m.

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA (No discussion by RAC members)

2. STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Austin Atkinson made the motion to add a third tier of 21-25 Bucks per 100 Does as an option for General Season units. Seconded by Verland King.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Chad Utley made the motion to change the language of the plan for the late season muzzleloader hunts from “set at” to “no more than” 0.05. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Passed unanimously

MOTION: Austin Atkinson made the motion to change the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read “clean skulls” instead of “clean skull plates”. Seconded by Riley Roberts.

VOTE: Passed unanimously

MOTION: Riley Roberts made the motion to keep the Statewide Deer Management Plan at 5 years instead of a 7 year plan. Seconded by Verland King.

VOTE: Passed 7 in favor; 3 opposed (Chad Utley, Sean Kelly, Austin Atkinson).

MOTION: Craig Laub: Accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented. Seconded by Riley Roberts.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

3. BUCKS, BULLS, AND OIAL 2020 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE, AND RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Riley Roberts made the motion to modify the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read “clean skulls” instead of “clean skull plates”. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Riley Roberts made the motion to combine the Willard Peak Mountain Goat hunts into a single hunt. Seconded by Chad Utley.

VOTE: Passed 7-2 (Tammy Pearson and Gene Boardman opposed).

MOTION: Chad Utley made the motion to accept the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented. Seconded by Tammy Pearson.

VOTE: Passed unanimously.

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion for the RAC Board to review and consider increasing the number of Cougar permits on the Mineral Mountains. Seconded by Riley Roberts.

VOTE: Passed 8-1 (Verland King opposed).

4. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020 AND LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to pass the CWMU Management Plan and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020 as presented. Seconded by Verland King.

VOTE: Unanimous

5. PROPOSED RULE AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS POINT CREEP, LOST OPPORTUNITES AND EQUITY IN UNT DRAWING PROCESS

R657-42 – FEES, EXCHANGES AND SURRENDERS
R657-57 – DIVISION VARIANCES
R657-62 – DRAWING APPLICATION PROCEDURES

MOTION: Riley Roberts made the motion to accept the Proposed Rule Amendments to Address Point Creep, Lost Opportunities and Equity in the Hunt Drawing Process as Presented. Seconded by Chad Utley

VOTE: Passed 7-2 (Bart Battista and Austin Atkinson)

MOTION: Bart Battista made the motion to amend the proposal so that an individual would not lose their points for purchasing Over The Counter permits. Seconded by Gene Boardman.

VOTE: Failed 2-7 (Tammy Pearson, Verland King, Chad Utley, Riley Richmond, Austin Atkinson, Sean Stewart, Sean Kelly opposed).

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
CEDAR CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
November 19, 2019 5:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Brayden Richmond Verland King Riley Roberts Craig Laub Gene Boardman Austin Atkinson Tammy Pearson Sean Stewart Chad Utley Bart Battista Sean Kelly	Kevin Bunnell Phil Tuttle Johnny Neil Dan Ruggiero Paul Washburn Jason Nicholes Mike Wardle Vance Mumford Kyle Christensen Lindy Varney Teresa Griffin Covy Jones Mike Christensen Andrea Gifford Denise Gilgen Blaine Cox Cody Evans Tyrell Orme Thomas Six Chad Wilson	Donnie Hunter Wade Heaton	Nick Jorgensen

Brayden Richmond called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. There were approximately 69 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees.

Welcome and Introduction Appreciation

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES – Brayden Richmond**

Brayden Richmond: We’ve got a full quorum tonight, so I appreciate everyone being here. We do have a couple of Board members here. Thank you for coming Donnie and Wade. Appreciate it. We do want to recognize you here and thank you for being here. Just a quick side note, if we have phones, if everyone

can just make sure to turn their ringers off, that will also help just with distractions and moving things along. Quick note, the RAC process, let me just read this, it says, “The purpose of the Regional Advisory Council is to get input from the public concerning wildlife management policies, rules, and regulations. The Counsel then makes recommendations to the Wildlife Board” and I think that is an important thing to know. This RAC, we recommend things to the Wildlife Board. They are the decision makers. So that’s good for us all to be on the same page there and understand that on the Board. The meeting will be recorded, so anything you have to say will be public record.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES (No discussion by RAC Board Members).**

Brayden Richmond: Then let’s move on to the agenda and minutes. As we talked last time, we will no longer ask for a motion on the minutes, if anyone has any issues or concerns with the minutes, we’ll discuss them, but if there’s no concerns we’ll just move on. Is there any discussion on the minutes from last meeting? Ok I don’t see, there’s not comments there so we will go ahead and move on.

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE (OLD BUSINESS) – Brayden Richmond**

On the agenda we don’t have a Board update, let me address that real quick, the last Wildlife Board was actually fairly straightforward. They talked about the Aquaponics rule and some fishing rules, that passed pretty much as presented. I don’t remember any big changes with that. They also had some discussion on the sheep on Antelope Island and some new language in the plan. One of the concerns from our RAC and several other RACs was discussing getting rid of the language in the plan that said the domestic sheep caused that outbreak, that was removed from the plan. That went forward. The conservation audit was very positive. The discussion was that it was very transparent and that passed as presented. I’m not aware of anything else from the Wildlife Board updates.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE – Kevin Bunnell**

Ok, realizing it’s going to be a long meeting tonight I’ll try to be fairly brief, but I do have a few things I’d like to report. First from our law enforcement folks, they did report fewer illegal kills during the rifle deer and elk hunts this year, which is a positive. Maybe the most significant thing that’s happened since our last meeting was we released 51 bighorn sheep on the Mineral Mountains that were captured in Nevada and brought over. All the sheep are collared. Since we’ve released them, we have had five of those sheep that have wandered off the unit and we have removed them lethally as we committed that we would do. But the remaining sheep seem to be settling down and doing well. We’re really excited about that. Our Wildlife Biologist have begun deer classification in the last week or so, any of the RAC members if you’d like to join the biologist in going out and classifying deer, we could certainly arrange that. We will begin our capture work here in the Southern Region beginning in December. We will be collaring deer on two new units this year. Both on the Beaver and the Boulder units. That will help us have a better understanding of survival and movement patterns on those two units. We’ll be continuing to monitor survival and replacing collars on the Monroe and Pine Valley units. We’ll be collaring more deer on the Zion and Paunsaugunt units as part of the migration initiative, and elk in the Southwest desert as part of the migration initiative. Then we’ll be capturing sheep and goats later in the winter as part of disease monitoring. So it’s going to be a really busy winter, particularly for our Wildlife Biologists. We do have some personnel changes within our wildlife staff, David Smedley who was the biologist in Fillmore made, what to anybody who lives in the Southern Region, a poor life choice because he moved

up to the Cache unit. But he's going home closer to family so we won't begrudge him with that. But with that we've had some shuffling. Mike Wardell who was the Panguitch district biologist will be moving up and covering the Fillmore area and that's a move home for Mike. Kyle Christensen will become the Panguitch district biologist. We've also had a change over in Wayne County, Jim Lamb has accepted a position as a restoration biologist specifically focusing on the Boulder Mountain and overlying areas to try to get some work going on the Boulder Mountains similar to what we've got going on the Monroe Mountains right now. To have some large scale habitat restoration projects going on the Boulder Mountains and the areas around there. There's been approx. 10,000 acres burned on the Monroe Mountain this year, if you live over in that part of the state you've seen the smoke. All of that is by design it will be very beneficial for wildlife. It's up to about 10,000 acres that have been burned since November 2nd. In addition to that we have another 60,000 plus acres of habitat restoration work that is taking place in the southern region by chain and bull hog and other tools like that. Over time that has a tremendous positive effect on our wildlife. And lastly from our fisheries folks, they completed the gill netting down at Lake Powell in the last couple of weeks Lake Powell experienced probably the best spawn of the two main forage fish, the threadfin shad and the gizzard shad. Which has the fish that we're all interested in, the strippers and the walleye and the other bass species are probably in as good of condition now as they've ever been. They are also hard to catch right now as there is a lot of food in the lake, but that large spawning event from the forage fish will have positive impacts on Lake Powell for several years, and the fishing will get really good. In addition, fall fishing in all the reservoirs down here has been very good. Richard just asked me to encourage everybody to take advantage of that before the lakes freeze over. And that's all I have for an update unless there's any questions.

Brayden Richmond: Alright, I don't see any questions from the RAC. Thanks. We do have a lot on the agenda tonight, so I think we want to just jump in and get going. We'll give it to you Covy to start with our first action item. Oh, we also have a fishing informational, I wasn't aware of that. Sorry, I grabbed the wrong sheet. We're ready to go, Covy.

- **STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN – Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Questions from the RAC:

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Covy. We're going to proceed as follows. Take questions from the public, then we'll have questions from the RAC, then we'll have comments from the public, then the RAC will discuss it. Just a couple of comments before we jump in to that. The first comment I'd like to make is we really appreciate your attendance tonight. This is a full room. That's the reason we have these meetings is to have public comments, so we appreciate you being here. Having said that, I think we all would like to get some sleep tonight, so let's comment, please don't sit here and have something on your mind and not get up and comment, but also keep our comments to the point and if you're comments been brought up several times, you may just want to stand up and say I agree with so and so and leave it at that. And the other comment I'd like to make is we received probably more emails on this RAC than I've seen probably ever on my time on the RAC. It's great, again, why we do this is to receive public comment. I've had hours and hours on the phone and I've read every email I've received and I would guess that most RAC members have done the same. We appreciate that. That's good. I strongly encourage people; emails always are read, your thoughts are received so thank you. One additional thing before we get going, I do have a comment card here from Curtis Barney, but there's nothing filled out on it. So Curtis if you're there, if you want to tell us which agenda item you'd like to talk on, and if you do

want to talk of if you just want to have a written comment. You do want to talk on this one? Ok I'll mark this one and we'll have you come up in a minute then. Thank you. At the end of our comments then we will summarize some of the comments and we'll also dive in, this year the Division implemented the online comment options and we'll kind of summarize that and the comments that came in from the online comment option. There were a lot of emails on that. It almost was a little overwhelming, but I think it was good too, so we'll summarize that at the end of the comment period so everyone can kind of get a feel for the public comments there. So with that said, let's go ahead and start questions from the public. Ok let me again, with this big of a crowd I kind think everyone has done this before. The way this will work is if you come up to the mic, state your name, and then ask your questions. Just a reminder, this is a question period, so keep it to questions, we'll do comments in a minute. If you want to comment you do need to fill out a card. So go get a card hand it to one of the Division guys back there and they'll bring it up, but if you have a question please come up to the mic here, state your name and your question.

Questions from the Public:

Robert Tate: Robert Tate. The question I had is you indicated that baiting was one method to try to reduce or control the incidents of CWD. My understanding is that baiting is currently legal, is that going to change?

Covy Jones: Not tonight. That's the short answer. The long answer is we asked about baiting in our mule deer survey and we asked about baiting in our Mule Deer Committee. The Mule Deer Committee, with the members that were there, the majority, they voted to ban baiting and the public, we had public support to ban baiting. So the Division went back and we started to work on a baiting rule, and what we realized was in order to write a good and forcible baiting rule, we were going to have to update the feeding of wildlife too. Because the best way to write the rule was to prohibit the placing of an attractant. So we realized that we've had the discussions about baiting, but we haven't done our homework yet on feeding. We do intend to take these issues on, and from a biological perspective there's a lot of negative impacts not just on how disease spreads but the damage and other concerns, so there will be a time when we will take this on, but we wanted to make sure that we didn't slide anything past the public and present anything that is a ban on baiting that really prohibited feeding. We tried to write this again, we tried to write it and only address baiting and what we found was a couple of things. We found one, we didn't address most of the biological concerns, we just addressed a sentiment of fair chase, yes or no. We also found that we created something that for our law enforcement would be really hard to enforce. Because that's not my pile of apples, I didn't put it there, I didn't know it was there. So in banning baiting it will probably look a little different in the future when we do that. When we recommend that, I should say, because this is a public process.

David Black: David Black. You mentioned the public survey that you sent out. I believe there is a number of questions that talked about quality vs. opportunity and what the public's sentiment was. Now do you have any results of that, or is that going to be published?

Covy Jones: Yeah, we can definitely get it to you, or whoever wants it, we can publish it on the website. Kent should have those questions up now. But the one thing that came back is, and it depends on how you look at it, but people wanted both obviously, but they like the system that we have right now. There wasn't a lot of desire to convert a bunch of general season units to limited entry units or a bunch of limited entry units to general season units. The sentiment was they felt like what we had right now was about adequate. But I can get you the detailed results and we can cut that out in the interest of time, but I

can get you those results after, we can put those on the website too.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson. The question I've got is you mentioned in the amendment for this CWD about a v-ed out skull cap to just not have brain matter. Would you be open, or would the Division be open to just having no brain matter and just leave the skull intact for European mounts? If the point is to get rid of the brain matter.

Covy Jones: Yeah, and I think the intent here is to make sure we don't bring back contaminated material. So if it were a beetled skull or something like that and we could write it in a way that said, you can't bring back in brain matter, I don't see why we'd be opposed to that.

Brian Johnson: So, a cleaned off skull?

Covy Jones: A skull free of brain matter.

Steve Barskey: Steve Barskey. You mentioned something called a..

Covy Jones: A monkey, sorry. That's probably not technically correct, it looks like a monkey.

McCrae Yardley: My question would be the late season muzzleloader tags that .5%. Is there a cap on that? You said it would be 50 for the Manti, is that extreme, do we consider that extreme? Would there be a capped lower number for those?

Covy Jones: So 40 would be the max on the Manti for the largest, and I used that example because they're set at .5% so if the unit is struggling, and general season permits are dropped, those would drop as well with that and when it rebounded it would increase with general season permits. The way we capped it, we did cap it, but we capped it with that .5%. It can't be above that.

Brayden Richmond: Boy, if that is all the questions we've got from the public we might get out of here at a decent hour. Anymore questions from the public? We do have lots of comments so we'll get there. But I do want to make sure everyone has the opportunity. If there are no more questions from the public, we'll change it to questions from the RAC.

Glen Davis: Glen Davis. We have three predators for deer and elk. Hunters, predators, cars. What are we doing about the crossings? Is there going to be more crossings to they don't have to go across the freeways? I've hunted for 52 years now and I've seen I-15 go from one car an hour to thousands of cars in an hour. You can't get across the freeways without being killed. I think that really needs to be looked at and addressed.

Covy Jones: You're pointing at one of the major issues that the Division of Wildlife is facing with Wildlife management in general. That is just the human population in our state is exploding. As we watch the adverse impacts just from automobiles on highways and freeways we are working more closely than ever with UDoT and the good news is we actually have quite a bit of buy in. Where as before we'd make a recommendation and a lot of times it probably wasn't considered very carefully. Now UDoT is working very closely with us, we're putting in more crossings, we're using the migration initiative to map routes and say here are the hot spots, here is where we need highway crossing, here is where we need fences. I think they are being very responsive. Kevin do you have something to add to that?

Kevin Bunnell: Covy, why don't you address just the level of data that we collect on that? Every deer that is picked up we get a GPS location so we can identify the hotspots.

Covy Jones: Yeah, we do. So we've had for the.. Ashley Green worked on this, he's here today, and so is Daniel Olsen did his doctorate on this. We developed an an antidote several years ago where we said, alright we want to record where every deer we pick up is hit on the road. So every time you see one of those trucks that's out picking up deer or a Division employee, we pull out our phones and have for the last several years and say this is where it got hit. So we're working to do two things; one, using collar data and the migration initiative, putting crossing where they're going. Two, use the data that we already have from road kill to say these are our hotspots. These are the areas we need to address. And the progress is slow, it's not as fast as I think any of us would like, but it's coming. We're getting better.

Kevin Bunnell: The only other thing I'd add to that Covy, is the importance of that data. We share that data with UDoT. That gives them access to Federal Highway documents to build additional fencing and more crossings and it increases our resources to deal with those issues because we have the data.

Brayden Richmand: Ok, if there's no more comments from the public, we will switch to the RAC. Any questions from the RAC? Let me just real quick before we, the RAC if you would let me state your name when you have a question, that way they can get it on the record, that helps them. So if you would kind of raise your hand and I'll call on you. That helps them with the public record.

Questions from the RAC:

Chad Utley: And I think you stated this, I just missed it. When you conducted this survey, who did you ask? Who was the target group?

Covy Jones: Mule deer hunters. So everybody that applied for a mule deer permit or applied for a point.

Chad Utley: Thank you.

Craig Laub: My question is with the car and deer conflict. You say you have an app where they are picked up, but out my way I haven't seen any picked up all fall and I probably make this loop from Cedar to St. George through Burrell/ Enterprise there's probably 30 deer killed there in the past three months and they haven't picked up any of them. So my question is, are they picking up all the deer?

Covy Jones: I'm sure we're not picking up all the deer.

Craig Laub: So the 7,000 or whatever it was on your deal was nowhere near correct then?

Covy Jones: Yeah, so there's some pretty good research on this. We know about in any given area in a population about 2-5% of the deer in that area are going to die on the road usually. He mentioned it and it's probably the perfect example. Highways are just another predator on the landscape. You're right Craig. We try to get everything, we contract a lot of these highways. Kevin, do you know how often they get down there on that one? He said it's been 30 days since we've been down there.

Kevin Bunnell: I don't know off the top of my head if we have. If Gary Bezzant was going to be here or that's handled through our habitat section. Craig, we can find out for you, where that contract is, what it covers, how often they're contracted to pick it up, but I don't know that off the top of my head.

Covy Jones: I'll acknowledge, we don't get every deer in the state picked up. We miss spots.

Craig Laub: They just haven't been there, I know. And I've seen them every year, but this year they haven't been there.

Austin Atkinson: Yeah, I don't mean to address a specific area that will come up later, but I'm curious the trigger that happens to create an extended archery hunt in this plan. What has to take place for that to be recommended.

Covy Jones: It's the same thing that, so a lot of this, it's the same thing that would be handled for a hams hunt. Below density or high depredation too. Areas where the Division has to come and do a lot of removals, we might look at that. Areas that are under utilized now by hunters in the specific hunting season. High potential for human contact, so we'd have a hard time harvesting animals with a rifle. Or migratory deer populations where we can offer that opportunity that are not getting hunted at other times. So there's a lot of different reasons we'd call one of those. Those are a few.

Austin Atkinson: And that would be up to the biologist to recommend either a hams hunt, an antlerless hunt or an extended archery?

Covy Jones: Or a combination of all three.

Chad Utley: I just had a question about the late season muzzleloader. We have a lot of comments on that in our email. I'm just curious as to the success rate to muzzleloader hunts in general. Because there were a lot of comments that muzzleloaders now shoot 400 yards, are scoped, and it's a different animal than it was before.

Covy Jones: I looked at this data pretty closely about six months ago to see if there was a significant increase in the percent success since before we allowed magnifying scopes to after and it's noisy because at the same time we allowed it, we had an increase of deer populations so we saw success go up for rifles and bows and everything, right? So we watched success go up, but it didn't appear that there was any significant increase in percent success on muzzleloaders. Now on these late season hunts specifically, they're anywhere from the lowest percent success was 25, they had some that were 100. The average, Kent do you have the average on that? It was in the 70's, I know it was in the 70's. 70 something percent, but I don't want to throw out a number that's not right. I do know it was in the 70's. Now it's hard to compare that to general season, right? That's going to be down to 30% success on average. Even a little lower sometimes.

Austin Atkinson: A quick question to follow up on that late muzzleloader. It says that it will be set at .5 permits. If the unit is trending under the objective, would that still be set at .5%?

Covy Jones: If, the way it's currently written it would be. We discussed this with the committee. One of the reasons we left it like that is they didn't want to see huge fluctuations in these permits, and biologically, it's not enough to matter. But really this is a social hunt, I think it's a good recommendation,

it's a happy middle where we're not creating more limited entry units by providing this opportunity, but really it's a social thing. Trying to provide the opportunity for the public and if they want it, that's great. If they want it modified a little bit, that's ok too.

Bart Battista: For the CWD and removing the feeding or baiting, does that include water guzzlers as well.

Covy Jones: Yeah, and that's a good point. The more guzzlers on the landscape, maybe we could redesign the way we do drinkers or something like that. Guzzlers definitely have a population benefit. Baiting and feeding, I don't know that baiting has a population level benefit. So I don't know if that means that we would never install another guzzler, but we would look at how we install them and try to do a better job with that.

Bart Battista: One more question. I don't think I saw a single comment that was supportive of increasing or extending the season or increasing permits, maybe one. But I read almost every single one that came into my inbox. I saw some of the numbers. The population was around 80,000 below what the goal is, and we had a pretty heavy or hard winter last year, so I was wondering how you include or incorporate a heavy winter that would probably have adverse effects on the population to your permit numbers? Right now it seems like you would like to increase even though we had a heavy winter. I was curious.

Covy Jones: I think there's a lot there, and a lot of confusion, I can try to sort it out. But that was a really big question. So first of all, this is just hunt structure. It could end up with a lot fewer permits this year than what we had last year or the previous year. The way we incorporate that is with survival data. We know what that survival looks like, we know when it's up or down. And when we come again in April, we would recommend decreases in permit numbers. But adding additional hunts might not increase the overall number of hunters on the landscape.

Bart Battista: I had a lot of information in the lead up, but the actual question was, do you have a mechanism to incorporate heavy winters, or I believe the plan says it bases the population estimate on the survey numbers that are taken in November time frame. Then you have winter which could have a major impact on the population. If you make your numbers based on that November data, you're going to possibly be issuing more permits than the population can handle. So how do you account for that? How do you account for those heavy winters was my question?

Covy Jones: That's a perfect question Bart. The answer is that we now have a new tool where biologist when they make those recommendations will look at that years survival data. That years body condition scores, and that years survival data and that years fawn survival and so we have one more thing that we can incorporate into that recommendation, right? Because we know a couple of things, we're starting to learn a couple of things. One, we can predict survival based on body condition. We can have deer in hand and based on how fat they are, and where they're at in the state, we're starting to see what's happening. Perfect example is on the Chalk Creek. We had some of the skinniest deer that we've ever had come in north of the Monroe. And as soon as we had deer in hand, we knew they were dead. We were monitoring these in December, they hadn't started falling off, or dropping off yet, but we knew they were going to die. Sure enough, we saw the lowest adult survival, I don't think it's ever been documented in the literature or anything else. We see skinny deer come in, we know we have a problem, we know we have to monitor that and we'd make recommendations on that survival data. That's how we'd account for that.

Kevin Bunnell: Covy, can I add a little bit to that?

Covy Jones: Yeah, please. I don't want to muddy the waters and confuse anyone here, so Kevin, if you have something to add.

Kevin Bunnell: Bart, that's a great question. The truth of the matter is we have the survival data, but one of the things that frustrates sportsmen and our biologist to a certain extent is, to a certain degree, and it's becoming less so, we're a year behind in making our recommendations. That's just the nature. We're doing our classifications right now, and that data will be part of the information that will be used to make next year's hunt recommendations. Now we can modify that with some of the survival data but the nature of the beast, and one of the things that frustrates the biologist and the sportsmen is to a large extent we're a year behind what is going on in terms of being able to react to it. Is that a fair statement?

Covy Jones: I think that's a very fair statement, but the other part is, largely what were talking about is buck hunting. So when we're talking about buck hunting, we don't have anywhere in the state where we're hitting any biological threshold, or even close to any biological threshold. Now that might seem really really frustrating, but we know and there's good data that shows if you have five bucks per 100 does on the landscape, you're going to fertilize every doe, five to seven. We run way above that. So we don't run into this point, we're going to have a negative population impact. Now could you have a poor hunt? Yes. And I think we saw a lot of that this last year in southern Utah and there's probably a lot of frustration. But we don't manage buck numbers at a low level that will negatively impact populations. Ever. The recent times where we have would be the Book Cliffs that closed in the late 90's. The Henry's closed at some point too. And we closed those units when they hit biological thresholds. When they hit four bucks for every 100 does we closed them to hunting at that point. Because we knew at that point we could have a population level impact.

Austin Atkinson: A quick question on success rates, there is very little in the management plan as far as hunter success rates. Is there a reason why we do not survey all general season hunters?

Covy Jones: Send a survey to every general season hunter?

Austin Atkinson: Yes.

Covy Jones: I'd rather have Kent talk to the statistics of the survey, but long story short is we can get a good sentiment with a subsample. It could bias our data with a sample that wasn't random. Kent do you have anything to add to that.

Kent Hershey: That's good.

Covy Jones: That's the reason why we don't want to bias us our sample.

Austin Atkinson: Just to clarify, by surveying everybody it would bias it?

Covy Jones: It could.

Kent Hershey: So statistics are designed to get a random sample. The way you get the best results is by

random processing. If you try to survey everybody there is a percentage that will not turn that sample, regardless if it's mandatory or not. So when you do that, their likelihood is actually smaller actually, and we don't know what that is. So you're actually biasing your sample more by trying to get everybody. Does that make sense? Sound Statistical design is what we have. We try to target a certain number on each hunt, on each unit. As long as that sound and we meet that random criteria it is the most cost effective way to get the data we need.

Austin Atkinson: I think that answers my question. I was just trying to understand why there would not be a mandatory harvest survey or why there wouldn't be any triggers based on success rate. in past years.

Covy Jones: Oh, okay, so you don't mean a mandatory survey for how you want to hunt mule deer, you mean like a mandatory harvest reporting survey?

Austin Atkinson: Yeah, I'm talking strictly harvest.

Covy Jones: It's the same reason that Kent gave. The other reason is we're moving towards e-tagging hopefully in the next couple of years we'll have e-tagging and that will give us our harvest right there. So we are moving towards something that will look kind of like that, but Kents right it would bias our sample. Good Question.

Riley Roberts: It almost sounds like virtual hunting in the future, e-tagging. First things, Covy, you've got broad shoulders, I know you're going to get a lot of comments right here. One of the first things that stood out to me when this was presented was, which there wasn't any question from any of the other members of the RAC, or from those in attendance tonight. Seven year plan. That to me was a big red flag. Could you please explain to me why we would do that?

Covy Jones: I think there's a couple reasons why. One is when I mentioned when I presented it was, when we are rewriting these on a five year rotation, sometimes it's so fast that we never ever have time to see if we are meeting the metrics or if we have met the plan. So we hope to stretch it out a little bit to really test the plan to see if this is what we really want or if there's some major tweaks. When we re-write it every five years we don't get that. The other reason why is when we write a statewide management plan for moose, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, every species we manage, I guess not bison because we only have them on a couple of units, but it ends up that we're in committee meetings all the time. Instead of doing good things for wildlife, managing wildlife, we end up in a committee meeting and we would rather work towards spending more time and effort doing good things for wildlife.

Riley Roberts: And the follow up question to that is, but doesn't that eliminate the process that we're here tonight for anyway? If we're not allowing.. too often times I hear, we use that's not in the plan, we have to wait until that comes back around, that's now not five years, but seven years, which that limits public input, that limits this process in a sense, does it not?

Covy Jones: Make sure that we have a good plan to start with I think, Riley is what I'd offer. And it's just a different perspective. Utah has more flexible plans and recommendation processes. New Mexico sets their permits for four years. They have a meeting to set their permits and they hunt off of those for the next four years. Our plans allow us to be flexible, to modify, to move. As an agency we also need some consistency, and if you don't agree with that, I completely understand, but we felt like that was a good move.

Riley Roberts: Well, it's not a matter of agree or disagree, I think that too often times, and this is going to be a question, but it's going to be long. Too often times we talk about that transparency, and sometimes as a public and as a whole, we don't understand that process. So with an additional.. maybe I'd just ask this. Explain to all of us, what can't we change in that plan? What flexibility do we lose? What can we change in the seven years now?

Covy Jones: I think what I would say is if we end up with major problems in any plan, we're willing to back up, and at times, reopen it, evaluate it, call a committee back together, adjust it and put it back through the public process. We're not opposed to that. If we end up with a problem, we'll say hey this is a major problem, this isn't working, let's look at it. Let's take a hard look at it, let's see if we can modify it, let's see. But it's, we put a lot of time and effort into the plan.

Riley Roberts: And when you say we?

Covy Jones: The agency, the public, the committee members, the public process, I mean, we. We have a lot of public input by the time it gets to the Board and to reopen it more frequently means that this public input matters less.

Riley Roberts: Ok, thank you.

Gene Boardman: Is there any slack for managing the units other than the 15-17 and the 18-20?

Covy Jones: We talked about this. The agency came in and we took a pretty hard stand on this in the beginning and we didn't want to deviate that from where it was. And I brought that right from the Mule Deer Committee at the beginning, we said we don't want to deviate, we want to be where we are. The concern is, we will create some super units, that will have really negative impacts on hunters too. At that point why not just make them limited entry? We've got a lot of point creep in limited entry, we wouldn't be opposed to limited entry unit. Why not just go that direction? But we finally did, the committee wrote down and said we want to have this discussion, regardless whether the Division wants to have this discussion, we want to have this discussion. We sat around with a pretty diverse group of constituents. They did want a third tier, they wanted a 13-15. There was not a lot of support to go above, but there was a lot of support to go back below and offer more opportunity. At the end, we said what do you want to do? What recommendation does the committee want to make to the Division and I'll take it back, good bad or otherwise, and they settled on, let's leave it where it is.

Tammy Pearson: I'm always the one that has to be a smart ass and be the only one that's allowed to swear, so we'll just put that out there right now. At some point in time, and this is coming from the livestock perspective and whatever else. At what point in time is it just plain old common sense instead of study study study and all of this kind of stuff. I mean I'm not saying that you guys are idiots, that's not my point, some of us are idiots. But I have a real hard time locking ourselves into a seven year plan, I don't agree with that. I do appreciate the fact that you do, you have your assessments on an annual basis and that you can swing your permit numbers and that kind of stuff, but a seven year plan makes me really nervous.

Brayden Richmond: Tammy, do you have a question with that, or?

Tammy Pearson: I guess I should have stated the question, that was my comment. How can you not see the trending pattern within five years?

Covy Jones: Just a quick turn around Tammy. By the time you're done you've had five seasons is all. Again, if this is something the RAC feels strongly about I think the RAC can make that recommendation. The difference between five and seven is two years and it felt like we went that direction with the elk plan, it felt like it was a good direction, felt like it was the right time to do it with deer.

Bart Battista: So I'm jumping on the five to seven year bandwagon here. It does seem that if you're going to, why would you increase the length of the plan, the duration of the plan without increasing your flexibility to make decisions? That's the part I think that we're having troubles with. If you're going to increase those two measures to buck to doe ratios in those units, why wouldn't you increase that? Because now it's either one or the other right?

Covy Jones: I do not understand....

Bart Battista: I mean flexibility, do you want more flexibility in your decisions? In seven years, I think that is the question you were getting at, correct? You wanted more flexibility.

Covy Jones: I think we want flexibility within parameters. And the parameters we have taken into account the new data that we're getting.

Bart Battista: So you're locking yourself into parameters without change.

Brayden Richmond: Bart, maybe if I could comment here, comment to Bart to see if I'm answering his question. One thing, and this is one thing we wanted to talk about in the comments anyways is tonight we're talking about the plan and rules, the permit numbers will be set in the spring, and those will be able to move every year. Those are very fluid, that's not part of the plan.

Covy Jones: And Bart, honestly if we...

Bart Battista: No, I understood that. It's just when you have two bins and we're going to manage to this, we're going to manage to that. You know maybe there are better methods, that's all.

Covy Jones: If we came up with new, crazy new data that allowed us to manage deer differently, I'm sure that we would readdress it in the mule deer plan. I'm sure that we would open back up and bring it back. It's just..

Bart Battista: You're already overloaded, so you're just going to wait seven years.

Covy Jones: Yeah, I guess that's... If there is something that would help us manage mule deer better, because that's what we want to do, we'd do it.

Sean Kelly: Covy, I have a question for you. One of the complaints I hear from the Forest center about overcrowding, hunter satisfaction related to overcrowding. I was kind of curious about the addition to that new early season rifle hunt. Does that have any effect at all with hunter satisfaction with the hunter densities?

Covy Jones: I don't want to speak with the exact numbers Sean, but all the comments that we've gotten back on it have been overwhelmingly positive. That they've seen a difference that it's been a good thing. They've appreciated it, and in this plan we actually address that and say when we're talking about permit numbers, if we have a crowding issue, let's look at seasons and weapon types to make sure we address it in that matter. So I think we'll continue to do that. I think it's been a success. An overall positive.

Brayden Richmond: Other questions? Go ahead Verland.

Verland King: Well, you mentioned that you're a year behind on everything. So it seems like with this plan you're doing your studies now, and in April you'll do the numbers? Is that what I heard right, that you'll come up with permit numbers? Are you relying on your biologist to look at the data on the ground. Death loss, winter kill, before you come up with your numbers for next year?

Covy Jones: Absolutely Verland. I think that is one of the big changes in this plan with general season units from last year, that they'll take survival from that winter into account as well.

Verland King: Alright, that's good, that's been heartburn for us and a lot of these management plans is you're a year behind, but you're actually more than that it seems like.

Brayden Richmond: Any other questions from the RAC? Alright, let's go into the comment period. Just a couple of reminders for those that may be new here, and reminders that have been here before. If you are apart of an organization, you will have five minutes to comment, if you are an individual, you'll have three minutes. I will always read a name ahead so you can kind of stage to move this along, that will help the process.

Kevin Bunnell: It's kind of my job to sort out the comments here, I think we have quite a few new people here that didn't actually put which agenda item on, I took my best guess whether it was the mule deer management plan or the bucks and bulls agenda item that's coming up next, if I got it wrong just come up and say I'll hold my comments til the next agenda item. But the majority of them I thought was associated with this agenda item, so that's where the majority of the comment cards that I've received so far I've sorted.

Brayden Richmond: And just one additional comment to what Kevin said, I would believe that the majority of you are here for this agenda item, once we end the comment period of this, we will move on, so if you haven't filled out a comment card and you do want to talk, please fill it out and bring it up while we're going through these comments. So let's go ahead and get started. We want Dave Jordan first and then Jeremy Anderson will be next. Just a reminder, when you come up to the mic, if you could state your name.

Comments from the Public:

Dave Jordan: Dave Jordan. I want to recommend that in the mule deer plan we have a tier three of 21-25 buck to doe ratio. And a lot of these southern units have a lot of good winter range, they're not going to winter kill, and another thing, comments were made with the questions about building more fences for crossing with the higher traffic, and I think that we need to look at maybe fencing off maybe more agricultural lands also. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Dave, Jeremy you're next, and then it will be, man I'm not good with names, you've got to at least write them so I can read them. Steve Barsky. Not to call you out Steve, but..

Jeremy Anderson: Jeremy Anderson, Mule Deer Foundation. First off, I'd like to thank the RAC, I appreciate this opportunity to have a comment. I want to thank Covy Jones as well. He invited me on to this management plan. I wasn't quite sure what I was getting into when I got onto that thing. I've been on other plans, nothing to this level. One thing that I immediately saw was the diversity in the group. You had Ag. guys, you had sportsmen, sportsmen's groups, hunters, and I was wondering how they would bring, or what they would bring to that meeting, and I learned something from every single one of those guys. And I feel like there are a couple of the guys here and I think they would probably say the same thing. We had some awesome guys from BYU that are telling us all this data that we are collecting from the collaring, which also I am super excited about the collars going on on the Boulder and Beaver. So it is just a great thing. One of the deals too. We had a meeting a couple of weeks ago with my leadership group of wildlife and they got to even suck in a little bit of what we learned and even in that meeting and in the actual management meeting group committee. We didn't all agree. We didn't agree on everything, that would be a worthless committee if we did. People left with not getting their two cents. But in the end or the beginning of the meetings when we set this up, we talked about, hey, at the end we all want to come together and say yay or nay and I felt like that was accomplished. I want to thank Covy and the Mule Deer Foundation fully supports this plan.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. Steve? Then after Steve will be Steve Carroll.

Steve Barsky: I apologize for my poor handwriting. My mother wanted me to be a doctor and it didn't work out.

Brayden Richmond: No apologies needed. Our Board members phone just rang, I would never point that out. (laughs)

Steve Barsky: My only comment is I'm an older hunter, there are a few of us here in the room. I would just like to state my opposition to the reduction in permits to those over 65 in regards to management bucks. Time weighs heavily as you get older as I'm sure some of you appreciate. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Steve. After Steve Carroll it will be Colby Adams.

Steve Carroll: My name is Steve Carroll. I live here in Cedar City, and I'm just going to pick on one particular area, the Bumblebee area. It is addressing the Ag. How do we work in harmony together, because there have been a lot of reports when the deer come down and eat the alfalfa. I've heard numbers of anywhere from 50, to 100, to 200, to 300 deer that have been killed just because of the eating of the alfalfa and such. Now Covy had said that these are everybody's mule deer, and when we as sportsmen volunteer our time, our money and our efforts to create habitat restorations, and then we see these deer that are killed because they are affecting the Ag. area, do we not have a plan in place that is not like the 72 hour plan? That if they are affecting them, they can kill them? Why don't we get together like other states have and create another situation, whether it be tags that we can offer them, compensate them for that, fencing and other things opposed to killing our resource, the deer. I think we need to take that into consideration as well as mortalities that are killed on our units that we're trying to create objective numbers at. That's my thought.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Steve. After Colby we'll have Hal Gale.

Hal Gale: I was not not going to make a comment.

Brayden Richmond: We missed that one, we'll read your comment in a second. Next we have Clay Christensen.

Colby Adams: I'd just like to recommend adding that third tier to keep the buck numbers a little bit higher and keep the permits where they're at. Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Colby.

Clay Christensen: I'd just like to recommend to the RAC. Right now we have a month long archery hunt, would we be opposed to splitting that into two 14 days hunts? One early season, similar to the one we have now, and one later in November to give archers two different opportunities.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Clay. After Patrick, we'll have Cory Bundy.

Patrick Henry: My name is Patrick Henry. Talked to a lot of people from Cedar that do a lot of hunting, but I don't know where you guys get your numbers from for your deer numbers, but I had the unique opportunity to hunt the Kaibab Indian Reservation that's just on the south border of Utah, right? So it's Arizona, but the majority of the deer are migratory, they come down off the Zion. In the last nine years there are like no deer that have moved down. So I guess it's Arizona but their Utah deer. I don't know, I feel like has a correlation to all these tags. The muzzleloaders being long range. So I don't know a lot of people I've talked to feel about the same way on that. And I agree with Clay too, on splitting the archery hunt.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Patrick. Cory Bundy, and then we'll have Mason LeFevre.

Cory Bundy: Cory Bundy from Enterprise. I wanted to address the RAC and say thank you for everything. I'd like to thank the Division of Wildlife for everything they do and their recommendations trying to make our hunting opportunities the best possible. One thing I would like to address according to the limited entry hunts on the agenda that they've put out for this management plan. Under part B where it says under all limited entry hunts in general season units it specifically word for word says permit will be set at .5%. We'd like to ask the RAC to change that from set to recommended. Partly because if it's a seven year plan, without that flexibility being able to change from year to year based off of if there's drought or what not, we can at least look at that from year to year and get the public input. We just don't want to lose our opportunity to have that public input, being able to do that. They've done an awesome job the Division has trying to collect the data, the up, the down. That's the whole point of the hunting part of it is to try to create that homeostasis that balance with our ecosystems. But if it's set and we can't fluxuate that and have that ability to move things around, then we are going to lose that and if it's stuck some place then we want to make sure that we have that flexibility. So I'd like to ask the RAC to actually take a vote to actually change that wording from set to recommended.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. After Mason, we'll have Shane LeFevre.

Mason LeFevre: Thanks Brayden. I just had a couple of comments. First of all I wanted to say how grateful I was to see the habitat goals in the management plan. I think a lot of times as sportsmen we lose sight of what's really wrong. The reason we're all here is because there are not that many deer. The reason there aren't that many deer isn't because we kill too many bucks, it's because our habitat isn't in shape to produce a lot of deer. When Utah's habitat was producing a lot of deer in the 50's and 60's they basically couldn't kill enough deer to make a difference. As our habitat has declined, and we do do a lot of habitat treatments, but those treatments take a lot of time. I have the opportunity to work in a field where we implement a lot of habitat treatments and when you do a treatment, especially some of these burns, you have to go through succession and sometimes that takes 40 years before you get back into a habitat type that is really beneficial to mule deer. But I did want to express my gratitude that those are in the plan. I'd also like to see something in the plan to utilize this data we have with the collars to treat specific areas and especially the fawning habitat. I feel like that's.. I mean if our numbers are declining I feel like that's because our fawns aren't making it, and because their moms are dying too. If we can do those things, it will take time, but I don't think we're in as bad of shape as we think we are. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Mason. After Shane we'll have Lance Smith.

Shane LeFevre: Cedar City boy here and I just want to thank you for your time and the DNR and the RAC for meeting tonight. Nice to have some public input. That's what we're here for and there's a pretty big sentiment that we want to keep that here. Last November, a group that I'm involved with called Southern Utah Deer Alliance began meeting. We wanted to discuss ways that would get our buck to doe ratios higher in our units, as our units have been chronically over objective and we don't want to crutch these herds we want to keep them where they're at and we've come up with an objective of 21-25 bucks per 100 does which would be the next bracket up. by doing this it fills what we feel is a gap in the management as far as chronically having to add permits. The Pine Valley, Zion, and Southwest Desert have been 23 bucks per 100 does average for the last three years. So by doing that we wouldn't have to cut any permits. One thing I want to touch on is hunting pressure. It's been incredible for the last five years. Permit increases have gone up every year as the units have chronically been over objective. That's something that, a sentiment in the hunting community that's very frustrating. The last thing I want to touch on, I only have a couple of seconds here, but we talked about killing does to take off the top of the herd, by doing this I feel that you are pushing the herd towards hitting objective and when you hit objective more tag increases come which then hits the herd with a double edged sword. Thank you for your time and have a nice night.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you, after Lance, we'll have Troy Justensen.

Lance Smith: I'm hopefully going to take a minute and represent the Beaver Chapter of the SFW. I guess I'd be speaking regarding mostly the Southwest Desert unit mostly and the Beaver unit itself. There's been a.. hopefully everybody knows about this. We've had a pretty drastic downturn in the deer population in general in these two units. Beaver has taken a real hit the last few years. I think there is a little bit of data out there about fawns survival, I think it was 40% in 2018. There's a ton of pressure from the local communities and the people that hunt these deer populations so I guess I'm making a plea today to address this the best we can. There'd be two things as far as I understand some of the data and I think the one thing I'd ask for would be more focus on these units from the biologist standpoint and to get as much data as we can. I know everyone's got their own personal opinions, but I'd like to ask for a little more data regarding collared animals, GPS tracking of animals. As far as I looked at it I think these two units were some of the least collared units in the state the past few years. So fawn survival being 40%, I

think it probably will be, definitely be that 2019, these two units are going to show some drastic downturns in their population in general. Some kind of fawn survival study would be something I propose and some more tracking of the does in general. We've had a lot of, well we've had some does killed on these units with depredation type situations and I would ask that be stopped as quickly as possible. I don't think these units can handle the loss of any more deer in general. I think I would ask for as much data as we can get from the Division on harvest data. Maybe there needs to be something different done there. Survival of fawns and does in general. This is a little different I think than the Beaver unit especially I don't think habitat is a problem at all. I don't think there are any deer to live in these habitats. I think there has been a lot of good work from the SFW and the Division too to improve habitat, there's just not the animals there. This is going to be a tough one, but the predators are a pretty significant problem in these two units. So I'd request maybe two things with regards to predators. I don't think there's any data or DWR plans regarding bears. As far as I can tell. I know there's some goals with the DWR regarding...

Brayden Richmond: Lance, we're going to ask you to wrap it up. That's five minutes, it goes quick.

Lance Smith: That's five minutes, alright. So last thing. I'd like to get some rules regarding bear numbers and especially the desert bighorns that were just placed on the Minerals. The cougars were not handled at all before they were placed there. That's going to be a huge problem, already it has killed one. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. After Troy, we'll have Curtis Barney.

Troy Justensen: Good Evening. I'm going to split my comments up into two different sections. First of which would be SFWs position on the statewide deer plan. As some of you may know we have 17 committees throughout the state. We have the Division come and present their proposals and we vote on that. So as a statewide organization, we support the deer plan with one exception, and that being the late muzzleloader. Going on all the general season units, because of the year that we had this year with the drought and everything SFW feels like we should maintain just on existing units that we currently have and not add the new hunt to all the general seasons. Other than that, we support that. Now speaking for myself who represented SFW sitting on the statewide deer committee, I support the committees recommendations. We started this back in May. We ended in September. We didn't have the luxury or should I say, we experienced this year on the deer hunt. I am pleased to see the number of people here. We are simply an advisory committee, did we get it right? I don't know if we did. So all of your input is good. so now we can give this back to you guys, and you can give it to the Board and the Board can decide what's best, but it's key to have this input and come together to see if we can come together with the best plan possible. As far as the committee goes I support the recommendations. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Troy. After Curtis, we'll have Glenn.

Curtis Barney: Curtis Barney, Panguitch, Utah. Beaver unit deer lover and I support all the others that are with me, I don't know if that gives me five minutes or three. But, if I represent something or not. But let me just tell you my frustration. First of all I do not support it, but I appreciate the questions the RAC asked because those are some of the reasons I do not support it. I don't support seven years. That's too far out there to make adjustments as the time goes on. The other thing I can't support is the same way that they count the deer herd. How many of you heard in October 370,000 deer in the state of Utah? More deer than we've seen in the last 25 years. And more bucks on the statewide range than there's ever been

in the state of Utah. Now, them numbers, as we've been out in the field, we know them are not true. You know they're not true. We drive over the mountains in our cars, the deer are not there. So the number they are using to come up with this population is way over populated. and then we turn around and give tags to that overpopulated number that they have. I can't support a number like that. Two people ago, he got up and said the Beaver unit has taken a terrible hit. That's where I've hunted all my life. It's hard to find even ten deer in places that had hundreds of deer on it. We can't continue to over give tags to an area that is that bad off. We've got to have a different system, a different way of counting the number of deer that we actually have. So I am not in support of it because of those two reasons. The seven year plan is too long, and the number of deer that we are stating there is, is definitely not there. Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Curtis. After Glenn Davis then we'll have Devin Albrecht.

Glen Davis: Alright, I'm Glenn Davis. Some of my questions have been answered by different people, like the Beaver unit. I've hunted that for years. I feel these guys pain. We used to see, believe it or not and I told Jason this, we'd go off the night before with a spotlight into my dad's friend's field and we'd see 800-1,500-1,600 does and small bucks in that field. Before my dad died we used to get landowner tags, and we were told that this would be the last year because there were only 20 deer coming in. So it's a major problem in that unit. I hunt the Zion unit now because it used to have a lot of deer in it. The last four years I've seen the decline just slighten down. An opportunity to shoot a two point, how is that an opportunity? A two year old buck. The last RAC meeting I went to was on bulls only. They changed that and managed it to six year old bulls and that's why you're going to shoot a raghorn six point. I had a friend that all he could find was a five point this year, and it's supposedly one of the best units in the state now, but there's no bulls in there, because we've shot them all out. There's still some big bulls out there, but not like we used to have. I'm just frustrated. I've been hunting for 56 years. I started when I was six years old with my dad, and my dad taught me the ropes how to hunt. And I just don't see the deer numbers. If there's 375,000 deer in this state, I'd be surprised. I'd be surprised if there was 200,000 because the Zion unit I hunt and the guy that got up and talked about not seeing any deer where he hunts down on the Kaibab Reservation, that's because there aren't any deer left. Well, there are, but there's not a lot of them left. This year I hunted six days to get my daughter a shot at a 4x6, a small one. I got nothing because I hunted my butt off to get her a shot at one and it took six days. I usually can shoot a buck like that the first day. We don't see those bucks anymore because we are managing to a two year old buck. With our objectives with 13 to 15 or 17 or whatever it is. We need 25 bucks to be able to get that bigger buck up there. And that's what I'm used to, I'm used to from 170-200 inch bucks. Every year that's what we killed through the 60's and 70's. A little history lesson if I can, Richard Nixon back in the 60's wanted to put a, well he did, he put a ravenacation order out on coyotes and Utah was one of them, Nevada. They used cyanide traps, they killed the coyotes way back and nature takes care of itself. Coyote females have eight tits right, to take care of up to 8 pups. So after they killed..

Brayden Richmond: I'm going to ask you to wrap it up.

Glen Davis: Okay, after they killed those, they started noticing that they had 12 pups. Nature takes care of itself. The doe population, you rarely see a single fawn, you're seeing double and triples now cause they are trying to keep up with this bad management. Thank you very much.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Glen. After Devin we'll have Garth Carter.

Devin Albrecht: My name is Devin Albrecht from Panguitch. My thoughts have been already discussed

a little bit, but I echo what Steve said from Cedar City. I feel like a lot of our doe tags are given out, too many depredation tags where there is a problem, maybe we can take that depredation money and build higher fences or through other processes. That's my first point. My second point is, I feel like there's too many predators, cougars, bears that are killing our deer herds. I don't know if there's enough action being taken to control that. I personally have been putting in for bears now for nine or ten years and I still can't draw. I have a few cougar points as well, but it takes so many years to draw these and they are taking an effect on our deer herds as well. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Devin. After Garth we'll have Lynne Shakespeare.

Garth Carter: You know, I think you've done a great job of increasing your populations of bears and lions, and if that's your goal you are to be commended on it. I looked at your population charts and I've been actively involved in Utah's deer management since 1975 and I've studied every state and every management scheme out there in every state and watched states fall and rise and I think your deer herd, if the state is represented by the Beaver, the Pine Valley and the Southwest Desert, I think you're at the lowest levels we've seen since the 50's. And you can computer model what you want, but when boots on the ground, me and my buddy have 1,000 acres on Southwest Desert. I don't see a deer on there. I had four second cousins spend 25 days of the archery elk hunt on Indian Peaks which is arguably the best forage area out in Southwest Desert, spend 25 days, so that's 100 man days and they saw one buck deer. And this is the story I'm hearing constantly. I haven't been to one of these meetings in 20 years, 20 something years cause I think it's a waste of time. Cause you're really not going to listen to people that spent their whole lives in the field and are telling you our numbers are not there. Don't increase a single number. And as far as buck to doe ratios go, you should be running about 25 bucks per 100 does. Not only biologically so you have a good age structure nature creates. When you have a high buck to doe ratio all that posturing and numbers of bucks have a short breeding window; and when you have a short breeding window, you have a short fawning period. And whatever predators get those fawns get part of those fawns instead of spreading your fawning out for two months and have those same predators have a huge impact on your survival rates. I would recommend that you don't increase any hunting. No more late hunts, no more archery late hunts, and I would look at your mortality factors and I would do everything I could do to keep every doe in this state alive. We are not flush with high deer numbers. There's units that I would tell you right now as a biologist that worked 25 years for the Division of Wildlife Resources, there are units in this state that will never come back if you shut the unit down. So don't ruin units that still have a chance by over hunting them, more seasons, more tags, just like he said for what, two points? We need a good age structure on our bucks, we should have 25 bucks per 100 does statewide. I've talked to avid avid hunters that hunt several states a year that said I'm done with Utah this year, I'll never hunt here again. I took my buddy to Colorado, he'd never been on the unit, I said let me show you a couple of hot spots to hunt...

Brayden Richmond: I'm going to ask you to wrap it up.

Garth Carter: 40 mature bucks the first day is what he saw. I hunted a unit that had 15 tags cause of the deer on the unit, I saw 12 mature bucks the first day. I haven't seen that in 10 years in Utah. Be conservative, air on the side of caution. Be conservative.

Brayden Richmond: (Clapping) Thanks Garth. After Lynne we'll have Josh Pollock.

Lynne Shakespeare: St. George, Utah. I echo what Garth said, 100%. I do not believe the deer numbers

in the state of Utah they're saying from different units. From the Boulder unit where I grew up, one of the worst units in the state this time, followed by Dutton, Beaver, Southwest Desert, and the numbers or where you're calculating them from. But it's not there. Few other things I'd like to touch on is tier 3, I'm for that on the general units, on the units that can handle it. And I'm going to read a little bit here that I've got wrote out here. It says, You may have noticed on the Divisions recent public presentations have all started with a slideshow showing one kid holding a large buck, and another kid holding a small buck. The question is then asked, which of these hunters is wrong and which is right. The one wanting quality or the one wanting opportunity. Which quality and opportunity is what we're all in it for. I think so right? I hope that's what we're all in it for. Because right now the quality and opportunity is falling through the cracks big time. And then we go on to discuss the balance of the quality and opportunity, and the trade offs for managing for each. But reality is everytime when someone speaks up and advocates for quality, we get pushed aside because it's all about opportunity. We've got to have quality of hunt as well. if you go out and you chase a two point and you hunt for nine days to get a two point, what quality is that, for a two year old or a senior citizen or anyone else? I say right here that no one ever talks about other side where so much opportunity completely ruins people's quality of hunting. And we're not talking about antler size, we're talking about the hunting experience. And it seems the Division is not at all concerned about hunters having quality experience while hunting. They feel like their public duty is to get as many hunters in the field as possible and regardless of what experience it looks like. And one of the main things is safety. You've got a unit that's above objective and you want to add more tags; take Pine Valley, it's already got 4,500, you want to bring the tags down to bring the objective down, and what there's 1,000 people on there. Safety, we need to look at the safety side too when we start adding numbers. I thank the RAC and the Division for all you do. And then one of the main things I love about all that's taking place with our wildlife is the mastication projects in the state of Utah is incredible. Keep up the good work and the deer will flourish in certain areas. Other areas, just like Garth said, you will not get them back because we have diminished them. The deer herd is in rough shape in the state of Utah. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Lynn. After Josh we'll have Steve Monk.

Josh Pollock: Josh Pollock from Panguitch, Utah. I just wanted to come and say a few things. I'd like to thank the Deer Committee for taking the time and volunteering. That's a lot of hours they did to put this together. Those plans are important and they need to be followed and I think it's good. I've seen things that have come from the plans in the past that have been awesome. You know that five day deer hunt, that early hunt that was on the Panguitch was probably, I don't know, it helped more than anything I've ever seen as far as hunter crowding. So we need to continue to do things like that to move hunters out. We get a lot of hunter crowding issues and complaints and we need to continue doing those kinds of hunts to do it. The thing is, for general season units, we all want to drive down the road and pass up 180 bucks, but it's not the case, it's never been the case. I remember when I started hunting in 1995-94 it was terrible. it was 9 bucks per 100 does and you couldn't even find a two point. It is considerably better now, however we've had rough years, we've had terrible years as far as the weather goes. We can make all the plans we want and have all this set up as pretty as we want but Mother Nature comes in and kicks it in the pants and it all goes out the window, and that's what we've seen. Two years ago it was the best hunting that we've had and now it's tough. And it wasn't anything to do with permit numbers, it was Mother Nature and we need to just kind of grow up and remember that. Remember we're going to have bad years, we're going to have great years. So take the good years when they're good and kinda take it with the bad ones. I think one thing I'd like to see though is all this data that is being gathered the fawn stuff, that needs to be put into play. We have a three year average with buck to doe ratios, and we follow that,

but if you have a downward trend on your buck to doe average then all of a sudden you're only putting out 40 fawns per 100 does you're not kicking those new bucks back in so it seems like we're always playing from behind the curve and way behind instead of saying hey let's try to get ahead of it. I'd like to see some of those matrices in there that show that we want to try and say hey we had a terrible drought, we had an 80,000 acre fire, we have something like that that is affecting this particular unit, let's look at it and adjust to that before it gets bad. Because then we have instances like this when everybody is up in arms because there is no deer. And it has nothing to really do with permit numbers that were changed last year, it has nothing to do with a change. It's weather. And if deer aren't living, then we're not going to have bucks and we just need to keep on doing that. But anyway, I'd like to thank the Division, it's a terrible job, but you guys do it well. So anyway, that's all I've got. So thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Spoken like a true former employee. After Steve, we'll have Brian Johnson.

Steve Monk: Steve Monk with the Southern Utah Deer Alliance. I just wanted to take a few moments to talk about our proposal that we sent to you guys. I presume you all saw that, I sent that I think Saturday or so, I hope you had a chance to look it over and you can see why we think this third tier is important. But I did want to take just a minute and address something I thought was not correct. I was on that statewide deer committee and we briefly talked about that third tier, the Division was against the idea of the third tier but they let us discuss it. Covy mentioned that there were only people recommending to go lower to like a 13-15 and I think that there may or may not be several people in this room that wanted a higher one. So if you wanted to correct that I'll give you the chance, but if not, we can go on.

Covy Jones: I think that there was a lot more support for 13-15 than there was a higher tier..

Steve Monk: But you said there was only people that were wanting to go lower.

Covy Jones: That's fair Steve. You were on the committee, I know what you wanted, so

Steve Monk: Exactly, but you said there were only people wanting to go lower.

Covy Jones: That's fair, I meant majority.

Steve Monk: Ok, so anyways, our proposal basically we want to eliminate this discord and this fight between the Division every year the plan says we're over buck to doe ratio every year the hunters rise up and say, no there's already too many people in the field, 4,000 plus in Pine Valley and Zion is right there with it. But I wanted to just briefly mention why we have these objectives. And we haven't always been managed for 20. In 2011 we were managed for 18-25 and in 2012 we broke the state up into the units, all the different units and the bar was lowered due to concerns of chronically low buck to doe ratios in specific units. So we lowered the bar for the whole state but our units down here were always up in there. So from then on we've been over objective ever since. So that's what triggers these automatic tag increases and this third tier would let us stay right where we're at, we wouldn't have to add permits, we wouldn't have to cut permits, stay in that window. We wouldn't have to fight back and forth about permit recommendations. And it's worth noting that the three year average of 10 of our 29 units are over objective some of those are close, but some of them have been over for a long time, like the units up north have the private lands issues where you dish out whatever tags you want and it doesn't come down. Our units down here in the Pine Valley, Zion, Southwest Desert. /so this is what we feel is a simple fix for that social problem. We just think it makes sense. You guys have been around, you've seen this fight

we have every year and we just want it to be done, we want to stay status quo and this would allow it to do that. And all we'd need to do is manage general season units for 15-17, 18-20, or 21-25. One word and 2 numbers will fix those problems. I just want to spend the rest of my time talking about if we don't change this buck to doe objective, what that looks like in the future. And if I could get Covy to verify my numbers here, make sure I'm not off base. How many deer is the estimate in the Pine Valley unit?

Covy Jones: Uh, if we're going to talk specific units I'm going to have the biologist address that.

Jason Nicholes: Last year, post-season we estimated the Pine Valley population at 19,000 approx.

Steve Monk: Okay, and the buck to doe ratio is about 20-24 average?

Jason Nicholes: 23.8 last year.

Steve Monk: Alright that's good. So basically, we're at 24 bucks per 100 does, the plan says we're supposed to be at 20, we're 20% over. We're out of the 20's and that's 20% of $\frac{1}{5}$. If we've got $\frac{1}{4}$ of our bucks and say we've got 20,000 deer just for easy numbers, we have 5,000 bucks and we need to eliminate 1,000 bucks to get down to the 20 range. Does that sound correct?

Jason Nicholes: I'm good at math but I'd rather do that on paper.

Steve Monk: Ok, $\frac{1}{5}$ is kind of easy, but ok. To eliminate 1,000 deer how many... (inaudible) What's the success ratio on hunts, just general overall?

Brayden Richmond: Steve your times getting short, you may want to cut to the chase.

Steve Monk: What I'm getting at is we would have to have huge increases in excess of 15,000 on the Pine Valley and Zion is right there with it to get our buck to doe ratio down to where this plan says it should be. We are already well aware of the congestion issues that we face and the quality of hunting people complain about. Let's fix it, let's vote in this third tier and let's fix our issues down here. But thank you guys for listening to sportsmen. We appreciate the hard word. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Steve. Brian Johnson and then after Brian we'll have Cody Webber, I believe.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson, Non-consumptive, oh wait that was last month. Sorry Brian Johnson with the Utah Archery Association, and I'll break this up into my own comments in a second. The UAA supports the Divisions recommendations with the exception they'd like to say that if you bring a deer skull in, from a CWD area, it just has to be free from brain matter, not necessarily a skull plate cut out so people can still enjoy a European Mount. Now that that hats off, I'll put the Brian Johnson not so popular hat on. I think a seven year plan is ok in the fact that we adjust numbers every year. So I personally support a seven year plan just because it doesn't really change a lot of things we can still adjust the numbers depending on what the Division finds on buck to doe ratio. Let's talk about buck to doe ratios for just a second. Everybody talks about the good old days, what were they, the 50's 60's 70's, maybe a round of applause for those, they were great days, the buck to doe ratio was under 10. You guys it was pretty low. So the buck to doe ratio isn't necessarily the problem as far as what you're seeing for bucks, there was a huge population back then.. Ok that's fine too...(inaudible) They have actual data and that's

fine too, you can

Brayden Richmond: Let's keep it to the comments at the mic and a little less interaction.

Brian Johnson: Sorry, that's my fault, I apologize for that. I think that the way this is set up now, these are general season units. I love the fact that we can offer as many tags as we do in a general season unit. I want to make sure we're clear on one thing, I'm a lifetime license holder, that doesn't benefit me at all, I would personally like to see less tags. I don't think that's the right thing to do. I think these are general units. I think that 18-20 bucks is a great number. I personally see the pressure like everybody else does. It doesn't bother me. We've cut several hundred thousand tags out of the pool since we've started this program so I don't understand the pressure conversation. You just go and hunt, and if you see other people you just go and hunt, and you say hi to them and then you just go and hunt. And it's great that we all get the chance to do it. And one last thing I'm going to say guys, this public process works, ok, we're all here because we're passionate about what we're doing here. We all love wildlife. Now just because some of us don't get what we want, and that's myself included. I sat on that side of the table and didn't get what I wanted a lot. Just because you don't get what you want today...

Brayden Richmond: Brian, I'm going to ask you to wrap it up.

Brian Johnson: Please keep coming to these meetings because they work.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Brian. Cody Webber, then we'll have Zane Stratton.

Cody Webber: Cody Webber, I'm a Southwest Desert guy. Appreciate all the work that's been done out there. We've got more habitat than, I mean I've been hunting that place for 20 years, it's awesome. We've got a lot of water out there. Especially this year, it's been great. But I wanted to back up exactly what Garth Carter said. I had 10 guys between my friends and family, 10 guys in camp this year, four dedicated hunters. Nobody took one shot. I had my son, 13 years old, first deer hunt, of course I wanted it to be an all star experience. Took him out the first weekend, we hunted those first 3-4 days and all we saw were 4 yearling bucks. I couldn't get him to go out on the second weekend with me cause he said dad it's just not worth it. So that's what we're kind of getting to here. It's the worst that I've ever seen it and I'm very passionate about it, I don't think many people spend as much time out there as I do, and I take pride in being a good hunter and knowing in what I'm saying is true. I don't know where these guys get there data, but it's not adding up to what I'm seeing out there. Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Cody. After Zane we'll have Lee Tracy.

Zane Stratton: I'm from here in Cedar City, I want to say I do support the higher tier that these guys have all been talking about. With that being said I'd like to pull some of their wording from the new management plan. The Divisions new plan says to manage mule deer populations below biological carrying capacity to increase herd productivity, and use antlerless harvest as the primary tool to manage deer populations. Now I've been hunting Pine Valley, is where I've grown up hunting, so a lot of what's going on out here on a lot of the farms has really affected the deer that I feel like are left that we do hunt. My suggestion is, and I don't know why it hasn't been brought up in the past, I'm sure it has or there's a reason for it, but there's a lot of dedicated hunters out there looking for projects and if we could put all that labor to good use, building fences, whether it's for roadways, farms, anything like that I think we could use a lot of people that way. The other thing I heard brought up earlier so I jotted it down was

about habitat and I think it's great everything that we're all doing for a lot of the habitat, but take for example a lot of the area from here, if you take off toward hwy 56 from the Pinder Rd out to hwy 18, if you wait for the snow to fly here in December you can drive down that road maybe a week after the snow flies and you'll be lucky to cut a deer track. There's tons of sage and bitter brush out there and you're 6,000 feet in elevation, I feel like if the deer are overcrowded and moving to these other areas there's so much forage through that country that's not even getting touched for more than half of the year that I feel they could be naturally be pulling back to. I'm not old enough to see a lot of it, how it was in the past, but talking to my dad and grandpa, and this is just coming from dad and grandpa so take it for what it's worth, but they used to look at deer through all that country during the rut they'd be out there, and now there's not a deer left in it by the time the rut hits, the deer aren't even back in there by the time they are shedding which I feel like there is a lot of food there that they could pull back to if they really need it. The other thing I feel like this year, being in the dedicated hunter program is that the length of the hunts and how many days you can spend in the field is just astronomical. 28 day archery hunt. These deer never, from August 15th til the time the late muzzleloader hunt is over, Mid November, these deer never see what more than a weeks worth of a break without thousands of people after them. I feel like those numbers could be cut down dramatically to help save some of the deer. Even if the tag numbers are cut way back, if the tag numbers need to stay where they are to get people in the field if we cut these hunts to half the length, there's naturally going to be less success, which ok, maybe we're setting people up for failure, but it's still going to get people out in the field and naturally bring the deer numbers back. The buck numbers back. Also the deer numbers I feel like are way over shot, I feel like they are counted in a certain way that, sorry I'll wrap up, if there's less number and we're killing these does to get our ratios back, I don't know, we're just killing more deer overall, so we still need to take the overall deer herd into account. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Zane. The last comment card I have is Lee Tracy.

Jason Aiken: I don't see Lee, it looks like he left, but I have one more.

Brayden Richmond: This looks like a strategy to be last, I'm a little suspicious of this.

Jason Aiken: No, Jason Aiken from Cedar City. Actually Brians the one that kind of encouraged me to get up here. I just kind of want to mirror what Brian Johnson said, I mean I like the seven year plan, I like the way that it's going. We do have the flexibility to make changes kind of on the fly. It's to me more of a guideline than a set plan but that's just kind of what we call it I think. The other thing is, just like he said, I really like the idea, this is general season, this is opportunity, we need to be able to recognize the reason we hunt Zion, Pine Valley, Southwest Desert is because we get to every year or every couple of years. Lindy Varney is going to get up here and talk about point creep and that's a huge topic of discussion and she's going to to say hey I'm getting as many complaints on general season as I am limited entry. And here we are saying well we need to not issue as many tags. We're doing it to ourselves. With that being said I do know that this year the deer herd is suffering. I've talked to a lot of people that says that they've had a rough year hunting. I myself had a Beaver tag, I didn't see the quantity or the quality that I've seen in the past, but at the same time I was hunting a general season unit and I was stalking deer every day I was going out. So I don't know if that's a good thing or a bad thing, but I had a good hunt. I didn't kill, but I was successful because I was seeing the deer that I was going to go after. It just makes me a bad hunter I guess. Then on the Zion unit my 13 year old daughter had a dedicated hunter tag, we hunted deer, we were stalking on deer every day. She was actually holding back saying, no I don't want to shoot a three point I want to shoot a four point, and she shot a four point. So I agree that

the deer herd isn't quite as good as it's been in the past, but I don't feel like it's as in bad of shape as people are portraying today. So I just wanted to shine some light that we're not dying completely but I do know that we're heading down hill vs. uphill. As long as everybody can recognize that. Ok, thank you for everything.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Jason, that was the last comment card that we didn't have, we'll move on.

Jason Aiken: Yeah, the Zion hunt, I did hunt private, but we were seeing just as good of deer as we were seeing in the past, so.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. We do have a couple of comment cards that didn't want to come up, I think the best way to do these would just be to read them so, bear with me as I maybe mumble through these a little bit.

First comment card says, Years ago DWR filmed buck bulls bucks on the Beaver High Adventure. I challenge the RAC to get that and watch it and see what we used to have. Get rid of 12 year olds, go back to 16 year olds.

The next comment card says, Support Steve Monks plan for 12-25 bucks per 100 does option for some general season units.

The next comment card says, increase tag numbers, buck to doe, oh sorry, the comment, manage for buck to doe we have now, third tier three point or better general hunts, no increase to tag numbers.

The next one is, would like to see the Division be able to manage to a higher buck to doe ratio on general season units that the biologist feels can sustain it.

The next one, I would like to see the Pine Valley ratio raised to maintain the herd we currently have and not give out more tags.

The next one says, Add another higher bracket to buck to doe ratio, maintain ratio without adding more tags to drop to the lower bracket.

The next one says, get rid of the early rifle hunt, shorten the archery hunt and increase the number of deer. Allow the bucks to increase size, increase buck to doe ratio 21-25.

And that's all the comment cards we have. I'm going to give it to Kevin to kind of summarize some of the Divisions online system and then we'll attempt to try and summarize the comments.

Robert Tait: You lost one comment card.

Brayden Richmond: Come on up, fill a comment card out after.

Robert Tait: My name is Robert Tate I live in Hurricane. I remember the first day I purchased my hunting license in 1955. I lived on hwy 55 over on Mount Carmel and when you'd buy your hunting license you got a buck tag on general season you could hunt anywhere, and then for another \$5 you could buy a doe tag on Paunsaugunt and a doe tag on East Zion. So I know that's changed and last week I have a little CJ7 Jeep and I love driving around and looking at bucks as much as I love shooting one. Last week I drove all over and I want to compliment the DWR for all of the habitation improvements that's taking place. I spent 42 years out of the state of Utah and moved back and I've just loved what I've seen. In all of the time I've spent driving around, and I actually took an eight mile hike in the mountains west of Kanab and East of the Sand Dunes I saw seven does and one shootable buck. And in driving around in the area that's been cleared out in the sand I saw no bucks and saw a few does, nothing like I would have expected with the way the habitat has been improved. So all that is to say is I don't question the scientific surveys that have been done, but as much time as I've spent out walking around and driving around I

haven't seen the deer that I would like to see. So I would just make that comment. But I do have two comments to make. Number one, I would like to see the age reinstated for the quota for 65 and older. As you can see I don't have a lot of years left to hunt, so I want to get out as much as I can. And the second thing, I would like to recommend that the process for the draw, the premium limited hunts such as the Henry Mountains and the Paunsaugunt be looked at. I have a close friend that has 14 bonus points. He has friends that he hunts with who after 3, 4, 5 years in fact as long as he's been collecting hunts for 14 years, he's got friends that have drawn out on the Paunsaugunt three years, he has not been able to. So there seems to be some inequity in the way that's designed. If something can be done such as maybe at the end you if you've applied for 8-10 years and you don't get one after 10 years, you should be automatically be given a draw. I think there's some inequity in that draw process somewhere. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. We did find your comment card, we put it in a different pile, the agenda topic was not clear. So we've got those. Let me turn it over to you Kevin and see if you can summarize the online for us.

Kevin Bunnell: As Brayden mentioned earlier we are working on coming up with a way for people to comments online and this is the second RAC that we've done that. And we've had a fairly good response this year just to give you some statewide numbers. 42% of the people who commented online were in the central region, about 26% in the northern region. 22% from the southern region. So those by far were the largest regions. Northeastern region 6% and southeastern region 4%. On this particular agenda item. From a statewide perspective, a 46% of the people supported the proposal on the Mule Deer plan. 29% were opposed and about 24% of the people that commented were neutral. And that's about 500 people overall, and about 80 of those were from the southern region. Specifically from our region, as is the case, it was split exactly even. I mean down to the percentage point. 42.31% of the people that commented were supportive, and 42.31% opposed or were not in support of the mule deer plan and 15% of the people who logged in and watched it were neutral. So for the RAC members I think you were sent that data as well and had a chance to look at it. Do you want me to summarize these comments as well?

Brayden Richmond: Yeah, I want you to do that instead of me.

Kevin Bunnell: Ok, for the RAC just as a reminder, I tried to keep track of the major comments that were made, I'm sure I missed some. There was a number of people and I think around 15-20 people that were in favor of the third tier of adding another tier of adding another tier of 21-25 bucks per 100 does on general season units. The Mule Deer Foundation expressed support for the plan. There was some opposition to limiting the reduction of the permits of people over 65, that one happened twice and that one actually will come up in item number 8, I believe, so Lindy help me remember those number comments were made. Opposition to killing too many deer, specifically does to protect agriculture, they have a feeling that there are other tools that we should be using. There was a comment to split the archery hunt into two 14 day hunts, one early and one in November. Change the late season muzzleloader hunts to a recommendation that the plan reads instead of saying set, that it says recommend that the .5%. Increase habitat treatments even more, and use the collar data to direct where habitat work is done. A number of people that expressed opposition to killing more does. Another group of people that were wanting more focus on the Beaver and Southwest Desert units in terms of more data and more collars. Those of you that may have not been here when we started this meeting, we are planning on putting collars on the Beaver unit this year, so hopefully we'll be getting better data there. Several comments about predators, increasing pressure on predators, both coyotes, bears, and cougars were all mentioned. SFW expressed support for the plan except they don't support adding the late muzzleloader hunt on all

the units, they'd like to keep it to the units where it currently exists. Comments on both sides on whether a seven year plan is good or bad, some support and some opposition to that. There was a desire to find better ways to estimate our deer population. Let's see if there's anything else new here. Comments on both sides in terms of the opportunity vs. quality. Eternal debate that we have, some support to decreasing opportunity to increase quality, and others expressing the opposite of that. A recommendation to reduce season lengths to give the deer a break between the seasons. I think that pretty well, there are some other things in here that are repeats of previous comments, but that captures most of the comments that we heard.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. We didn't summarize the emails that came in direct to the RAC I trust that everyone read those, but maybe for the benefit of the public here, we did get a large amount of emails this time. I've never had the emails that I've had this time, it was a tremendous amount. So just maybe a quick summary of those is we had an equal ratio I'd say to the public comments here regarding the Pine Valley, we had a lot of comments on the overall herd health of the Beaver, Monroe, didn't get much on Boulder actually, but that was brought up here today. We had a lot of comments on predators, what else Riley help me out. There was a lot of comments on some of the other agenda items, those were probably the main comments as far as the plan, right? Ok, at this point we'll have comments from the RAC, we'll take a minute to have comments, and work through that and then we'll work on trying to make some motions here. So let's stick with our comments and thoughts, things we want to bring up, and then we'll go into working on a motion.

Comments from the RAC:

Bart Battista: Yeah, my comment is you know everyone knows I'm a non-consumptive rep, I'm not a hunter, I work at Best Friends Animal Society so I'm on the Paunsaugunt, and last year I probably say every day 40-50 deer running around from my office. Multiple bucks, does and fawns. This year in the past month I've seen one buck, and maybe, probably I could count 40 deer that I've seen. That's been over the past month and a half. So it seems to me that the winter did something. So I have concerns.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you, I need to to pause here, according to process, which we don't do this often, but according to process the Division does get an opportunity to..

Kevin Bunnell: This is the the new process going forward, so we'll always have this opportunity going forward.

Brayden Richmond: This is a good step. So the Division gets a chance to respond to the public comment.

Covy Jones: Ok, not a lot to say here, first of all I am grateful that there are this many members of the public that have shown up that are passionate about this. It is our resource and we're not always right, but we try to make the best recommendation possible. The only thing that I really wanted to address was a little bit of when Steve got up, Mr. Monk got up and was asking about the Pine Valley specifically and introduced the idea that third tier has been introduced and supported several times. There are actually some biological rationale as to why the Division is not entirely supportive of that. And Jason can back this up with what he's seeing on the landscape, and I might ask him to get up here and say it but we watch a population increase and approach carrying capacity and we've seen on the Pine Valley. I'm not talking about bucks, I'm talking about the overall number of deer as they grow and grow. One of the

things we watch is that hunt productivity goes down. And what I mean by that is the number of fawns on the landscape at times goes down. On the Pine Valley specifically we started to see that especially the last two years, right? So there's good data, there's good research done in Colorado that shows that if you are at or approaching a carrying capacity for mule deer and you increase your buck doe ratio is from 20 to 25 you have the potential to decrease your fawn/doe ratios by seven, right? And it's kind of a hard concept to understand but by carrying more males on the landscape you have the potential to negatively impact your herds if you're approaching a carrying capacity. And so on the Pine Valley and some of our rationale for not recommending this as an agency is that we do want to offer as much opportunity as we can, on a general season unit. And I mean the literature is out there, it's not a secret you can read it, you can look it up, it's peer reviewed, it's published. But on the Pine Valley specifically if you're approaching that, you can decrease overall heard productivity, and as an agency we do have to take into account that we want to offer the opportunity we can, while still managing for the quality we've agreed to. It's tough it's tough especially on a year like this, I mean we we know, we know deer are down, we know that there are areas in the state where they weren't as impacted as some of the areas that you know, the Boulder, the Beaver, some of the most impacted areas. We also know that some of the central areas we didn't have some of these great impacts you know, but getting back what I'm trying to say, the overall rationale for not increasing, or not having that third-tier is because it could negatively impact not only the number of permits and opportunity we could give today, but also moving into the future; and make a herd that's approaching carrying capacity less productive overall. Meaning that you have less buck fawns being born, and less bucks recruiting into that population. And I think that's the only thing that I wanted to address, so thank you .

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Covy. Other RAC comments?

Chad Utley: This is a question for Covy, I'm trying to understand what you just told me. So if we put in a third tier, is it mandatory or do you have the flexibility to change tiers from year to year?

Covy Jones: We... if there were a third tier, from an agency perspective we would probably recommend it as a limited entry. Because we have point creep in limited entry as well, and we would address it that way. We don't try to maximize populations or opportunities in limited entry. Those you understand we sacrifice maximizing a population to be able to offer more quality. Right? And the sentiment behind general season is try to maximize both. So you maximize a population to maximize opportunity, and manage to a level that you've agreed to. And so if we're not going to try to maximize that, it would make sense to make it more restrictive.

Brayden Richmond: Tammy, go ahead.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, I've got a couple of comments. I've basically lived in the Southwest Desert my whole life, so I'm older than dirt. But I've been a farmer, and a rancher, and a hunter that whole entire time. I remember, like these guys said, the population of deer. I mean we had deer everywhere and it was a huge habitat. I think your biggest impacts on deer are not only the predators, but the increase of horses and elk. Especially on Southwest Desert. I think that we've had a huge hit with last winter, I think we've had a lot of mortality rates on our fawns, and just deer in general. I spent a lot of time on public land. I run cattle, I spend a lot of time with the people in Beaver County, and Millard County, and Iron County on range, and that's just general principles. You know, guys that are out there hauling water to their cattle and keeping an eye out for deer. And I do know that most of us that run cattle or run sheep love deer; we hate horses and we hate elk, and that's just kind of general principles. But I've seen on our Beaver unit,

and I run cattle up there, we drove cows, moved cows, and the entire time we were moving cows, and that's a lot of acreage that used to be premier Minersville permit. And everybody knows the old joke about Minersville tag, right? We didn't see one single deer the entire time we were up there driving cows. I know they're there, but we covered a lot of country and this was the week before the rifle tag. I think that there's so many changes, there are so many different layers to what effects especially deer. I think that the number of days that we're hunting deer, the drought, and I agree I think the habitat especially because of the drought, not because of the WRI projects; and these are huge projects that all of us, you know the permittees have put a lot of money in, SFW and these guys, DWR have put it in wonderful, I mean just amazing habitat projects. But I think that the pressure of hunting and whatever, brings those deer especially into irrigated private property. It's not necessarily that the ground outside is better or worse, but it's just like the prairie dogs in the towns and ground squirrels; we're irrigating prime alfalfa and it's just like eating icing on the cake for deer or elk, that's where they want to be. So yeah, I understand we put a lot of money in the fencing, we put a lot of money in the predator tags, or not predator, but depredation tags. But I agree with Garth. I hate the thought.. I grew up in that generation, you never shoot anything under a four point, you don't shoot anything that don't have horns. I'd rather put more money into trying to relocate these does and stuff instead of depredation tags.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Tammy. Gene?

Gene Boardman: On this third tier, if that decreases the fawn production, what the heck does premium limited entry do to fawn production?

Covy Jones: I acknowledge that. We absolutely don't manage premium limited entry, or limited entry to optimize a population. That's why we give so limited tags. I mean that's why a unit like the Book Cliffs you can only give 400 tags. That's why a unit like the Henry's you have 49 permits, right? We know that we're not trying to optimize a population of those units. It's a sacrifice to offer premium quality, there are trade offs. If you take it to 25, the data says you'll lose seven. That's just what the data says. It doesn't matter. And that that study was done in Colorado.

Gene Boardman: Okay, while I've got it, we're here to approve a seven year plan and it must be a good one, cause it's got something in there to piss everybody off. My problem is that we manage for objective and that gets chiseled in stone, and we manage for buck to doe ratios and that gets chiseled in stone, and we manage for age objective and that gets chiseled in stone. And we're putting up a seven year plan and they're going to take this up on Mount Sinai and chisel it in stone and then put it in the ark and covenant and it will not come out until seven years. If I could see some flexibility, I'd be a lot happier. But I haven't seen flexibility in those things that I mentioned, the buck to doe ratio, the age objective, and the population objective. And management seems to go to all three of those. Now I think that if we could go for three years with the third tier on Pine Valley, and see how it works out, maybe it won't, but I don't think it would destroy Pine Valley and we've got a lot of public support to do that. So my worry is that we passed the plan as approved and then there's no change for seven years of making any adjustments anywhere. I'd just like to see us go with one thing that will go with the public. There are several things that we've had a lot of points about how the populations struggling in a lot of units, but we don't have time for everything tonight, and we need to pick our battles. I'd like to see us go with the recommendation from the SUDA on the Pine Valley Unit.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Gene. Go ahead Craig

Craig Laub: I'd just like to, the deer in general. And somebody alluded to it, that the deer or not staying on the public land. They're moving to the private land. Probably part of that is because of the drought over the last 15 years or 20 years. But I see a problem coming that I don't know if we can ever get them back. They're not.. you go hunt this year, I had a tag on the Pine Valley. I went hunting high and there was absolutely nothing there. I had to come down to my hayfields to see the deer. That's the way it's been, and it's getting worse. As those fawns grew up there, they're not going to go back, and I got a real concern and I don't know how we address it; to push those deer back to their traditional range. Because they'll go there in the summer, but they're sure heading down there earlier than they ever did before. I mean and I don't know how we address it, but that's that's a real concern I have going forward with our deer.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Craig. Austin? I was waiting for you to raise your hand. I was just going to look at you til you did.

Austin Atkinson: Um, I would just like to share some of my comments personally, and as representing the public. The DWR and all of us, we've created a beast with this general season, and I think that's why a lot of us are here. By calling it a general season, but running it as a draw with preference points, I feel like we've created a mess for ourselves. Except for the few lifetime license holders that can actually treat this as a term general season tag that they can obtain every year, we've pushed ourselves into a limited entry scenario. Even for a general season tag. I think as members of the southern region of Utah, we take pride in the quality of deer we're able to find. We're excited that we get to have opportunity, but we also see that there are some good genetics, and we can kill some better bucks. Now that we don't have the opportunity to have a tag every single year, that's why comments like this third tier are popping up. A little better quality in exchange for some opportunity. So I know Covy you mentioned it's going to have to go limited entry if we do that. Well we're already running a limited entry scenario. We're calling it preference points and we award the tags from the top down, there's no random tags, but we're trying to play that game. And it's only going to get worse the more people that move to Utah. As more people move up north and want to hunt down south, cause they have bad winters up there. It's only going to get worse for everybody. So I will support and I have to support, based on the comments I've received, as managing these deer separate down here with a higher tier. And keep the late Muzzleloader on general season with the 14 units that it's at. And let's choose how we're going to manage our deer down here and see what happens in this plan. That's all I have to say.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Austin. Go ahead Sean.

Sean Kelly: Hey Covy, if you don't mind, I'm just curious, what's the difference between the proposed upper tier and just a limited entry unit? In practical terms?

Covy Jones: It would be managed there, in practical terms you'd be able to offer a few more permits than you would on a limited entry, if it's 20 to 25; but not a lot of difference. You know we find ourselves these ranges, 20 to 25 really means 25, which is the bottom end of what a limited entry unit is right now, 25 to 35 in Practical terms.

Sean Kelly: And if you did add an additional tier, I'm assuming that would apply to all the other units around the region and state? How would you decide what units become included in that tier?

Covy Jones: That's where it starts to become difficult. If you create one, you have a rush on that unit, and you go from hunting it every other year, to every seven or eight years, or maybe even less frequently.

So that's one of the things that we take into consideration as to what does this really mean? How many units would you put this on? What would that look like? So there's a lot to think through. Even if you applied it to multiple units, there would definitely be a rush on those units and it just depends on.. You know I've given you the Divisions perspective on this, but there's a lot of public support for this. I can see how bad they want it, I just don't know if it's what we want in the end. I do want to clarify, and I've kind of said this, fewer buck tags and more bucks does not mean more deer on the landscape. It just doesn't. But Sean those are all good questions, what exactly what I mean? I don't have all the answers.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Verland.

Verland King: Well, I'm not in favor of seven year, I think five year is what we need to stick with. In the presentation you talked about something that gave me a little hope that your biologists would look at stuff maybe and be able to make a recommendation to the state, or to the higher ups, and historically what I've been watching the biologists, even if they made a recommendation, a lot of times it wasn't listen to at the state. And what came down wasn't what they recommended. I can see why the numbers are low, because of this drought we went through, and that hard winter I used to have, I don't raise as good of hay as Tammy, but I had about 50 head of deer in my field in the spring, and the fall, and and 10-15 that stay all summer. I had one doe with two fawns, two of the fawns got hit by a car, and then the other day that I saw, was probably ten head and they were all bucks, you know a spike or little two points, that's what they were, and it seems like the bucks survived and the fawns didn't, that hard winter and the drought. But I really think we need to go stay with the 5-year. I think we need to kind of have a system that you kind of alluded to, that takes into account what's going on in the environment. That's something we've fought no matter what plan were talking about, you guys are always at least a year behind. Where we as ranchers, we've got a deal with it right now. Case and point was last winter down on our desert around the Henry Mountains, you people took cattle down until we got the moisture and could take some down in March. So you need to have in this plan where you can react quicker to to the environment, what happens with the climate. And so it's encouraging when you talk about taking what the biologists is telling you, and then adjusting the numbers in the spring accordingly. And also I worked with Wayne County Commissioner Stan Wood today, and I says I'm going to the RAC Meeting, what you want me to tell 'em? We're talking about deer herd. He says, well you tell him as long as they've got this many elk, you'll never have a deer herd. Tammy and I kind of laugh at each other cause every now and then you come up with one of theses studies that points out what common sense, what we've been saying for years. So I'm waiting for that study to correlate to elk numbers with how it relates to deer numbers. And I don't know if there's been not one but, on the ground we see that, and we sure like more deer. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Chad.

Chad Utley: Covy, if I can ask you again, did you say on that study referenced, 25 was kind of the magic number?

Covy Jones: That's what they evaluated. They evaluated an increase. So is a real life scenario where they evaluated an increase with buck/doe ratios, and at the same time correlated that with production at a herd that was approaching carrying capacity.

Chad Utley: So if you had a third tier that managed for 20-23 or 20-24 and 24 is your top number, would you expect to have the same issues?

Covy Jones: Expect for every one you add, you to reduce some, right? So five bucks reduce seven fawns. I don't know exactly what it would be, but you'd expect as you add you could have some reduction fawn production. I don't have that magic number though. (inaudible) So the deal is, somebody's got to stop the comments from the audience because we can't put up with that.

Brayden Richmond: We've had the public comment, and we'll ask to leave it at that, we just won't address them.

Chad Utley: I had another comment, somebody asked to recommend on the late-season Muzzleloader that you have some flexibility, as to what percentage you set it at. You know if you set it in no more than .05. If you had that, and when I heard your comments you said that's not a statistically significant amount, would the Division even consider putting it lower at that point, if it's nice to statistically significant?

Covy Jones: The gentleman that made that recommendation, I think that's perfectly fine if that's what the RAC decides to do. The way we wrote the plan is it sets those, and just the difference saying that we would recommend that, and then allow those through the public process to be reduced or increased based on sentiment. I completely understand that thought actually.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Bart.

Bart Battista: So the study you referenced, you know that it said it was 25 and it was correlated with population drop with that higher tier. But when you read the mule deer management plan, it's multiple variables actually affect survival and affect the population. So is that study purely a correlation or was it multivariate?

Covy Jones: It was a correlation but they drew a conclusion that that was probably why.

Bart Battista: You know they say correlation is not causation.

Covy Jones: Sure.

Bart Battista: So it's not necessarily the strongest argument to say you shouldn't do a third tier.

Brayden Richmond: I'm going to ask the audience, we've had the public comment, and there needs to be some order to the process, so we're going to ask the public to maintain some order please.

Covy Jones: I think it was a good peer reviewed study that drew that conclusion, would be my answer.

Brayden Richmond: Let me just add to my comment. We did have the public comment, it was overwhelming public comment, we heard you. There's a thing that happens when you become obnoxious, your comment holds less credence. So I would caution on letting your good comments stand.

Verland King: I think the one thing that we're not picking up on when he talked about that study, is that was on a population that was nearing carrying capacity, which you've said several times. Which may not.. I don't know how many of these units are nearing that, but you know that those numbers are based on a study done on the unit that was nearing carrying capacity. So take that for what it's worth.

Sometimes you can you can determine what you want out of studies, so you kind of have to think about it and read between the lines. Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: I want to make a couple of comments real quick. By far the majority of the meeting we've talked about the Pine Valley, you know it correlates to the Zion unit, and increasing that buck to doe objective. We haven't spent near as much time, which is surprising to me, talking about some of our units that are suffering. It's actually a little concerning to me, because we talked about a lot of time on the Pine Valley and Zion, which frankly those herds are doing pretty good. Now we're trying to figure out how to shoot big. But we got a real problem on some of our other units of doe and fawn survival. We had a recommendation come from the Beaver area with the collars. I know the divisions doing some collaring there. Thank you very much. It's pretty exciting to see the coloring that's going forth, we got a list of all the captures of the Divisions doing this year, it's pretty extensive. And it's exciting, as we collect more data will get more information. My comment would be that I want to support the Division, and I want to encourage them to expand that as aggressively as possible. I wonder if we're doing a good enough job of targeting the areas that that we need more answers on. Are we collaring deer in the areas where we really need the answers to figure out what's going on? Maybe we are, maybe we aren't, but I think that's something that's important to look at and make sure collaring in the right places, and aggressive enough. On the Beaver, I believe they're planning on collaring 50 does on the Beaver. I applaud that. I think we need to double it, or triple it. The Beaver units, that's my backyard, I haven't hunted it for five years because it's just tanking. I hear the same thing on the Monroe. I'm not familiar enough with Monroe to speak to it, but again I think we got everything collared on the Monore, we even have the monkeys that you talked about collared on the Monroe, but again I do applaud that effort, and I think we really.... it concerns me that we're spending a lot of time, and rightfully so that's the public's input talking about Pine Valley, but I hope we are as concerned about our units that are really suffering.

Riley Roberts: Hopefully, my comments will have a little bit more of a positive spin on them as well as well. I want to say first, thank you to the public. It means a lot that people show up and they are as passionate about it as you are. This is a way of life for us, that's why we're we feel so passionately about it. It's the way we were raised, it's our own backyard, it's what we know, it's what we love, and there's a lot of emotion that rides on those things. And so when something as controversial as some of the items like we're discussing tonight night, we need that input and we appreciate it, and we appreciate you being able to do that in a in a manner where we can accomplish something. I also want to point out that there are a lot of things in this plan that we are in 100% agreement on. And we have not, at least not to the level that I think is necessary, given the Division the credit that they need for the time, and the efforts that they put into making some of these things happen. We've acknowledged the habitat restoration in many areas, we've acknowledged the repairing, the waters, different things that have happened that way. But there's been a lot of volunteer work. Not just from the Division not just from the RAC. But also from these committees that get together, and they discuss this thing for hours and hours. And I've been on some of those committees, and it's not always fun, and it's not always a good time, and we do, I do, I appreciate that, because it is the future of hunting in Utah that we're talking about. Especially the Southern Utah because that's what we're representing. We had tremendous amount of input from the public this go-round of mainly in part to the new process with the surveys and the emails, and as they showed you some of the statistics, it's it's pretty split especially down here. We had comments on opportunity, we had comments on quality, we had comments saying kill all the elk, we had comments saying there is no deer, we had comments saying you need to shoot more cougars, we had comments saying you need to have more cougars. I mean there were all of these comments and I stayed up late reading all of these and I appreciate that because it gave me a better idea what was going on in the other

areas that I'm not as familiar with. I'm real familiar with my own backyard, and so when we talk about things like the Pine Valley, I've read the proposals, I don't know that I have an opposition to that. The same time I don't know that I personally could make a motion, because there's some things that I don't have enough information on, myself.. Again, I'm not saying that I would oppose that. But I would personally want some information from the Division, rather than just accept it as is. Just cause I'm not comfortable with that doesn't mean that it's bad, or that it's not the way it should be, or that it's false; because there's some very valid points in that and I appreciate the time that you all put in, and making that happen. I definitely appreciate the support because that's what this process is about. So there's a lot of naysayers whether this process works or not. It does. It's the only place that you can complain about the buck to doe ratio in the Pine Valley is here, and the coffee shop in the morning. That's it. And so this is the process that works, it will work. Doesn't mean you're going to always get your way, trust me the biologist, the former biologist and I have had many discussions on elk herds where I feel super passionate about. I don't always get my way, but it's still when we go out of this tonight whatever the vote is, that's what we collectively as representatives of our different regions, we will vote that way. And I appreciate that. Looking at some things I specifically on the on the plan, again I'm all about flexibility. One of the things that has kind of discouraged me from from the beginning since I've been on the RAC is the inability to make some of the changes quicker. I do think that we do use the plan as a crutch, I think it's necessary, and it has to be there, and there's there's a ton of information that that goes into that, and there's a ton of numbers that need to be crunched because of it. But I do like the ability to make changes on the fly. And I'm not talking about numbers, a lot of the stuff we talked about tonight or are permit numbers and tag numbers, and a lot of that's going to be interesting and future RACs, not tonight. Tonight it's more about the structure of it, and I do like the ability to to be able to make those quicker. So again, I know we talked a lot about this seven year, and I personally like the five year. I actually like it sooner but I know that's not on the table. But I do like that because I think that we need to be able to make those not just in emergency situations, but because this process is what it is, it needs to be social and needs to have the biology into it, it has to have all of those things as we move forward to be able to make those decisions. Some of the things that we talked about was that the antlerless. I don't think that.. I don't like killing does, I don't like killing cow elk, but I don't think that needs to be taken out of the plan because it's a necessary tool that has to be in there, when we need to make some of those changes. Just a to finalize my thoughts and my comments, I am in support of the plan, a five year plan with the recommendations, and would like to hear more when the motion is made on whatever else happens on the Pine Valley, and some of these other things, and I can make that decision to that time. Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Riley. Other comments? Let's try to go into a Motion. I think what we want to do on this is, my recommendation, and help me out Riley and Kevin, I would suggest that we make some individual motions on parts of this that we've had a lot of input on and then once we make individual motions then we'd accept the remaining plan as presented. I think that might be the easiest way to not confuse it and not jumble it up. So I would entertain motions on individual items, is how I'd like to proceed.

Craig Laub: I think it would be better to accept the whole plan and then amend it as we go. That's my thought.

Brayden Richmond: If you accept the whole plan, then you have to do everything as an amendment, it is an option.

Craig Laub: I think that would be simpler myself.

Kevin Bunnell: The RAC can do what they want Craig, I tend to agree with Brayden, like make a Motion on whether you'd want to have a shorter duration to the plan and if you want to do something with the third tier and take all of those issues that we've heard about tonight, deal with them individually, and then just make one motion at the end that takes care of the balance. To me, that seems less confusing.

Brayden Richmond: When I've seen confusion before Craig, it usually comes from amendments and people want to make an amendment to an amendment and they interject in the middle of it and I really feel like if we take them one at a time it might make it cleaner. I can tell you as I go up to the Board and present, it is much cleaner for me to say we passed this motion, this motion, this motion, and then that, vs. amendment, amendment, amendment.

MOTION to add a third tier of 21-25 Bucks per 100 does as an option for General Season units.

Austin Atkinson
Verland King, second
Passed unanimously

Chad Utley: Yes, I can support that motion if this study is presented prior to the Wildlife Board, so they have a chance to look at it and make some determinations on it.

Brayden Richmond: I think that's a really good comment Chad. Here would be my comment to the RAC is, let's all remember that we're all making a recommendation to the Board. I guarantee the Board is getting a lot of input on this. But I do appreciate what you're saying there that they have a chance to review this study and look at it. But we're simply making a recommendation to the Board and they will make the final say.

Austin Atkinson: Can I make a comment back on that? Just that this is adding to the tool kit if you will of the statewide management plan, we're not necessarily assigning units or tag numbers or anything.

Brayden Richmond: I like that clarification, I think that leaves some openness. Thank you.

Gene Boardman: The motion as stands is the way that the Deer Alliance suggested that it be. It doesn't include that we put the Pine Valley unit in that category, they'll have to sell that to the Board. If we vote for it the way that it is, but this is the way that their proposal read, so I think the motions been made.

Brayden Richmond: Any additional comments?

MOTION to change the language of the plan for the late season muzzleloader hunts from "set at" to "no more than" 0.05.

Chad Utley
Tammy Pearson, second
Passed unanimously

Riley Roberts: So the comment, I think it would just be verbiage thing, could you tell me that because the way it was proposed was “at” and we want to do it “recommend up to”?

Chad Utley: That’s correct. Because if you just say “at” ...

Riley Roberts: Correct, I just couldn’t remember exactly how you had it and I had written down recommend, but it wasn’t exactly how you had it. I think we’re saying the same thing, so as long as it says that.. (I think the intent is the same) Yep.

Brayden Richmond: And again, let me just remind that the words we use is not what the Board has to use, we’re sending our idea to them in our Motions so they can change the wording. Any more comments? Thank you Chad, I think that's a great motion, that's one I had on my list.

Kevin Bunnell: Hold on, hold on, let me.. give me a chance to try and repeat the motion.

Brayden Richmond: Kevin, I’m trying to move this thing along.

Kevin Bunnell: I know you are and I’m trying to make sure you’ve got it right.

Brayden Richmond: Any other motions?

MOTION to change the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read clean skulls instead of clean skull plates.

Austin Atkinson

Riley Roberts

Passed unanimous

Brayden Richmond: Any comments on that one?

Verland King: Alright, so I don’t understand that. So the skulls clean of all meat and tissue, so the infected part of that is the brain tissue and the spinal cord, so that’s what you’ve got to have cleaned. So I guess that’s other tissue.

Kevin Bunnell: So they’re gonna have to be, it’s going to take somebody some time. They’re going to have to boil it, take care of it, prior to bringing it into the state to remove all the muscle and tissue from the skull, so it's just bone.

Verland King: Alright.

Brayden Richmond: And that is fairly in line with what other states are doing. It’s pretty similar to their verbiage on that

Brayden Richmond: Alright, any additional comments?

Bart Battista: It’s not a motion, but it’s something I don’t think that was really talked about and I know that we received a lot of comments about it, and that was about losing preference points. Now I’m not a

hunter, so that doesn't affect me, but..

Brayden Richmond: That will be in the next agenda. We've just begun, we're not even 25% of the way done tonight.

MOTION to keep the Statewide Deer Management Plan at 5 years instead of 7 year plan.

Riley Roberts

Verland King, second

Passed 7 in favor, 3 opposed (Chad Utley, Sean Kelly, Austin Atkinson)

Brayden Richmond: No additional comments?

MOTION to accept the remainder of the Statewide Deer Management Plan as presented.

Craig Laub

Riley Roberts, second

Passed unanimously

- **BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL 2020 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE AND RULE AMENDMENTS – Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brayden Richmond: We will now begin with questions from the public, and just a reminder as we stated before. As you come up to the mic with a question, please state your name. And we'll proceed.

Covy Jones: One more thing Brayden, just a reminder that biologist look forward to this RAC all year long, so if it's a unit specific question, let's get one of them up here so they can have some fun too. If it's a statewide question, I'd love to answer it.

Brayden Richmond: Let's get them some good questions then.

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracy: I asked you at the other RAC, but I think these people need to hear it too. Those extended archery units, they're available for both bucks and does?

Covy Jones: That is correct, you can harvest a buck or a doe in those areas.

Lee Tracy: Alright, thanks.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson. You mentioned, I don't know if we have a northern region biologist here, do we have one of those here? Sorry Covy that's you. On the Williard you mentioned no hunting nannies up there on Williard.

Covy Jones: Correct.

Brian Johnson: The reason was lack of goats?

Covy Jones: Yeah lack of goats, which means we'll be reducing permits too.

Brian Johnson: Would it make sense to go to one hunt, because before it was two hunts for crowding. If you're reducing tags, it might make sense to keep the bonus point... would it make sense to go to one hunt now?

Covy Jones: Yeah I think the advantage to keeping two hunts is just consistency. but the advantage to going to one hunt would be longer season dates or opportunities. I don't think we'd be opposed to going to one hunt.

Brian Johnson: Thank you. One more question. Would the RAC need to do the exact same thing with the skull in the rule vs...

Covy Jones: This is more important important than the plan.

Brian Johnson: It's more important this time than the last time.

Brent Blackner: Brent Blackner, I just was curious, I didn't make the presentation but if it was the same one I watched at work, but it seems like there are a lot of tags that go un-reallocated? And it seems like the new rule with the turning the tag back rule would change a lot of that, but what's the process of reallocating those tags and is there a way to reallocate more of those tags?

Covy Jones: You are super lucky, because you didn't miss that presentation. It's coming up. Yeah, we just got started tonight.

Brayden Richmond: I hope you got all night. Any other questions from the public? Let me start a question to start us off in conjunction with the question from Brian and the goats. Would you need a recommendation or would the Board need to address combining those goat dates as part of this process?

Covy Jones: Yeah.

Brayden Richmond: Would you have a suggestion on how we could word that so that it allows you the tool to go either direction depending on what you decide to do with numbers? I would hate to have it say we are going to have it be one season, or going to have it be two, and that limits you.

Covy Jones: We have to have it before the application period, but what I can tell you based on the flight, is that we wouldn't have the crowding issues now with just one hunt. I do know, cause we already flew it, so I have an idea of what the permit numbers could be, and even if we went to the top end of that, we're not going to have the crowding issues.

Brayden Richmond: Yeah I think that's a great question. I'm familiar with the situation up there and I think that's a great question that we may want to look at even though we don't know much about it.

Riley Roberts: I've got several questions, on the state park rules, is that something that's available on the

Divisions website already? Where you can find that information?

Covy Jones: Their rule? I don't know. I know you can get it on their website. I don't know that we have it.

Riley Roberts: If we don't, could we make that available?

Covy Jones: A link that referenced it? I understand why you'd want that, I don't see that we'd have a problem with that.

Riley Roberts: There are just lots of parks we want to hunt in now. I think again it would be nice to have that available there. Question on the Bison on the roadless hunt on the additional, does that mean additional tags/additional opportunity?

Covy Jones: Maybe, so we know that we have a population of bison in the roadless, the concern is we already have an either sex hunt in there, hunters choice hunt in there, this adds a cow hunt. But, concern is always how much pressure can you add there without pushing them out of there, so it will just depend on where we're at on the population objective this year. We added a lot of permits to the Book Cliffs this year, so we're waiting to see exactly how that plays out. But it could, yes.

Riley Roberts: Okay two more questions. On the sheep you said that potentially you would like to have a discussion with Nevada to get that every year, have there already been conversations had? Do we think that this is probable?

Covy Jones: We've started the conversations, I think it's going to happen. Two things, that and hopefully change the season dates because right now the agreement with Nevada, the season dates, they don't match the rest of our season dates, so we'd like to do both. Match our season dates, and get a tag every year until we harvest those rams.

Riley Roberts: Alright thank you. And then the last one which is the big one, I wouldn't feel like me if I didn't ask, on the season dates, what do we have to do to move those around? We actually did get a lot of comments from the emails on moving the elk season specifically those archery dates, it's been a discussion we've had for years and years and years, and I know that you said that the majority kind of said leave it alone, but we're also getting a lot and have in the past to move those primitive hunts further into the rut.

Covy Jones: I just presented this to the Board this last year. I presented them basically with three options and then our recommendation. I agree, I get emails about it, phone calls about it, texts about it, all the time. So what we always go back to and check ourselves with is, ok what is the majority of the public want? So we come back with and say, well there's always a vocal minority, and it's hard not to listen to them because they are passionate and they care and I don't want them to think that we'll ignore them. And I think we saw a perfect example of that tonight. Because it's definitely a minority that wants this third tier. They came, they showed up, they pushed, and it happened. But as far as a recommendation to the Division, we know that we'd be making that recommendation against the majority of the public, and we've struggled with it.

Riley Roberts: And a follow up to that, do you think that is because the majority has the point built up

for these species?

Covy Jones: When we survey the people that have points, obviously, right? There's probably some of that highly invested individuals, sure.

Riley Roberts: Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Gene.

Gene Boardman: On these extended archery seasons, new extended archery seasons in the southern unit, have you got a feeling for the ratio of public to private land on those? Is there going to be any place for people to hunt?

Covy Jones: Jason is so excited to come answer this.

Jason Nicholes: Both of these areas that we are recommending for extended archery in the southern region are 90% plus private land, so I don't see a lot of opportunity for the people that don't have access to that private land to hunt these areas. Just like a lot of units, a lot of our antlerless units, both of these are antlerless units already, we recommend to people to get permission before you even apply. Don't even come down and hunt these unless you have permission to be on private land is what I guess I'm saying on the extended archery.

Covy Jones: Just a follow up from my perspective. You've worked with these landowners a lot and not to commit anybody, but is there any willingness to allow some access in your experience? He said yes, put that on the record. Thanks.

Gene Boardman: Is there an effort to educate the public so they don't come down here expecting something different than that?

Covy Jones: Yeah we could put something on the website to educate the public and say hey these are primarily private land units. Whenever we start a new hunt we do that alot. (It's in the application guidebook as well) It's in the hunt planner too. We usually put it in several different spots. But most hunters don't go into an area completely blind. If they are going to waste fuel to drive down here most of them have looked at it. Most of them have OnX, most of them know what they are getting into.

Tammy Pearson: So my question goes back to the bison hunts. Is that also part of your objective is hunts off of private land, try to get them away from the impacts on private land both in Book Cliffs and in Henry's? I mean what kind of accessibility.. and why I'm asking this is because I get feedback from both sides. There's heavy impact on private land, and then people that are hunting are hunting and they can't find them, they don't exist, and I always go back to then call the county commissioners and here's a list of people that I hear..

Covy Jones: Yeah I think we are always trying to manage wildlife in a way that we're.. I think we both get it. Private landowners and public wildlife, we both get it. We try to manage wildlife in a way that we can minimize the impact on private land owners. There aren't a lot of private lands in either of these units, but there are public land grazers and we're trying to work right now, we're working on an agreement in the Henry's to try to address some of that and do a better job. And we're committed to keep

trying to do a better job in both of those areas. I think some of the private land issues that you're referring to are really outside of the unit boundary, and they have a committee as well, and they are proposing some recommendations right now that's outside of this process to the Division. And we'll take those recommendations into consideration. It will probably look a little different than this, but there will be some ideas that come out of that, that you could see this spring.

Tammy Pearson: Is a lot of those issues also Tribal animals?

Covy Jones: It's a very complex issue Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Oh I know.

Covy Jones: Yeah the bison population on Tribal lands.. yes is the answer.

Austin Atkinson: To go back to the extended archery, I've spoken with a few landowners that lie within that Southwest Desert/Cedar Valley area that are passing along a question to ask to you, which is, why are we opening up an extended archery that is open to every archery hunter in the state that hasn't filled their tag, as opposed to a mitigation permit, or some kind of landowner authorization. And this particular landowner that sent this question, he's concerned that now he has to chase public hunters off his property all the way through November as opposed to if his neighbor wants to shoot bucks or does, shoot them.

Jason Nicholes: Um I would say that for mitigation permits, we're only doing antlerless permits. We've been killing does in these areas with hunter that have tags. We've been issuing mitigation permits to the private landowners, and what is left is a high buck to doe ratio in those areas and bucks that aren't accessible unless they have access during the general season. So bucks, also migratory deer are moving into these areas and it inflates that buck to doe ratio even higher. We see it a lot in private land states for example, Texas, private landowners, the state puts out permits, the private landowners regulate the access and it works.

Covy Jones: I think that part of that too, and Jason touched on this, but it allows... There are two ways to look at this, right? And you've brought up one way. But the other way is, it's pretty easy to get an archery tag in Utah, so if a private landowner has an issue, or wants to be able to hunt his own land, this is a push back we get from private landowners all the time is, I can't even get a tag! This is a way where private landowners and their kids can get permits and hunt their own properties as well. There's just two sides to the coin, both ways of doing it are good. We feel like this is a good way.

Austin Atkinson: Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Other questions from the RAC?

Austin Atkinson: Sorry I have another one about bighorn sheep and this is one I do not understand. On the Zion bighorn sheep we allow non-resident hunters to hunt the first hunt, or sorry they apply for the first hunt, and they can hunt both seasons. But on Rocky, now with the Fillmore, and the Newfoundlands, we have split hunts on both those units, but the non-residents have to hunt the late season on that. Maybe a housekeeping thing? Maybe a reason and I'd like to know why that is.

Covy Jones: I could sand up here and make up a reason, but I don't know where exactly that evolved

from on the Zion. Kevin, do you know why the Zion is allowed to do both?

Kevin Bunnell: There was a recommendation that came through a number of years ago that only addressed the Zion unit and it was accepted by the Board.

Covy Jones: Is that correct Kent? Do you remember the same thing? He doesn't know. Recommendation?

Kevin Bunnell: Enlighten us Jason, but we will check your answer.

Jason Aitkin: There were two hunts and there was one non-resident tag for each hunt, and so I remember talking to Justin Shannon about this, saying what about taking that non-resident and making it so they could hunt both hunts, so they could apply for one single hunt that would allow a bonus tag, and a random tag. I think they did it on a couple of goat units as well, I think Beaver was one that they did that on. But anywhere where they had a once in a lifetime, from where they were splitting due to crowding, they didn't want to separate the non-residents tags just so they could have two tags and have a bonus and a random. That was the purpose behind doing that.

Kevin Bunnell: That sounds correct. When you only have one tag it's completely random.

Covy Jones: I would say that whenever we have enough permits to allocate a non-resident permit, we will always work to allocate them, or with these split hunts, we'll always put them in one or the other. That is because just in case there is a chance that they hit that 10% mark and they have two, we'd hate to put on in both hunts. We always look to consolidate out of state permits wherever possible, but I haven't thought is this the rationale of letting them hunt both seasons on the Zion. And that is specific to the Zion.

Austin Atkinson: I guess back to my question, my concern would allow the non-residents to hunt the early hunt. If they're only going to be allowed one hunt, I understand that rationale, but not force a non-resident to hunt the later hunt and give a resident priority. If that makes sense. On season dates cause it's strictly split by season. Is there any reason we couldn't do that?

Covy Jones: You couldn't put them in the early hunt?

Austin Atkinson: Modify it. Cause the way it's written right now, they start on the later hunt.

Covy Jones: No there's no reason... I don't want to split them, but there's no reason that they couldn't go in the other hunt.

Austin Atkinson: Ok, thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Other questions from the RAC? Alright, I've only got a few comment cards. If there are any additional comment cards, please bring those forward. We'll start with Troy Justensen, after Troy we'll have Brian Johnson.

Comments from the Public

Troy Justensen: SFW. Riley, you understand that it's State Parks not National Parks, right? So you can't hunt Bryce Canyon even though it's in your backyard. We support the Divisions recommendations with the following exception. Once again we ask if we're going to have that late Muzzleloader season, that we keep it on the existing units. If this RAC decides to go with it and put on all general season units, we ask that we modify it today. That if that unit's not reaching buck to doe ratio, or if it's under objective, that we can go with the five permits vs. the .5. And also just to speak a little bit of the hams, pretty excited about that. With the advancement in technology today it's kind of fun to step back a little bit. And excited on these three specific areas just for the opportunity. Like Covy pointed out, some of it we haven't really been able to take advantage of it, because those animals aren't there at that particular time of the hunts. Some of the country like the one that's down on the Kaiparowits, it's not a lot of roads, you're going to have to strap it on and go. So we're pretty excited about that. Thank you.

Brian Johnson: Utah Archery Association (UAA). I would just like to ask the RAC to make the same recommendation on the clean skulls that they made during the plan. Also I would also like to ask the RAC to make a motion to combine that Willard Peak mountain goat hunt. It's going to be a long time before crowding is an issue up there with the data that they have. I think they'll agree with me on that. It's going to take a little while so it's not an issue, it will lengthen the season dates out a little. It'll even the draw odds out. And it will also keep the bonus point allocation a little more realistic as far as what tags can go where. And this is not part of the presentation, and it's not the right time to bring it up; and I realize that as I bring it up. But it's my public comment so I'm going to bring it up anyways. I think we missed an opportunity last month on the Mineral Mountains when we put a pile of sheep on there, and we didn't raise the mountain lion tags. I would really like to see this RAC, and I don't know how you can do it where it's not the right meeting, send a recommendation to the Board that we look at those mountain lions on the Minerals, and we made that a little more liberal on the take on mountain lions to protect that asset of those sheep that we just spent a lot of money putting up there, and a lot of effort. So that's my comments. Thanks.

Lee Tracey: Lee Tracy, I represent myself. I approve or support the presentation as presented. I have a couple of comments, maybe an answer to the gentleman's question about State Parks. I happened to be up there on family business just last week, and I dropped by the Parks and Recreation, and talk to them about it. I wanted a copy of the amendments and the changes and stuff like that, and I was told that that will be a 90-day process, which includes public input and some other stuff. So hang on for a couple more months and you'll get the information you need. Also on the archery units, the extended archery units, New Harmony is specifically private property. If you read the boundary they skip all the public property, and put in the private property. You're going to have to get permission or something. Thanks.

Clay Christensen: Clay Christensen I'm representing myself. I'd just like the RAC to really look into... I agree with the hams hunt, although I do oppose having the hams hunt on the Kaiparowits. My reasoning for that is, right now that unit is combined as the Boulder/Kaiparowits unit. My question for the Division would be, not for the hams but as a general season. As a general season unit it's combined Boulder/Kaiparowits. Is there much data specifically to the Kaiparowits on their deer numbers? The reason I ask that is, I think it's important to think about that before we just go ahead and pass that hunt. I'd just like you to look into that.

Brayden Richmond: Covy, did you have any concluding comments you'd like to make?

Covy Jones: No, I feel like we're good this time. Good comments, thanks everybody. Teresa has one/

Teresa Griffin: And Brian this is just in response to the Minerals. The plan wouldn't allow us to do more than double the permits, so we did double the permits. If we do start to see specific lion kills, Wildlife Services, they're actually working on one right now for us, so we have committed that we'll take action when we see the issues.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks. Comments from the RAC? And while I've got the hot mic I'm going to ask.. I was going to try and ask before Teresa went all the way back and sat down. I appreciate the.. and it is an interesting situation that Brian brings up, and one that I'm concerned with also, because this RAC did make a motion to increase those tags and I believe it was unanimous. At the time of that motion and at the time the Board meeting we didn't have sheep on the mountain. We now do and we've had one killed by a lion. Again this is not part of this discussion, but with your comment I am curious if you would... Based on your comment I guess I'm a little unclear. Would the Division oppose if we try to get some more tags still for that somehow? I am clear about what the plan says so I'm probably putting you in a weird spot here, maybe I don't want you to comment.

Teresa Griffin: We have to follow the plan.

Brayden Richmond: Teresa don't comment. Thank you for helping me out there. And that is an interesting one, I would suggest, I don't know how we want to deal with that one, but I would like to see it dealt with.

Covy Jones: And Teresa mentioned this, but just so the RAC knows, Mr. Chair, that we have asked Wildlife Services to target the areas where the sheep are hanging out. So we do have somebody active on the ground right now where the sheep are hanging out on this. I think if we made a mistake, and I made a mistake, I'll own it, maybe we should have done some work a few days before or a few weeks before we put the sheep out. But it's a hard time to kill cats right now too. We don't have great conditions. But we do usually work with Wildlife services to have some take before we put animals out, and we'll continue to do that. In addition to the permits.

Brayden Richmond: We are getting sidetracked. But I do have another question on that. My understanding is last year they ended up killing 10 cats on the Minerals, and five of those were on the last day. So it would appear to me that there are plenty of cats on there.

Covy Jones: Do you remember?

Brayden Richmond: The harvest objective, my understanding was that they filled the objective and then before they closed it, they hammered them. (Well that's exciting) It's exciting to me.

Kevin Bunnell: Brayden we'll check that data and Teresa will send you an email to confirm, we just don't have it in front of us.

Brayden Richmond: Alright, let's move on with other comments from the RAC, little distracted, but let's move on. Go ahead Riley. Kevin's right, let's summarize the public's comments here.

Kevin Bunnell: Well did you want me to summarize the public comments or review the online

comments, or both? (yes) Yes, ok. On this topic, for the southern region specific. 51% support, 31% oppose the proposal and 18% are neutral. From a statewide perspective, about the same; 54% support, 25% neutral, 21% opposed to the proposal. Pretty consistent there between the region and the state. As far as the comments we heard tonight, SFW supports the recommendations with the following exception, that we limit the late season muzzleloader hunts to the current units, or if that's not possible then limit them to 5 tags instead of the .5% on units that are below their buck to doe objective. Did I get that right? A request to address the CWD skull plate vs. skull issue as was done with the mule deer plan recommendations. Combine the Willard goat hunts to a single hunt. There was a question asked if there's data to support the hams hunt? And then concern expressed about cougars on the Mineral Mountains.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks for keeping me on track all night. Riley you had a comment.

Riley Roberts: Again Covy, well done, thank you for the information. I like this, I'm really excited about some of these things, some of the things we'll talk about in the next one with point creep. I think that some of these proposals address those with hams hunts, some of the late Muzzleloader hunts. We're not going to get away from point creep without thinking outside the box, and trying to do some of these things that we talked about for several years now. And I'm really excited about our sheep right now. Both our deserts and our bighorns, our rockies and our deserts. I'm really excited about that. I would also recommend that we modify our verbage for CWD skull, and also to combine those hunts on the Willard, and again I think you need to move that archery hunt for elk to the rut. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: I was one that did draw an archery tag for the big bulls last year. I had a ball and it was only my own inability of getting there. It was nice not to have a hundred other people out there in the middle of it, and I'd hate to have to chase bulls down after all the rifle hunts and whatever else. I can't even imagine that, but it would be fun to have them during the rut. I agree with that CWD, we've got to get that changed. That's my comment.

Brayden Richmond: If there's no other comments from the RAC, let's move forward. Let's do it the same as the last one. Let's look at individual comment and move forward with the remainder of the plan.

RAC discussion and vote:

MOTION to modify the restrictions on deer being transported into Utah from CWD positive states to read "clean skulls" instead of "clean skull plates".

Riley Roberts

Tammy Pearson, second

Passed unanimously.

MOTION to combine the Willard Peak Mountain Goat hunts into a single hunt.

Riley Roberts

Chad Utley, second

Passed 7 in favor, 2 opposed (Tammy Pearson and Gene Boardman opposed)

Tammy Pearson: I do have a little bit of issue of changing another reason thing when I know nothing about it. (They change our all the time) Well this is just the recommendation.

Brayden Richmond: I think that's always important to keep in mind as we make recommendations. We're not making the rules, we're just sending our recommendations to the Board. Sometimes I think we lose sight of that a little bit. Any other comments on this?

Covy Jones: If it's any consolation, that's fine, it's your job to change these things, but the other thing is that we've talked with the northern region and their biologists and they're fine with it as well, if that helps.

MOTION to accept the remainder of the Bucks, Bulls and OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented proposed plan as presented.

Chad Utley

Tammy Pearson, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION that the RAC review the number of Cougar permits on the Mineral Mountains and consider increasing the number of permits.

Tammy Pearson

Riley Roberts, second

Passed 8 in favor, 1 opposed. (Verland King opposed).

Just the comment that this was something that was discussed before that this is something that we would do already from this region. I just want to clarify that. That we would increase those tags as necessary once we did get sheep on those units.

Verland King: While we're at it, why don't we just increase the cougar tags across the state too?

Brayden Richmond: As much as I appreciate your thoughts, I don't think we'll get that one to go through. And we get made fun of enough up there at the wildlife meeting.

Verland King: Well if you're killing cougars that kill wildlife..

- **CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020 AND LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020 – Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brayden Richmond: We will open up from questions from the public. Just a quick comment, we don't have any comment cards on this, so if you do want to comment, hurry and submit a comment card, it will probably go quick. Questions from the public.

Questions from the public

Brian Johnson: The unit that had the enforceable boundary issue, has there been a trespassing issue with that or is it just hey this makes sense to add this to our unit?

Chad Wilson: It's more than it's been in practice that way since the inception. Box Elder is, I don't know if it's just a little different than the rest of the state, but they have..

Brian Johnson: We're south of I-70 so we're different than the rest.

Chad Wilson: So anyway they have grazing allotment and what not, so it's a cliffy area on top of the cliffs is fence. That fence for all practically, for all purposes has been the boundary, so it's to clean it up. It's an area where if a hunter could probably drop on in that little bit of public land, but when they get something, they're probably going into the CWMU.

Brian Johnson: So they're adding a permit, but it's going to the public?

Brayden Richmond: Do you need to fill out a comment card, Brian?

Brian Johnson: It's still a question.

Brayden Richmond: I know I'm just asking. Any other questions from the public?

Questions from the RAC

Gene Boardman: I am a little more understanding on this LOA stuff. The LOA gets say four permits, does the landowners get those, do they sell those, can they do either?

Chad Wilson: Yeah it's their choice. A lot of times they'll sell that permit.

Gene Boardman: And is that hunting exclusively on private land, or is it on the unit?

Chad Wilson: On the unit. They do have to allow access to their private land.

Gene Boardman: Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Bart do have a question?

Bart Battista: This is just for my information. In the northern region, for the Grass Valley/Clark Canyon, the moose went up an additional permit and the acreage increased around 550 acres, so is that a, they're seeing an increase in the numbers, or is that the number you say you increase 500 you get one more moose?

Chad Wilson: Yeah moose is kinda tricky because usually there's not a lot of permits for that, so it's a 60/40 split. So during the course of a three year application, a lot of times they'll have low numbers, those kind of just rotate. But if you did 10 moose over the three year period, there's going to be one year

that there's an extra moose tag. And I believe that is the case with this Grass Valley.

Bart Battista: Thanks.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Austin.

Austin Atkinson: Two quick questions. On the Henry Mountains, if I remember right, they used to alternate on how they got a tag, every other year or something. Are they just out? Like they didn't renew at all?

Chad Wilson: Right, they got one every three years and they just didn't ever turn in their application to renew.

Austin Atkinson: Then my other question is just a curiosity question, if you were going to adjust season dates pertinent to a CWMU, when would that be adjusted, is there a five year plan for CWMUs or how are those dates set?

Chad Wilson: Yeah it is set up in the rule. So it would be when the rule is opened back up again is when we could look at that.

Brayden Richmond: Any other questions from the RAC? I don't have any comment cards from the public. We don't have any comment cards to summarize. If you could review the online stuff for us Kevin, then we'll get into comments from the RAC.

Comments from the RAC

Kevin Bunnell: So the online comments on a statewide basis about 30% support, 52% neutral, and 18% opposed the recommendation. Southern region specific, 33% support, 54% neutral, about 14% oppose.

Tammy Pearson: I do say that the comments that we've had, I really appreciate. The ones that were thoughtful enough to give a solution. I mean it doesn't make any sense to be against it to me unless you have a reason to justify it. But I do appreciate their comments.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you.

Gene Boardman: I have no problem with the CWMU the way it goes. I might think that more public permits should be issued. There's one thing on the LOA permits, and it goes beyond the LOA permit. They're never shown on any document that's easy to read where your line for the Panguitch Lake unit says so many rifle permits in the draw, so many archery permits in the draw, it never does account for these permits. Not only the landowner permits, but the convention permits, the conservation permits and so forth. I'd really like to see that and any other permits that leak out of the system. I'd like to see it all on one line. So that when it says that there were so many permits on the Panguitch Lake unit, it includes every other permit so that we get the real picture. And if the Division could work on that I'd sure appreciate it.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Gene. Any other comments? Let's do the same with the other one. Let's

look at individual motion if we have them, if not, we can jump right in as presented. But are there any individual motions?

RAC discussion and vote:

MOTION to pass the CWMU Management Plan and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020 as presented.

Tammy Pearson

Verland King, second

Passed unanimously

- **PROPOSED RULE AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS POINT CREEP, LOST OPPORTUNITIES AND EQUITY IN THE HUNT DRAWING PROCESS – Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Questions from the Public

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Lindy. I had heard from other RACs that you did a great job with this presentation, because it was kind of confusing to read through it. And I'd agree with them. Questions from the public.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson the dumbest guy in the room. That's all I'm gonna say. What's the percentage of people turning these tags back in that have the maximum point for that specific hunt or draw? I hate to say max point, because it's 26, but it depends on the unit. But per that unit, what's the percentage of people turning in their tags that are guaranteed to draw next year?

Lindy Varney: It's around 57%.

Brian Johnson: So, a little bit more than half, but here are guys that...

Lindy Varney: Are max point holder for that unit that they drew out on.

Brian Johnson: Ok, that's good information.

Lindy Varney: When I say this it's limited entry, bucks and bulls, cougar, turkey, all limited entry and once in a lifetime species.

Brian Johnson: Perfect. This is, like I said, I have a lot of questions because we've been talking about point creep for a long time. This is great that you're addressing these issues. The next question I have is, what's the point of this rule? The 30 day part. Is it to reallocate the tag? Is that the primary purpose of coming up with this 30 day number?

Lindy Varney: For the 30 days itself, why we came up with that number instead of a different number? If you look at the data, yeah we can get those permits back out, but it's also because, if you surrender your permit more than 30 days, you get a refund, minus 25. So we've already put that number out to the

public, saying 30 days, get it in to us.

Brian Johnson: So the point is to reallocate the tag,

Lindy Varney: And to give opportunity to other hunters.

Brian Johnson: Not to punish the guy that's turning in the tag?

Lindy Varney: No, we want to give those permits back out. But the problem is, what like eight years ago we did the refund, because before we didn't do any refunds. We said, ok if you do the 30 days we'll give you a refund, minus the 25. And we're seeing that didn't stop the problem. So people are still surrendering it days before.

Brian Johnson: Absolutely, but..

Lindy Varney: I think there needs to be a little bit of..

Brian Johnson: So it is to punish the hunter?

Lindy Varney: Not as much as it is to get those tags back out. But there needs to be consequence for people surrendering there permits days before the hunt.

Brian Johnson: Absolutely, I have done it. Questions, I'm keeping it at questions. My next question is on purchasing an over the counter tag, would forfeit your preference points for example, I want to make sure I'm clear on this, if you were to buy a private lands cow elk tag, you would lose your preference point. Is that correct?

Lindy Varney: That is correct. That is how it is written in the rule right now. That's what I'm presenting.

Brian Johnson: See I kept that as a question guys, you're proud of me, I know you are. Then, would it make sense to combine the general season deer preference points and the dedicated hunter preference points because they are essentially the same thing now with your proposal.

Lindy Varney: So it is a possibility, it is doable. So what you're saying is not combine the points, but combine them as one hunt choice so when you go in you can pick your first choice as the dedicated hunter, the next choice as just the rifle hunt. It is doable, but it's not doable for 2020. Because...

Brian Johnson: It's probably a lot of work.

Lindy Varney: Well that, but we can't combine points. And the preference points for general season is different than the preference points for dedicated hunter. So it's two different preference points systems. You can get a dedicated hunter point, and a general season point. We can't combine those into one.

Brian Johnson : We can't combine those in 2020 or we can't combine those ever?

Lindy Varney: Ever. That's what my attorney said, not to combine them. Because if you combine them

now, people are jumping up, cause we'd have people with 10 points for dedicated hunter.

Brian Johnson: So maybe combined isn't the right word. Maybe just make equal. Like not one dedicated hunter point and one general season deer point equals two, but...

Lindy Varney: We'd have to think through that part, but as I said I've talked to our attorney, and what they would recommend that if we wanted to go down this route that we could give the public notice that this is happening, that we're going to combine it into one application, so use your dedicated hunter points, because moving forward in two years from now, this is no longer going to be able...

Brian Johnson: Burn them cause they're not going to be available.

Lindy Varney: Like I said, it is doable, but it would be a couple of years out.

Brian Johnson: Thank you, you cleared up some stuff for me. Thanks.

Lee Tracy: Lee Tracy. Are those expo tags considered public draw tags? or are we talking about the general public draw?

Lindy Varney: So for this variance request?

Lee Tracy: Alright. If I draw an expo tag, is that in this rule considered a public draw? (No) If I draw an expo tag, and a sportsman tag?

Lindy Varney: Not for the same species, no.

Lee Tracy: What about once in a lifetime species?

Lindy Varney: Not for the same species, but if you draw an expo desert you can still draw out on a rocky. It's different.

Lee Tracy: Alright, thanks.

Jason Aiken: Hi Lindy, Jason Aiken, a couple of questions. So this is a great presentation by the way, so thank you. But I wanted to ask, was all this and most importantly the variances but the recommendations to address point creep itself. Was that developed by a committee or by just you in general?

Lindy Varney: No, it was developed through the Division. We had members of different people from the Division come up with these recommendations. A lot of it was admin, but we also included the Wildlife section.

Jason Aiken: Okay are there any additional changes that you guys are currently working on?

Lindy Varney: It depends on what goes through, and what doesn't. I do have some different ideas on the drawing board. But those are down the road.

Jason Aiken: Just ideas, right?

Lindy Varney: They're just ideas they haven't been vetted, or worked through, they're just ideas.

Jason Aiken: Ok, that's perfect, thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: I think it's worth noting Jason that Lindy did this at the request of the Board. The Board directed us to come up with some options to address point creep.

Kenny???: On the general season, dedicated hunter spit, does that mean that for lifetime licence hunters they're not able to put in for dedicated..

Lindy Varney: They would have to pick.

Kenny: Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Any other questions from the public?

Brian Johnson: How many lifetime license holders apply for a dedicated hunter and a general season tag? Is it like 100, 200?

Lindy Varney: I have that, hold on. I just have to find my notes. It's a little over 100. It wasn't huge it was like 100-ish.

Brayden Richmond: Alright, questions from the RAC. Go ahead Tammy.

Questions from the RAC

Bart Battista: You already acknowledged that the losing your preference points if you turn in your permit within the 30 days is, there's a punitive incentive there, you're trying to incentivize not doing it. It seems pretty draconian for them to lose all of their points. Did you guys consider any other measures? You know delays, two year delays before you can apply again? Something else so it's not a loss of all those points?

Lindy Varney: We did talk about several different options, and this is the one that the Division felt would be most productive. So people would surrender their permit so we could get those permits back out. Most incentive idea. We did think of some other things, this is the most effective.

Bart Battista: What were some of the other things that you guys came up with.

Lindy Varney: Well there's the Arizona method, which is kind of like an insurance policy, where you can buy insurance so if you do surrender your permit, you can cash that in. We thought about that, or we thought about, docking 1, 2, 3, 4, depending. But that's hard because some people are surrendering when they only have 2 points, so how do you take that into account? We went through several different ideas.

Bart Battista: Okay, rounded percentage.

Brayden Richmond: Go ahead Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Okay I need to clarify on your over the counter permits. Would that also include landowner permits, not ones that you purchase from someone else, but people that legitimately have landowner permits.

Lindy Varney: Yes it would.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, I have a problem with that.

Lindy Varney: So the reason why we went with the landowner appreciation permits, to include those on the list is it's a unit permit. It's not just for the land that they own, they get to hunt the whole unit. That's why the Division decided to include those in the list of losing their preference points.

Chad Utley: First, I would like to say you're presentation was excellent, thank you. My question was on the surrender for military service. You're requiring that they notify you within the 90 days. If they're in active duty in the military, that may be impossible. Do you have any exceptions for that?

Lindy Varney: Yeah we would make exceptions for that. The ones that are on our desks are not military, I guess that they've always been able to get their orders into us, even when they are out of the US. Yeah, we would make exceptions if they were unable to get their military orders.

Chad Utley: Alright, that's all I have, thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Tammy did you have another question? Verland?

Verland King: So that permit that Tammy was talking about, it's called a landowner appreciation permit?

Lindy Varney: We have landowner permits and landowner appreciation permits. There's two different types.

Verland King: Say that again, I don't hear very well.

Lindy Varney: There are two different types of landowner permits that hunter with land can purchase. There's a landowner appreciation, and a landowner permit. Covy can explain the difference between the two.

Kevin Bunnell: I can explain it for you Lindy. The first is if you have 640 acres within the unit, every 640 acres you have or every section qualifies you for one permit. That takes care of larger land owners. We also have what we call the landowner appreciation permit, which are for smaller landowners that have irrigated pieces of land, and those can go down to 100 acres to qualify to the appreciation permits. But they have to be irrigated harvested lands. Cultivated harvested lands.

Verland King: Okay so in your presentation it doesn't say specifically on here that those would cause you to forfeit your points.

Lindy Varney: We consider them general season buck deer permits, because that's what we...

Verland King: Then take out the appreciation and the landowner. Alright.

Brayden Richmond: Any other questions? Go ahead Gene and then Bart.

Gene Boardman: Help me understand on this dedicated hunter situation. Presently a dedicated hunter can apply for a dedicated tag and can also apply for a general tag?

Lindy Varney: So what you can do, so currently if I'm not in the dedicated hunter program, I go into the application, I can select to be apart of the dedicated hunter program, I select the unit, and then pay the application fee of \$10. I also at the same time can go in and apply for a general season buck deer permit, and then pay the \$10 application fee for that one. Then when the draw happens, we do the dedicated hunter round first, so if you draw out on the dedicated hunter, you will accumulate a preference point for the general season permit because you were now unsuccessful, because you don't qualify. So then you accumulate a preference point for general season deer, so when you're done with the three year program, essentially you already have a point for general season deer so you can then apply for a dedicated hunter preference point, get the point and apply for general season. So it's a cycle that you keep doing over and over again and hunt every year if you're doing this. So these hunters are using this as a loophole to hunt every year.

Gene Boardman: Plus accumulate preference points every year.

Lindy Varney: Well, they can't once their in the dedicated hunter program, they can't accumulate.

Gene Boardman: Well now they could. Yeah, that needs to be cleaned up, that needs to be cleaned all the way up.

Bart Battista: So I have two questions. So for over the counter permit purchases, if you do that you surrender all of your preference points. What's the purpose for over the counter tags, aren't you trying to, you're encouraging additional take, so...?

Lindy Varney: So the leftover permits from the drawing, so what we've seen is when we changed the preference point structure in the draw, people are now only selecting one hunt choice because they'll just go buy an archery permit leftover because historically there have always been leftover permits for certain units. So what they're doing is they are purchasing, they're applying for their preferred hunt, like a rifle tag, and then when the draw is over with they will purchase an archery tag and go archery hunting, so they are still hunting that unit and when we changed the draw structure, our leftover general season permits went back up, and they're slowly going back up. So people are saying I'll pick one unit, and I've got a pretty good chance of getting an over the counter permit...

Bart Battista: But if the over the counter permits are so that you can meet your management objectives, you want people to do that, and now you're going to penalize them to help you meet your objective. I just don't understand that.

Lindy Varney: No matter what we'll sell those permits, it's just another way people try to go through the system. Get a point so they can hunt their preferred unit, and then take the chance of getting a general

season.

Bart Battista: Okay, second. So if you were to remove the permit quotas for youth and 65 and older. Obviously I don't fit into that category, but also I don't hunt, so. But if you're doing management buck deer hunts, I assume you have a quota you're trying to manage to. Will you have the quotas to you can exceed that number, so say if you've got 10 buck permits, you've got two to youth, two to 65 and older, six to everybody else. The six get pulled then you have unlimited, you could have 20 permits then for that management hunt, is that correct?

Lindy Varney: So I guess I'm kind of confused on the question.

Bart Battista: You say you will move the permit quotas to those two groups, so that means you can give as many as you want to those groups?

Lindy Varney: No, it just goes back to everyone that applies is treated equally just like a normal limited entry hunt. So this is the only limited entry hunt that has allocated permits to the youth or 65 and older. So we'll remove that and who ever applies will go through the draw..

Bart Battista: Okay so basically they all get lumped together. Ok, alright. I misunderstood. Thank you.

Austin Atkinson: Quick question, when would that waiting period start on buck deer? I've had a few guys ask if they're already in the waiting period, does it...

Lindy Varney: It would start in 2020. Whoever is on one now would be grandfathered in to the two year. So if you drew out in 2020 you would start a five year. So we would have some in a two year, then starting this year, 2020 it would be a five year.

Austin Atkinson: One more question on the alternate list, if a bonus tag is returned, we don't have a lot of transparency about whos on this alternate list, where you rank. Can you tell me if a bonus tag is returned, is it allocated to next in line bonus?

Lindy Varney: It is not. Because it would be an administrative nightmare to do that. And the reason why is when you do the drawing, we do the bonus point round first, and whoever doesn't draw on the bonus point round, goes back into the regular round. And some of those people draw out in the regular round so we would have to look at every single person that drew a permit and see if they drew in the regular round, bonus round, and have two different alternate lists. At the magnitude of permits that are getting surrendered, we wouldn't be able to get the permits back out if we had to look at every single permit that way. But the nice thing is a lot of those max point holders are on top of those lists because they do have a lot of points. A lot of them do have low draw numbers.

Austin Atkinson: Just to clarify, system consultants can not provide you with that.

Lindy Varney: No they can. We've just chosen not to. We've chosen just to the regular list that was done in the regular round.

Austin Atkinson: It does not address point creep in the sense that it's taken the next guy in line and killing his points. It's pulling some random person and killing their points.

Lindy Varney: Yep.

Austin Atkinson: Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Riley.

Riley Roberts: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a couple questions and echo everyone else. Great presentation, this is something that we've talked about for several years and have been excited for. My questions are both really about the process that you went through on this and the first one is you talked a little about some of the neighboring states, Arizona in particular and their insurance that you can get. Which any of us that can do it, we buy it, we're participants in that. They also do a one time opt out, was that a discussion and if so how did that go?

Lindy Varney: It was a draw on the table. We looked at all the western states to see what everyone did. That was discussed. Arizona doesn't have the number of permits surrendered that we do. Like I said last year we had almost 800 permits surrendered just for limited entry and once in a lifetime, that doesn't include general season permits. So if you throw that into the mix, you're over 2,000 permits getting surrendered into the Division in a two and a half month time period. So we wanted to do what was best for our hunters and what the Division could handle. So that's the reason we went with the option we went with.

Riley Roberts: And then the second is just a follow up to that. Obviously this will go ahead and if there are some kinks or different stuff, what do you foresee will happen to get more aggressive on that? It looks to me that perspective is it hits a lot on the general and some on the limited entry, which definitely has to happen. We do have the percentages that are probably quite a bit higher with your point creep on your limited entry than the general, and again that doesn't really matter, but what will have to happen before we need to get more aggressive? Is it going to be a social thing, or?

Lindy Varney: It's something we are going to monitor. But yeah maybe social. All of these proposals I'm making to you tonight is social, more of a social. It could turn biological, if we're not meeting management, you know harvest. But if we wanted to get more aggressive it would be social.

Riley Roberts: Alright hopefully not this late, but thank you very much.

Brayden Richmond: Any other questions? We do have some comments from the public.

Comments from the public

Lee Tracey: Lee Tracy. I support the program as presented with one exception. I would like to see the expo drawing be included with the general drawing and the sportsman drawing for the purpose of the one species per year, once in a lifetime species. In other words I think the expo is promoted as a public draw in my mind. And anybody can do it with the stipulation that they have to verify it up there and so forth. But it's promoted as a public draw and I would like to see it listed as a public draw in that proposal. Thanks.

Jeremy Anderson: Jeremy Anderson, Mule Deer Foundation (MDF). As echod and was said multiple times. Well done Lindy, that was a lot of work to you and your team, thank you for that. This is all about, well not all about, but essentially it's about point creep, and this is a good start. There's obviously a lot more to be done but this is an amazing tool that she's got. So MDF supports this in full.

Jason Aikin: Jason Aikin. Troy asked me to comment from SFW standpoint on this. SFW supports the Divisions recommendation with the exception of one thing, and that thing is the dedicated hunter not being able to apply for both. The dedicated hunter program is a great program. It offers up opportunity for people to get involved and do projects and be involved with volunteer work, that kind of stuff. There's been some great things done with it, so taking that away from them and making them pick one or the other, we feel like it would be a little bit detrimental to the dedicated hunter program itself, so we didn't want to lose sight of what that program was built for, and that was made for people that want to come and help and participate in that. We didn't want to take away that opportunity. Now that was SFW. Me and myself I like the recommendation, I think point creep is a huge topic of discussion across the board. What Lindy has come up with today, it's genius, whatever she does is going to have an effect on point creep. The question is, how much? Is it really going to have an effect? My thoughts are this is just going to be a drop in the bucket, but I'm sure she's going to bring a lot more stuff. I'm excited to see what else get presented in the future. One thing I wanted to talk about was the antlerless hunts, especially the private land tags. The Division came up with that idea several years ago to put people on private land, on unit to get cows off of private land and to harvest antlerless animals to help control the population. By taking away their point, you're kind of taking them out of the draw for next year if they are going to try to hunt somewhere else. I feel like we're maybe overstepping that just a little bit, maybe pull some of those antlerless ones out. If we're issuing antlerless tags over the counter, it's because we want those animals harvested and we don't want to punish somebody by taking away their points for buying that tag. We want them to go out there and hunt it. Maybe take the 30 day rule, with turning your tag back in, it might be a little bit of an overstep by taking away all their points. I just feel like it might be a little bit of an over step. I feel like you've got a better opportunity to reissue that tag, if that tag is in your hands. In my mind, you still want to give them some type of incentive to turn that tag back in, even if it is only 10 or five days prior to the hunt, you've got a better chance reissuing it if it's in your hands vs. if it's still in the guys hands that says well I'm just not going to be able to go hunt, so I guess I'll just put this in the dresser drawer and call it as it is and not be able to go. I think there should be a little more of an incentive to turn their tag back in, even within that 30 day range. Then one thing that was just brought up about allocating the tags turned back in. The topic of discussion is point creep and when a tag is reallocated it sounds like it's just sent to the random draw application and somebody who might have had 20 points who drew that tag might turn around and that tag be given to someone who has two points. That's not a bad thing. I appreciate that we're going to be able to get somebody back out in the field, but if we're trying to address point creep, shouldn't we be pulling from the top? Even if it was somebody that had two points that turned the tag back in, shouldn't it be given to somebody that's got the higher points to help address point creep. Not for any other reason, just that reason to address point creep. So maybe switching that alternating list to the bonus point round vs the random draw. Thanks again.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson Utah Archery Association. They support the recommendation with a few exceptions. One that if the purpose of the 30 day rule is to reallocate the tag then we shouldn't punish the person turning the tag in and they should get their point back for that year if they turn the tag in prior to the 30 days. After the 30 days, we're ok with them losing their point. I just think that if the purpose is to truly reallocate the tags, then I really think that there should be a reason to get that back. I remember when they instituted that refund. I sat in that chair down at the end and said, the moment moneys not an

issue, the people with max points don't care about the \$408. They just don't. What they care about is their point. If you want them to turn that in on time to reallocated it, just put a date out there, 30, 40, 60 days, but still allow them to maintain their point, and you'll solve the problem. I understand that you're taking out a little bit of wrath on a guy that draws the Henry Mountain deer tag 10 years in a row and turns it in, and rightfully so. That's ridiculous and he hands it in the day before. I love the idea of putting a time frame on it. I don't necessarily love the idea of punishing him. The next thing I want to address is the UAA is opposed to over the counter tags that are purchased, losing your preference points, specifically that private lands elk tag. Guys, we said that here in this meeting, and it came out of this RAC over and over again until we got that hunt. And the hunt was specifically for the Zion unit, other units too, but the hunt was specifically to give landowners a tool to get elk off their property. We've got to remember that we want to kill these animals. We're trying to kill these elk. Please don't punish that poor guy that has an opportunity to hunt 1,100 acres on the Zion unit that he may or may not see an elk on. Cause chances are, you just never know how that goes. UAA is opposed to the general season and dedicated hunter rule, until you can combine or do something like we talked about in my questions. Thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: I'll just cover the southern region internet comments because they are almost identical to the state wide. 53% of the people commented support the recommendation, 23% opposed and 24% were neutral.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you, one additional comment I would make, I'm actually surprised that we didn't have more people for this, but it is 11:00. We did get a lot of emails and a lot of feedback on this subject, almost as much as on the mule deer plan, so I would encourage us to remember what we got in those emails. As I talk to people I always encourage them to please send an email. We take your emails serious, so even though we don't have a lot of public here like we did for the mule deer plan, let's remember those comments. We give it back to you Lindy, if there's anything more you would like to comment and add prior to the RAC.

Lindy Varney: Covy wants to say something.

Covy Jones: I am going to get told to sit back down. Mr. Chair with your permission, I'd like to comment on this.

Brayden Richmond: Absolutely.

Covy Jones: It's a package deal. And what we're really trying to address is the fact we want the people of Utah to be able to hunt as frequently as they can. And that means that each aspect of this affects somebody. The private lands tag affects somebody. If a landowner chooses to redeem, that effects that landowner, but what it ends up being, is we all give a little bit. And everybody in our state hunts a little more. So this is given as several different things and I understand that it's a little bit of a mix with limited entry people turning permits in, it's a little bit of general season, taking points. but at the end of the day, the things it's trying to address is everything the same. If we pick it all apart and make exceptions for this and that and the other, we end up with something that accomplishes nothing. If you hunt, basically, if you chose to hunt and if you draw, you burn your points, and you start back out and begin again. But it's all your choice. There are exceptions for injury, illness, deployment, death, there are exceptions for all of those. So the only thing we're affecting is your choices as a hunter. If you choose to do this, you lose your points. If you want to buy a private lands tag, you lose your points. If you want to redeem a private

land, landowner appreciation permit, and hunt that unit, not just your private property, you lose your points, you want to buy a voucher, lose your points. I mean we get told all the time, it's not fair we have this point creep, we have these issues, and we see it coming, and it's a lot worse than what we're presenting tonight. It's a pyramid, right? So right now if you're at the top you're drawing permits and things are good and happy, but you're going to enter back in at the bottom. So that's what we're trying to address, that's what I wanted to say.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Covy.

Comments from the RAC

Riley Roberts: Thank you Mr. Chair. Again, this is something that I've been excited for for a long time. In fact I think it came from the RAC several times, that we wanted this to be a motion and be something we discussed and talked about, and as I read through this the only part I had a sticking issue with at first was having to choose between dedicated hunter, or general. As I've read all the comments, as I've thought about it, that was me being selfish because I've played that game. And the reality is that was probably an oversight on the Divisions part when we started that. Just because I want to play that game, even though I don't like it, it's probably the right thing. I support this as presented unless you want to make it stricter and then I will support that. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Riley. Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: I've got a couple of things, I do have some issue with the percentage of our youth and the 65 and older. I still think there should be a way of fixing that. I wasn't really, and maybe you could clarify by what you meant when you couldn't...

Lindy Varney: So, If you look on the screen, this is 2019, this is how it played out. When people applied in the drawing, they thought that 30% went to the youth, 30% went to 65 and older, and 40% of the quota goes to everyone else. If you look on the Henry's, the archery hunt and the muzzleloader there was only two permits. So we weren't able to issue 30% of that quota to the youth, or to those that are 65 and older, even though they applied thinking that we would have that quota for them. So it was kind of false when they applied. So as these hunt keep getting divided out to different weapon types, or as the permits keep getting cut, we're not able to issue those permits. So that's the reason we recommend removing that allocation and just making it, those two permits will go to everyone that applies to that hunt. Just like as it went through the drawing. So then hunters aren't assuming that there's a permit allocated to them.

Tammy Pearson: So what you're saying is like you had 10 kids applied for archery or something.

Lindy Varney: Or like hundreds of kids applied for archery and we only had...

Tammy Pearson: I guess I should have asked is you only have so many tags period and that's why that's not. And that's across the board as far as limited entry.

Kevin Bunnell: I think the important thing to remember on this is, this is only management buck hunts. This only applies to about 200 tags statewide to the 200,000 tags that are.. I mean it's a very very small

number or percentage of tags.

Brayden Richmond: Any other comments from the RAC? Go ahead Chad.

Chad Utley: I would just like to say this seems to address an abuse of the process that's been rampant. Even if it was legal, it appears to me that a lot of the surrender issues were unethical when you're trying to get out of that. So I don't think it's draconian at all, I think it's addressing those abuses of process and those consequences seem appropriate.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Chad. Gene?

Gene Boardman: I think this is all really good and I think you've gone through a lot of work. I think it just barely scratches the surface, of looking at the whole point creep in the system. Now I don't know where we're going to find a better system and I don't know if this system is going to float, but point creep is a real problem. Just saving one point on bighorn sheep don't help much to the kid who applies for the first time and he can look forward to being assured to draw a permit in 182 years. I'm really appalled with some of the excuses that you're presentation has brought up about why people turn in their tags, and expect that they're going to get it next year after all the effort and all the people that are standing in line. Some of those excuses are pretty dog gone lame and it's a way to abuse the system. I'm glad you're taking care of that. I'd like to address the dedicated hunter thing. The first place these dedicated hunters have a really sweet deal. A dedicated hunter in three years of the program can hunt 126 days. Well I can hunt nine days over that same three year period. And tell me they need more opportunity that that. And they can add points and draw on the year that they don't kill a deer and gosh I could go on forever with that system. I hope that's cleaned up. While I'm on dedicated hunter I wanted to just spill my guts for a minute. I went to the dedicated hunter projects today on the internet. You know you can go to the regions and there isn't one damn project on there that has to do with deer. If you look at all of them, it would be stretching it to have 40% of those projects that go to deer, yet all the reward comes out to deer. Then you've got the other little thing that they said it will just be a little bit, but maybe we've got to let some of the dedicated hunter buy their point. We'll their buying their points in pretty big numbers.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Gene. Austin?

Austin Atkinson: Lindy I appreciate all of your hard work on that like everyone else has said, and I might be a little bit biased as I get to spend my day job studying point systems and studying how application process, so I probably have too much of an opinion that reading public comments that have been sent to me, I feel like this does address those, call it 1,000 guys that are abusing the system at the top of the pool. I feel like we've taken it maybe two steps where maybe one step of not adding a point for the following year would have solved that for those guys, because if they fall back a year they'll no longer draw out on the max draw if there are that few people in that draw. By taking all of their points away, I think it takes us up to a lot of problems that we've seen in other states where you've got guys going to the Board meetings asking for variances, for reinstatements of points. You see guys refuting credit card charges in May, when you try to charge them, and you create a lot more issues on guys trying to get their points back for other reasons that don't meet the medical or death, injury. I would be an advocate for not.. a guy that turns his permit in within 30 days or whatever it is, that he still get a point for that year. We do apply in February and March, we don't even know the tag numbers when we apply, the sad thing is life does happen, things do change. I know this varies based on who the comment comes from. We get comments from the guys that are at the bottom of the point pool and man we just want

those guys with points to go away, but if you're at the top of the point pool, you're very serious about the two decades worth of points that you have. I think we need to take those guys that even though they're few, into consideration and say maybe we go to a Colorado type of situation where we go back to the points you used to draw that tag. You don't gain a point, but you don't lose them all. I would ask my fellow RAC members to think about that, if something comes up and life happens, do you want to be out of all of those points? For the guys that are not abusing the system but they are getting close to that season date, do we take all of his years of investment that he purchased?

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Austin. Other comments? Bart.

Bart Battista: I would echo that. I think that there needs to be some, obviously some sort of incentive to turn in, you know 30 days early so it can be reallocated. You take all of the points away, it doesn't seem... I don't think it's right. I assume that some of the comments are probably in the inflammatory ones that are received and make the best supporting arguments for a position. So I think something less than all of those points. And the other one that I still really don't think that we should recommend would be to lose all of your preference points for an over the counter tag. We're helping the Division meet management objectives, that to me doesn't seem fair.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Bart. Any other comments? Let's go ahead and try to get some motions on the table then. We'll entertain individual motions.

MOTION to accept the Proposed Rule Amendments to Address Point Creep, Lost Opportunities and Equity in the Hunt Drawing Process as presented.

**Riley Roberts
Chad Utley, second**

MOTION to amend the proposal to not lose points for purchasing Over The Counter permits.

**Bart Batista
Gene Boardman, second**

Tammy Pearson: What's your point of clarification, you don't lose any points?

Bart Battista: Correct, or you could lose one for that year, the one gained. But to me you are helping meet a management objective, so you shouldn't be penalized.

Brayden Richmond: The motion was that you could purchase over the counter tag without losing your preference points. That was the motion that was seconded, or the amendment that was seconded.

Tammy Pearson: And that's specifically the landowner over the counter tags, right?

Brayden Richmond: Any over the counter tag.

Tammy Pearson: I just want to make sure we're all clear on this.

Brayden Richmond: He said over the counter tags so that would be..

Bart Battista: It's for the recommendation of you will forfeit your preference points of almost any over the counter purchase with a few exceptions. That's on page 14 of the packet.

Tammy Pearson: Okay.

Bart Battista: Top slide, third bullet down.

Kevin Bunnell: So Tammy, that recommendation is specific that don't get taken to the draw, they were over allocated, we didn't have enough people apply for the tags so they are then offered over the counter. Not landowner permit tags, tags that are under subscribed for in the draw that then go on sale over the counter. Correct, Lindy?

Lindy Varney: It's any permit that you purchase, is what I'm recommending. Any permit, if it's landowner, if it's CWMU for cow elk.

Kevin Bunnell: But the over the counter portion is for undersubscribed..

Lindy Varney: Yeah, or if you buy a landowner appreciation permit.

Kevin Bunnell: So all of that comes from the over the counter portion.

Lindy Varney: Yeah, you buy anything over the counter...

Kevin Bunnell: Ok, strike everything I just said and listen to Lindy.

Lindy Varney: If you purchase a permit over the counter, you will lose your preference points if that species has a preference points attached to it. So not like general season elk because we don't have general season elk preference points. But if you purchase a landowner appreciation permit, you have general season deer preference points, you'll lose those points. That's what we're presenting tonight.

Riley Roberts: Mr. Chair, I have several comments, First my motion, was not with any amendments. Second, I would caution that when you make an amendment like that, specifically this one, what Covy said it muddies the water. The way that the Division has presented this, we're not cutting pieces out of this for special interest groups of any sort, this keeps it on a level playing field for everyone. It gives everyone that same opportunity and we're not taking away their choice, we're not taking away free agency if you will, they still can choose what they want to do, where they purchase, where they hunt, where they want to apply, and I would caution against going for that amendment.

Brayden Richmond: Any other comments?

Bart Battista: I mean I guess my response to that would be, you know if the population of species is as sensitive as we seem to be saying, and requires the management and the management practices of the Division, then when they sell them over the counter, they want that because they are trying to meet objectives. It's not to a specific group, or a special interest group. Well the special interest in that case is

the Division. If we disincentivize people for going for that, then they're not going to be able to meet their incentives.

Brayden Richmond: Thanks Bart. Austin?

Austin Atkinson: I just wanted to comment back on your amendment, Bart, and kind of clarify it as I understand it. Really what this addresses is double dipping, as I would call it. Guys that are building points and purchasing over the counter tags while still building points. These tags are still going to be sold, there are plenty of people to buy them, and there are plenty of people to go hunting. They're not going to sit in the quota forever just because they burned their points. There are still hunters and sportsmen that will buy these tags, it's just not the same people that are building points waiting for limited entry stuff.

Riley Roberts: Thank you for that clarification. I echo that.

MOTION to amend the proposal to not lose points for purchasing Over The Counter permits.

Bart Batista

Gene Boardman, second

Failed 2 in favor, 7 opposed. (Tammy Pearson, Verland King, Chad Utley, Riley Richmond, Austin Atkinson, Sean Stewart, Sean Kelly opposed).

Kevin Bunnell: So we're now back to the original motion to accept the presentation as presented, unless there is an additional amendment that anybody wants to propose.

Brayden Richmond: Any additional comments on the, to accept as presented?

Tammy Pearson: I do still think that there needs to be a way to put.. instead of putting those extra tags back into the general draw, I think there should be a way of putting those with more points. I know you said that's complicated. We've got computers, it should be a simple fix. There should be a pot that's got those extra points. That's my only issue really.

Brayden Richmond: Thank you. Any additional comments?

MOTION to accept the Proposed Rule Amendments to Address Point Creep, Lost Opportunities and Equity in the Hunt Drawing Process as presented.

Riley Roberts

Chad Utley, second

Passed 7 in favor, 2 opposed (Bart Battista and Austin Atkinson)

Brayden Richmond: We're on the last one, Lindy I'll give it back to you.

Kevin Bunnell: Ok, Mr. Chairman, this one is just informational, no comments afterwards, just questions.

Brayden Richmond: The RAC can't comment on it?

Kevin Bunnell: The RAC can comment and ask questions.

Lindy Varney: Okay, last one for the night.

- **Big Game Application Timeline INFORMATIONAL - Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator**

See Slideshow

Brayden Richmond: Thank you Lindy. I know this is an informational, I do have a couple of comments on it this then we'll open it up to the rest of the RAC. This is the one that kind of erks me a little bit. On this chart, sorry, and I don't want to throw anyone under the bus or make enemies, I know you put a lot of work into this. On this chart I work with very large construction projects. I also do a lot of process implementation using different kind of projects and charts. One of the tactics that is used across the board is people fill up their chart with task to show that you can't change schedules. On this chart I just don't see that there is a critical path presented on here, so this chart isn't really helping me. I need to see the critical path so I know what can and can't move. I'm aware and comfortable that there are a million things going on, a million components, but without a critical path it doesn't help me. Your example, going back to the presentation, and I didn't bring it up in that presentation because my concern really is based on this presentation. You brought up your boy that put in for the archery tag on the management hunt. That's the perfect example of why we want these dates pushed back the application date. If your boy was able to see that he can't have that tag, he would have known ahead of time. Last year we had a very big swing in some bison hunts that a lot of people thought they had opportunity at, and they didn't. We have that every year to different degrees. We've asked for this several times and the Board asks the Division to come up with some solutions for this, this strikes me as coming back and saying all the reasons why we can't do it, instead of this is how we could do it. And that's frustrating to me. I do have one question, your third option, I do see that as a viable option. Could you help me understand why that's not your recommendation?

Lindy Varney: Well that shouldn't have been printed. There are some options that we can do, it makes it hard is move it to February and close it before the RAC. We did talk about this. We can, it just makes it harder. Hopefully we could get them posted by May 31st. This was just let's think of something we could do, it puts the application closing, I hate using this as an example, spring break. We already have issues with RAC members being around town on Spring Break. What happens if people miss the application period? The next thing is we get about, say the last 10 days of the application period, we only have permit numbers, my hesitation on doing something like that is what kind of volume of apps are we going to have the last 10 days. Or what kind of people are going to withdraw and resubmit their application because they change it. That was one reason why I wanted to let people modify their apps. But not making everyone pay \$10 and resubmit because we have recommendation out. Again, they're draft. They're what's proposed and that right there can still cause issues. Because as we know permits still get cut. Is it doable, yeah it's doable. Not for 2020. Everything's already been set in place. But that's why we would love to look at technology, look at e-tagging, cause this is more like ok we can handle because we would have permit numbers sooner than the last 10 days before that closes. That last 10 days we might end up having 3/4s of our applicant the last 10 days and then why not just have the draw open, the application period open for 10 days then?

Brayden Richmond: I agree with you let's do it over 10 days and know the numbers, I agree.

Lindy Varney: I don't think my directors office will like that.

Brayden Richmond: I actually have, and I believe he's planning on commenting, if not, I'm going to put him on the spot, but we have an expert on draws on the RAC with us and why this is an informational subject, I'd love to hear your thoughts on this Austin. Across the board, everyone else tells us what you can put in for.

Austin Atkinson: Generally, that's true. I mean there are other states that work off of last years quotas when you're applying, so you don't know, my biggest headache that you deal with everyday, is we apply non residents in Utah based off a Y or N which is a yes or a no in the recommendation. That does not help our point creep issue among non-residents at all. It bites us all the time thinking there's going to be two permits or three saying I'm going to grab that bonus permit because I have maximum points and then we approve permit recommendations of one. Now it goes random, he doesn't draw, he gains a point and point creep goes on forever and ever.

Lindy Varney: I probably have the same conversations and issues. They're calling you and they're calling me.

Austin Atkinson: I would like to see it where we have some numbers, I know there are a lot of moving parts if we have to look back a full year and make them off of the year before. I think that's an option, but that's a big can of worms for a lot of our management plans.

Brayden Richmond: Just to be clear, I don't like that option. I am not saying I have the magic solution, but boy do we have a problem right now.

Lindy Varney: Me personally, I would love to apply with permit numbers, for my sons sake. Completely different. Maybe when e-tagging comes to place. Not maybe, but that's kind of the thought. When we talk to wildlife section in the director's office is saying let's put some things in place and then let's evaluate it and see where we can cut, and see where we can add more time. Hopefully, cause like I said things are already in place for 2020, hopefully in maybe 2021, who knows we may have some of those processes in place.

Austin Atkinson: Real quick Lindy. When you said that the ability to modify application which passed earlier, you don't see that as being able to modify after March 19th?

Lindy Varney: Yeah, that would have to be during the application period, while it's open.

Austin Atkinson: You don't have to waste the \$10 anymore. But not modifying after the 19th?

Lindy Varney: No. Once its closed, it's closed and you're done, because then we start our process of analysing everything.

Austin Atkinson: Ok, and one more question. How long are you stuck with system consultants or how long is that contract?

Lindy Varney: We have five more years.

Brayden Richmond: It's apparent to me that the RAC wants to leave so I won't belabor this point. I do appreciate the work that is done, I hope that this is not a dead issue.

Lindy Varney: No, it's not, and that's one thing that, before you all adjourn and leave, this is not a dead issue. We want to make sure that we have the best draw out there and hopefully in the next year or two we can make it more accommodating with permit numbers or the length of time. It's not dead.

Brayden Richmond: I think with that we can adjourn. We'll see you in a couple of weeks to talk about bears.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Southeast Regional Advisory Council

**John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah**

Nov. 20, 2019

Motion Summary

Approval of agenda and minutes

**MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes as written
Motion passed unanimously**

Deer Management Plan

**MOTION: to change the buck to doe ratio to 18-20 on the San Juan/Abajo unit
Passed/Failed: Passed
Supporting: 5
Opposed: 2
Abstaining: 3**

**MOTION: Accept the remainder of the plan
Motion Passed
Supporting: Unanimous**

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Updates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

**MOTION: to not pass the extended archery hunt proposed in the Green River valley
Motion Passes/Failed: Passed
Supporting: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstaining: 2**

**MOTION: to change the verbiage in the state wide mule deer plan so that late season muzzleloader permits can be UP TO ½ percent of the total permits, in all units.
Motion Passes/Failed: Passed
Supporting: 9
Opposed: 0
Abstaining: 1**

**MOTION: Accept the remainder of the plan
Motion Passed
Supporting: Unanimous**

**CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association
Permit Numbers for 2020**

MOTION: Due to lack of information, pass the CWMU operators' requests on to the Wildlife Board

Motion Passed
Supporting: 6
Opposed: 1
Abstention: 3

MOTION: Accept the remainder of the plan

Motion Passed
Supporting: Unanimous

Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process

MOTION: For OIAL and limited entry permits, change the penalty of someone turning in a tag <30 days, to losing a point and incurring a one year waiting period

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed
Supporting: 7
Opposed: 1
Abstaining: 2

MOTION: Accept the remainder of the plan

Motion Passed
Supporting: 9
Abstaining: 1

Town of Castle Valley Request

MOTION: to accept the Town of Castle Valley's proposed hunting restriction, with the inclusion of shotguns and cleaning up the verbiage so that it doesn't contradict existing state laws.

Motion: Passed
Supporting: 7
Opposed: 3

Southeast Regional Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah

Nov. 20, 2019 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

Trisha Hedin, Chairman
Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman · Public at large
Scoot Flannery · Sportsmen
Dana Truman · BLM
Hellene Taylor - Agriculture
Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor
Brad Richman
Darren Olsen
Eric Luke
Gerrish Wills
Jace Guymon
Kirk Player

Total public attendance

25

Others in attendance

DWR personnel: 14

1) Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure

- Trisha Hedin, Vice chairman

Welcome to the Southeastern Region RAC. We really appreciate everybody coming and willing to share their comments and/or questions as we move through our objectives. One thing I want to note is that if you do want to make comments, there are comment cards in the back and you need to fill one out and bring it forward to either Aaron or Chris. So, if you want to make a comment, we will have to have a card. The goal this evening is, I think it's a really great thing in the state of Utah that we have a Division of Wildlife Resources that is willing to listen, to put our objectives out on the plate and willing to listen to public comment and take that comment into place as we move to the state wildlife board. I will tell you and I feel very adamant about this that the state wildlife board really takes into account public comment. So, we really appreciate you guys being here. We know what it takes to be here. Our RAC is all volunteers so, we are here to do the same thing. One thing I did want to state is that please take into account that the way that this works is, you will see a presentation by the DWR, once the presentation is made we

will have questions from the audience. Then you are allowed to make comments and then the RAC will deliberate and make comments themselves before we make a final motion that will be passed onto the state wildlife board. Please make sure that you follow those procedures. So, if you feel the need to make a comment in the audience, those comments will not be validated. It's better to just follow the procedures. Your comments will be heard at that time. We have quite an agenda tonight and the goal is to move through that effectively. All of the other RAC's meetings have been extensive. So, our goal is to move through this as effectively and efficiently as possible. Also note that a lot of your concerns are probably brought to light in the other RAC's and those will be taken to the state wildlife board. I won't go through the introduction process but please note that our regional RAC, you have people here that are representing many different stakeholders so we have, at large but we also have people that are representing the BLM, Forest Service, agriculture, sportsmen, non-consumptive, so those individuals are put into place to represent you as citizens of the state of Utah.

2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Trisha: I'm going to move right into the agenda. We have an approval of minutes from the last meeting. Do I have a motion? We have a motion by Kent Johnson, do I have a second? Second by Eric Luke. All in favor? Passes.

One thing I failed to mention is, when you do come up to the microphone to ask questions or give comments, please make sure you are speaking into the microphone. We've had some mumbling issues in the past. Now, I have approval of minutes. (I think this was supposed to be approval of the agenda.) We don't have any old business.

VOTING

Motioned by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Eric Luke

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed. Unanimous

Opposed:

Motioned by: Dana

Seconded by: Kent Johnson

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed. Unanimous

Opposed:

3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update

- Trisha Hedin, RAC chairman

The last board meeting, we really just had some fishing recommendations and the bighorn sheep management plan. Nothing really stuck out to me. It was a two-hour meeting. We didn't even get lunch if that makes you happy. So, I have a regional update by Chris Wood, our regional supervisor.

4) **Regional Update**

- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Trisha is right, the meetings this week have been a beast, 5-6 hours long. I'm hoping Trisha is going to run a really efficient meeting and get us out of here. If there are any RAC members that would like to stay in a hotel, please do and we'll reimburse you. Also, in the back here there are refreshments. There are drinks, some cappuccino's, Red Bull, soda, stay alert and drink throughout the night and snacks too. That is for the audience too. Even division employees, you're welcome to the snacks. There is a bathroom here. It's upstairs in this corner of the building.

It's a busy time of year. Our aquatics section has been doing some gill netting. This wiper right here was caught at Huntington North State Park. We caught it in a gill net. It was still alive so we were able to release it. It is a state record. So, go to Huntington North and try to catch that fish.

It's a busy time of year for our habitat section as well. They are doing a lot of habitat restoration projects. There is a project at Miller Creek on the Emery/Carbon County line. They are installing BDA's, which is beaver dam analog structures. Basically, it simulates a beaver dam by backing up water and allows riparian vegetation to grow to restore riparian areas. They are also actively restoring and doing a project on Cold Springs. It's a WMA in Carbon County on the Tavaputs. They are using a chaining type contraption to restore Aspin. It's pretty interesting stuff.

Our law enforcement is busy as well. There are several cases that they are following. A bear case is a big one they have going on. But here is something interesting, we just got approved from our department to start using tasers. So, we ordered all the tasers for the officers and there will be training and in a few months from now they will have tasers. We're progressing. Beards and tasers. That's kind of fun.

Conservation outreach has had several events. We had a mule deer watch at Nash Wash last week and we had great attendance there. People came from all over the state. We're also busy working in schools and different career events and working with USU Eastern as well.

Our wildlife section just finished bighorn sheep flights and survey work. Right now, they are beginning their capture season. So, we'll be capturing bighorn sheep and taking blood from bighorn sheep so we can understand the disease profile of each unit. We'd like to invite all of you to be a part of our capture work on mule deer. Those are all the dates and locations. They are all very tentative dates because weather can trigger delays at any time. We capture mule deer, put radio collars on them, look at pregnancy rates, take fat measurements. It's for our (?) studies and our migration initiative. If you are interested in those dates talk to the biologist in the back afterwards and they can let you know and make sure we update you will those dates. That's all I have. Any questions?

Trisha:

Very well done. I like how fast you're moving back to your seat. So, next we have Covy Jones presenting Statewide Deer Management Plan.

5) **Statewide Deer Management Plan**
-Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: We're going to move on to questions from the RAC. Are there are questions from the RAC? So, just to reiterate the process, we'll take questions from the RAC, we'll take questions from the audience, then we'll take audience comments which we'll have Chris summarize comments that were made online. We'll take comment cards and then we'll take comments from the RAC and then make final recommendations and motions.

Kent Johnson: I've got a couple questions. When you were talking about management of deer herds and you look at the survival rates of adult deer and fawns, if you're managing for 15-17 bucks per 100 does, but somehow when you want more bucks, that becomes irrelevant to the overall health of the herd. How is that? And you're not looking at that as a factor anymore like on limited entry units where you're managing for 25-35 bucks, why is that not a factor in the overall health of the herd?

Covy Jones: Oh, okay. So, why do we not look at fawn survival? We could but it shows up in the buck/doe ratio. So, it's a lag effect but if you're managing for a high buck/doe ratio, you have more older age class bucks on the landscape. So, if you miss a cohort of bucks, you pick that up in your classification. Whereas, on a general season unit, you're dependent upon those yearling bucks. You're more dependent on those yearling bucks. So, on a limited entry unit you will pick that up. It will show up and you'll end up cutting permits. It might not happen because you'll still have those prime age bucks for a few years. So, a bad winter two years ago on a general season unit, you need to make cuts that next year. On a limited entry unit, you may be ok for one or two more years and then you need to cut. It does show up, just differently.

Kent Johnson: Okay. Then, questions about CWD. Is it just perpetual once it gets in an area? Is there a way that it goes away?

Covy Jones: So, it's highly stable. You can't even burn it and get rid of it. They did do a wild population; Michigan went in and they wiped out a bunch of deer and it didn't work. It came back at the same rate. The only place I'm ever aware of that it did possibly work in Scandinavian country, they went scorch earth on a population of reindeer. They had about 2,000 of them and they shot every one of them out of a helicopter. They think that may have worked. You can't do that with mule deer, we don't have wide open areas and I don't know that we want to. You probably can't ever get it out of the population. It will be in there forever.

Trisha: In my memory, the state vet, when we were at one of those meetings, mentioned even removing large amounts of topsoil and still having it.

Covy: They had a fenced facility where they come in and did exactly that. I can't remember how many years they waited. It was like 7-10 years. They removed the topsoil, they changed a bunch of stuff, they put deer back in there and they got it.

Trisha: Like 10 feet of topsoil, it wasn't a small extraction.

Eric Luke: So how long, if the deer contracts CWD, is there any data that shows how long before that deer dies?

Covy: About two years. There's an incubation period. That's an about. You could kill one that's completely asymptomatic. So, you could harvest a mule deer and have no idea it has it. Get it home and have it in your freezer and get a call from the DWR saying, don't eat that. We don't know, nobody knows the effects on humans. Nobody knows if there are any or none. I won't say it's a scare tactic, we just don't know.

Gerrish Willis: Covy, you talk about limiting feeding and baiting. What does that mean for CWD?

Covy: So that's a strategy in the plan. It's saying that we would support doing this but we're not making a recommendation to eliminate feeding or baiting anymore tonight. It's currently legal in Utah and we understand we probably should move that way. If it's ok, I'll tell the RAC what happened. We asked this in the survey. Is there support to eliminate baiting in the state of Utah? The survey came back as, yes there was. The mule deer committee wanted to vote on it so we let them vote on it. The mule deer committee came back and said, yes there is overwhelming support to eliminate baiting in the state of Utah. So, I went back to the drawing boards and I intended to write a rule that would eliminate baiting. I worked with our attorney's and I wrote a rule and pretty quickly I realized, I just created a rule that eliminated all feeding and baiting because the only way to write a good rule that eliminates baiting is to eliminate feeding as well. And they are viewed as two different things. A lot of hunter's view baiting as hunting over bait and feeding is maybe winter feeding to sustain higher population levels or whatever. But to write a rule that only prevents baiting, would be impossible to enforce.

Gerrish: So, my question is what does it mean by limit feeding and baiting? That's what the slide said. So, if you're not going to write a rule, how are you going to limit that practice?

Covy: And what I'm trying to say is that you probably will see a rule change in the future from us just not tonight. Because we haven't had the conversations with all the individuals to explain the rationales to why we would want to prohibit baiting and really limit feeding and work through what that looks like and what scenarios we would still allow feeding. I'm sure there are some scenarios where we would allow it and there are some scenarios where we wouldn't allow it. So, we just need to do more work.

Gerrish: Thank you

Darren Olsen: Typically, mule deer management plan is five years, what's the reasoning for going seven years?

Covy: There were a couple of reasons. One of the problems with the last mule deer management plan is that it's hard to see if you accomplished what you intended to accomplish in five years. So, if you're always changing the target, are you ever really managing to the plan? Five years in

wildlife management is not long enough to see if you are meeting a lot of metrics. So, we wanted to go longer to see if the plan was headed in a direction that we wanted to go and if not, what big tweaks we wanted to make. That's the biggest reason. The other reason is that we do a really good job, we spend a lot time on these plans. We also have a lot of good things we can do for mule deer and we only have so many hours so, we can either spend more time writing plans or spend more time doing good things for mule deer. We decided if we have a good plan that everybody can support then we'd rather go longer and spend more energy and efforts doing good things for deer.

Scot Flannery: Thanks for that presentation. My question is, you have the 15-17 buck/doe ratio objective and then the 18-20 and you have 11 of those that are 15-17 and 18 are in the 18-20? Is that ratio of 11-18, is that set or can those be looked at individually and say, turns out we want 10 and 17 or...

Covy: The goal at this time is to set those. If we want to change those, we'd do that now.

Scot: They can't be changed individually in other words. If you change one to 18-20 does that mean you have to change another to 15-17?

Covy: Not necessarily but when we wrote this, you could ask the hunting public, how do you feel about the opportunity? And if you change one, you're going to cut opportunity if you move it up so, I think it would be against what the hunting public said if you didn't offer another one that would lower it to offer that some opportunity.

Scot: And can I have one more? So, when it comes to... before you have this work toward the objective which seems like, but the other one is a ?? depending on work... what I'm concerned with is, is there any other way, let's say you're consistently over the 15-17 or 18-20, is there any other way to achieve that besides just going more and more tags?

Covy: This is just dealing with management bucks on the landscape so, no that is the only way. We did leave the caveat in there that says, one of the complaints we hear is hunter crowding issues that come into conflict with having too many hunters on the landscape so, we did address that in the plan. We said, if we have those issues, then we would work to adjust to add or recede rifle which is another option we have now or to change weapon splits so, we're not adding more rifle hunters on top or maybe adding more archery or muzzleloader. So, there is some flexibility in the plan to do that but we would still want to achieve the objective. The reason why is because we have units that over five years, we didn't make any harvest towards the objective at all. So, this is a little more drastic but it felt more active.

Eric Luke: So, I guess my question is, I understand why you want to do that to reach objective but in the past, we've heard the division come in and say, we want to do this not this and by going to this, if I understand what you're saying that's exactly what's going to happen. You're going to have sharper cuts, sharper increases and so you're promoting that type of scenario.

Covy: There could be more oscillation about permits. I think when we say we want to do less oscillation, that's more in probably populations. But yeah, I get it Eric. I know we've said that

before and what we've heard from the public is, no when we want you to cut, we want you to cut now. Then we come back in and say, well yeah when we can offer the opportunity back into the public sometimes it's more different through this process. So, make a good recommendation, but yes, you're right that's a fair point. The answer is yes there will be more oscillation in buck permits.

Kent Johnson: Also, talking about the buck to doe ratio in your unit, say you're always at or above the buck to doe ratio, are you looking at overall deer numbers in addition to just buck/doe ratio? Let's say your buck/doe ratio stays the same but because of a really hard winter your deer herd is cut by 1/3, but we look at the buck/doe ratio and say, well it's still the same so, we'll put the same number of permits and the herd will sustain.

Covy: So, that's what we would do by looking at adult and fawn survival. That's one of the new triggers in the plan.

Trisha: Okay at this point, we'll take questions from the audience. Only questions. If you have a question for Covy, come up and please state your name.

Questions from the Audience

Travis Pearson: When you guys came up with this mule deer plan, did you ever take into consideration the CWMU's and how those private land buck/doe ratios influence the public property.

Covy: Yeah. So, one of the strategies in the plan says that there are units where we know we can't manage to the buck/doe ratio and so, in short, we exempt those units that are dominated by private land and CWMU's. We'll manage those as best can but we're not going to throw an unlimited number of permits on those units because we will never hit the buck/doe ratio. So, we did address that, yes.

Travis Pearson: Just on certain units, not all CWMU's?

Covy: We didn't write each unit down but predominately public land is the way that we worded it.

Trisha: Thank you.

Adam Black: You keep saying, we asked the public or we hear or heard from the public, is that through your 9,300 people that you surveyed and only heard from 2,200 or when you say, you hear from the public do you mean RAC meetings where not very many of us attend or who is the public you hear from?

Covy: So, we used the survey data, diverse group of constituents and then this process as well to define the plan. So, this is just a recommendation, anything can change. But yeah, it's the public that cares and wants to share their opinion.

Adam Black: OK. So, we've got this new seven-year plan as opposed to the five and I understand your answer to one of the RAC questions. The current five year plan, and I've read it a couple of times and I'm illiterate and I tried to keep up with it but, if there needs to be changes to some aspect of that plan in that seven years is there an ability to amend that, especially when we start looking at individual sub-units, is there an ability to look at each individual unit with the overall state management plan in mind and say, this unit is having this issue and although the plan for the state says this and even the sub-unit plan says this, this is a big problem do we need to address it now or wait seven years?

Covy: So, there're two things. There is a lot of flexibility in the plan as to how we manage. Two, unit management plans will still be written on a five-year rotating basis. So, we'll rewrite unit management plans and unit management plans differ a little bit. The statewide management plan gives overall guidance and direction and mostly it talks about buck hunting, how we're going to hunt bucks across the state, to have some kind of uniformity of what we do. That's the statewide. The unit management plan is more about the population and how we've work to improve, maintain, fix a population. So, they work together but they're not the exact same thing. We'll still be writing them every five years. Each region will get their range trend data, look at it and rewrite their unit management plan. Does that answer your question?

Adam Black: Yeah in part. So, you bring up the range tend data and so, again is that only every five years, you look at what the trend was for the last five and go, well two years were good but three were horrible, our herds really struggle but we didn't do anything about it but now our trend says, it was bad so now going forward we have to do something about it. Is that what you're saying? You have to wait until the five years is up or can you jump in the middle and do something when it's a bad year or two.

Covy: So, the plan is just a guideline as to how we manage and we address a lot of that in the plan but it allows for active management of population so, it allows us to change or adopt or do different strategies. Obviously, if we ever came up with a major problem with the plan, we've opened plans before and said, we've got to fix this, we didn't intend to do this. And we don't do that all the time because we need some consistency and if it's a minor problem, we'll fix it when we open it again. But if there is a major issue, I think the division has been pretty friendly and willing to open and take a hard look at things and say, do we need to modify this. I don't see that changing.

Adam Black: Okay and does that strictly come from biologists and you or do we have input at local sportsmen and RAC type people to say, can we, I mean who implements that, who initiates that?

Covy: I hope the work always comes from local sportsmen through biologists to the state office. We all end up working together on that. I'd say that's where it starts.

Trisha: Questions from the audience

Tim Pilling: What's the trigger to have the five-day deer hunt in October? I know all units don't have that.

Covy: We implement it where we've had a lot of severe crowding issues and complaints and difficulty meeting our unit management objective in area where we could but otherwise the public has said, we don't want more permits on there. That's what we've used as a guideline to say where we implement those and where we haven't. I assume it'll gain more popularity. It's been really popular where they've been implemented. It just takes a portion of the any weapon permits back out of that later hunt and puts them a little earlier, spreads out a little pressure. You can hunt elk over the top of it if you've got an elk tag.

Tim Pilling: My other question is from a friend of mine that couldn't make it. You talked about the collared deer and you monitored their mortality, so in Cache they had 50 deer die that were collared, what was the mortality, what's the top three reasons of mortality on these collared deer?

Covy: On the Cache unit right now?

Tim Pilling: In general?

Covy: It depends on what time of year you're talking about. Are you talking about the neonates? Are you talking about the six-month old collars?

Adam Black: Baby deer. Baby deer. He's asking

Covy: Baby deer. We go out catch the little babies for a couple days and those are primarily killed by predators. Bobcats, cougars, coyotes. So, that's up until they are six months old. So, if you look at that and say, we lost half two years in a row with the exact same ratio to those three predators. So, you can look at that and say, it's clear that the answer here is that we have to do something about predators. When we collared six-month old's through the winter, guess what happened? They all died. The primary cause of mortality was malnutrition. So, it wouldn't have mattered in those years if we'd done a bunch of predator control or not because the rest of the deer died from malnutrition. Now, the Cache is an area where we're set up to grow. We've lost a lot of deer in that population so now is the perfect time to do predator control. You know you're well below a carrying capacity, you're going to have fat deer and you do predator control, you can grow more quickly. So, if we take out some of those bobcats, cougars and coyotes we can increase deer.

Tim Pilling: So, the primary cause of death on non-neonates is what?

Covy: On non-neonates the last year was malnutrition. But on neonates it was predators.

Tim Pilling: Last question, how do you validate and what is the accuracy of the deer model? What kind of algorithm are you using and how do you verify and validate that there's 372,000 plus or minus x% in the state of Utah?

Covy: It's exactly that number. It's not one more or less.

Tim Pilling: Just explain how that model is validated and how...

Covy: It's pretty simple. It's an AIC model. It's accepted West-wide, the same model Colorado uses. But I think more than how we validate that model, what's the scientific significance of the model is that it's wrong, the model is wrong. It's always wrong. It's an indicator of trend over time. And there are a couple of things that the model does that we have to come back and say, no you're wrong. The model wants to assume constant doe survival a lot of times, West-wide average of mule deer survival is 85%. So, the model tries to true and it says, we input our survival data and it says it's 76% and it says, no, no, no it wasn't that bad. So, the model penalizes you for having 76% adult doe survival and says, adult doe survival is 85%, this is the real thing, your data is wrong. So, we have to come back in and say, no our data is right and you're wrong. But the one thing the model does is that it smooths. So, the peak in 2016, we underestimated that. We know we underestimated that. The drop, we've underestimated that too. As we watch it over time, we can see where deer are headed. So, it's trend over time, not exact number. I almost hate giving the exact number. You can take the numbers off, they don't matter. What matters is you can watch mule deer oscillate and as wildlife biologists we try to prevent that oscillation as much as we can by looking at herd health. Herd health determines survival. Herd health determines production. Buck hunting, the thing we're most passionate about doesn't determine either of those. It's driven by herd health.

Tim Pilling: How do you get the inputs on the deer numbers? Are they field counts?

Covy: Every bit of data that goes into a model, I can go over it with you later Tim but, every bit of data that goes into the model comes from field observation. You've got to have real life field observations. It's just a calculator. You got \$100 in your bank, spend ten, how much do you have?

Tim Pilling: 80

Covy: 90

Travis Pearson: So, does this plan set numbers for population objectives as well?

Covy: No. Those will be set by unit plans. We need to go into way more detail than the statewide plan goes into to see those. So, we want to form, whenever we rewrite unit plans, for the same committee with local sportsmen go through it and decide what that population objective should be.

Travis Pearson: Okay. So, when you were saying those population numbers, there's really no accurate count, why are they even in the plan then? Why do we manage each unit by population objective?

Covy: Again. It's a good indication of abundance and trend over time. I guess what I was trying to say is, don't focus on the exact number, but it gives us an idea of abundance.

Travis Pearson: But those numbers trigger other things with the unit plan. Like predator control.

Covy: Predator management policy. Yeah, we're going to regret that too. There are some

triggers in the... it's a really good point actually, with the data we have before, we used the best data we had in our predator management policy. That data is antiquated now. One of the things I've committed to do is when we're done with this plan, to work with the mammal's program coordinator to rewrite the predator management policy to use the most recent data and input new triggers.

Trisha: Okay at this point I'm going to have Chris Wood summarize online comments.

Chris Wood: Yes. So, we have a new system. Those who present today, presented in front of a YouTube camera several weeks ago and their presentations were available on YouTube for several weeks and the public had the opportunity to watch these presentations and then submit a survey form to us. When they submitted this form to us, every RAC member received that answer. I think our RAC had 19 respondents from that survey. Other regions had hundreds of responses. So, from now on, we're trying this out to see how it works. One thing we learned is that we don't want to make it anonymous. So, we're going to require a name and an e-mail address and a zip code from here on out. My job at each action item is to briefly state what the survey result was. You've already received the comments, hopefully you read them so, I'm not going to go through that. I'll just say, for the mule deer plan, for the Southeast Region, we had 31% oppose the plan and 42% support the plan. We did have 26% that were neutral. That's similar to the statewide result. Statewide there was a little bit stronger support than there was in the Southeastern region. Statewide there was 29% opposed to the plan and 46% supported the plan with 24% being neutral.

Comments from the Audience

Trisha: Okay. So, at this point we're going to move on to comments from the audience. We have comment cards in front of us. Make note that if you are an individual you have three minutes total to make a comment so we will cut you off. If you are from an organization, you will have five minutes.

Jeremy Anderson/MDF: Thank you. Thank you RAC for this opportunity to speak. I'm Jeremy Anderson with the Mule Deer Foundation. I want to thank Covy on the awesome presentation and also for inviting me to be on that board. It was an eye opener to say the least. When I first got there, I wasn't quite sure what the different people were all about. Why did we have this guy or this guy? In fact, I kind of thought it's pretty stupid to have this guy. I learned something from every single person in there because I had my decision set solid then he or she would bring up a point and that's how that meeting went. I guarantee you; you will not find somebody in that group that didn't walk away with more knowledge. This pains me to say because I'm going to start giving props to BYU, but the BYU guys there are just amazing. They've been doing a lot of collaring data. One thing Covy failed to mention or he may have said it but with these dead deer, fawns anything, they are on them within 48 hours. 48 hours, that's pretty impressive. So, they are getting some awesome data. So, we're looking at the Monroe mortality and we know that this amount was predators, this amount had horrible body condition, it was so cool to go through all that. It was an eye opener. One thing, we had a big diversity on that group. We did not agree on everything. Like Covy said though, at the end of the day we all swallowed our pride and the committee as a general voted for something you didn't win, well that's just how a committee

works. It was a really cool thing. Covy was kind enough to grab, my leadership group has a bunch of awesome volunteers up there and they're across the state, we had people come from Vernal. We sat down and went over this and it spurred more questions just like tonight did. Even my volunteers that are in the (??) leadership team didn't agree with some of the things but overall, it's for the best. It's a plan, it's not set. The numbers of bucks and does are going to happen in later RAC's. Overall, the Mule Deer Foundation supports this in full and thank you for the opportunity.

Trisha: Thank you Jeremy. Next we have Tony Chavera.

Tony Chavera/SFW: Hi my name is Tony Chavera. We were hoping to change the buck to doe down in San Juan to 18-20. We really don't want more tags down there for the deer. That's it. Thanks.

Adam Black: Yeah, we're getting ready to create a mule deer group similar to friends of Paunsaguant so, we're here tonight to get some of this going. I appreciated the comments from the gentleman, Covy, the plan has enlightened me of things I saw that are on the objective are there. So, we're going to be really looking to get the public awareness side of that going especially down on the San Juan, Abajo and Elk Ridge. I just feel like the education side of this whole objective to grow mule deer is lacking. There are just too many people that are trusting in the models that, no offence, for the last five years down there haven't grown the deer. That's not your fault, there're lots of complicated contributing factors there. A large part of that could certainly be public awareness so, we're going to look to start doing more to get local people involved and we're also liking the idea of a mandatory harvest reporting. So, lots of states do that. It improves in my opinion, the data, the scientific nature of the data. The current mule deer plan, the five-year one we're amending now talked about check points and different types of things for checking for CWD and those kinds of things. I've never been checked. I've never seen a check point. So, I think there are a lot of flaws in the plan that hopefully are going to be improved with the current seven-year plan. Also, I just encourage the RAC and those that can speak to the higher ups, don't forget the force you have in the local hunting groups and the local hunters and sportsmen. Our good biologist down in Monticello, I can't imagine him trying to cover the whole San Juan to get an accurate deer count. So, use us. We want to become available to participate and help so that we can become more scientific and more accurate. We live in a day and age where we should know how to fix CWD. We can create a vaccine. In some ways it seems like we should be able to take the technology that's out there to really grow some mule deer. I know there are limiting factors and we have to address those and drought is starting to become one of those major players. Anyway, I had other things but I didn't get a chance to watch the YouTube videos so it was good to see the presentation here. It's opened my eyes a little bit and gives us things to think about. Thank you.

Trisha: Thank you so much, Adam. OK, our last comment is from Travis Pearson.

Travis Pearson: Just want to make a comment. First of all, RAC thanks for volunteering your time. I've sat in your seat. I've been there for four years. When they first did the mule deer management plan when I was on the RAC, we had a huge discussion on the buck/doe ratio and one of the things that that brought about is the San Juan unit is managed for 15-17 right now.

When we went to the smaller units, that data and hunters in the field showed that we... let's say we had 2,400 hunters on the unit, by implementing an 18-20 buck/doe ratio we were going to go to 2,500 hunters so it was going to add 100 more tags than we were normally used to. Then going to 15-17 was going to add another 250 hunters. So, in reality what was happening was we were going to add hunters on that unit regardless of what management plan we went to. So, we were already at the 18-20 bucks/100 does. We were a little bit above it. So, it was kind of a win/win situation for everyone. I brought that data here. We talked about it. It passed unanimously that we went to 18-20. What happened was our chairman went up and did not represent our RAC at the board. He went up there and dropped the ball. He did not take our volunteer work seriously. He took two phone calls from people from outside that weren't even at the meeting and took that information to the wildlife board and basically kept us at the 15-17. That made me mad enough that I actually left the RAC board. That made me realize, our information and what we fought for on the RAC was useless. Anise Aoude (sp?) at the time, kind of did the same thing. He went up to the wildlife board and didn't give an accurate account of what we voted on at this RAC. I would ask that you guys take into consideration of moving the San Juan unit back to 18-20 buck like we voted for at the first management plan and put us back there. Thanks,

Trisha: Thank you Travis. That's all the comments from the audience. I will take comments from the RAC. If we have any clarification questions for Covy, we can take those.

RAC Comments

Darren Olsen: Just looking at approval rating from the public, out of all of these four listed here, the statewide deer management plan seemed to be the least favorable or that margin was closer compared to others. The mule deer plan, going from a five year to a seven year seems like that is less responsive to some of the concern that I guess the public has with the lower approval rate and doesn't allow for some of the flexibility that I think you would want to have in a plan. Thinking about ourselves or even those on the board, your chance to participate in a management plan may not even exist in your term when you push it out to a seven-year plan. So, I guess that's a concern I have.

Trisha: Thank you Darren

Scot Flannery: I want to speak specifically on the San Juan, Abajo unit. So, looking at the data as far as the buck/doe ratio that (??) out of the units that are in the 15-17 buck/doe, there was only one year in the last 2016-2018 that we were even close to where we need to be at 17.8. Every other time, we're in the 20's. 21, 22, 23 bucks/does. We've responded to that by allocating more tags. So, looking in 2015 it was 2,500, 2016 it was 2,600, 2017 it was 2,750. When we have 100 tags in 2017, we killed less deer. The following year we kept the same number of tags and killed even less deer. In fact, we killed less deer than we did in 2015 when there were 2,500 tags. So, my point is that in that unit, there's some other factors that are contributing there. One may be is the CWMU, or the Limited Entry units but in either case, we've shown that allocating more tags does not mean that we're getting that objective. My fear is if we say, we're going to achieve this objective, at what point do we stop throwing tags at that unit? It looks to me like it wants to be in the 18-20 range but yet we're wanting to keep it back at the 15-17 range and that

scared me because we'll just keep throwing tags at it. If there are four two-points standing out in the field that are easy to kill and four hunters, they are going to kill them. But if there are 50 hunters, they are going to kill those four two-points. Same amount of deer. All it is doing is creating a less desirable hunting experience for the people that draw those tags. So, I'm hoping that we can change the San Juan, Abajo to the 18-20.

Trisha: Great, thank you

Jace Guymon: I might need to have a discussion with Covy if that's alright. So, along with what Scoot is saying, the four two-points standing out in the field. My question is, we manage the buck/doe ratio when you count the bucks, you count every buck. In my opinion, what I've seen, I spent weeks scouting Manti looking for elk and I saw several hundred deer and the average herd that the does were being rutted by a two-point. So, we've got younger deer, is there any way we can look into possibly, when we're doing our counts, eliminating yearling bucks? Because in my opinion, if you have a two-point breeding the does, he hasn't even proven himself yet. He's been with his mom clear until that rut, natural selection has no play, we don't know if that is a viable buck, if he's going to be one that we want his genetics staying around. He's a two-point, he's not getting it done initially so it's spreading out our rut, it's making more of those being bred later in the season so, we have fawns dropping more spread out. I can see a lot of issues from two-points not breeding crop. Is there any way we can look into not counting two-points in the buck/doe?

Covy: We have looked into that before. Two things, there's a concern that your parturition will be less synchronous if you have younger bucks doing a lot of the breeding. So, we evaluated some units with higher buck/doe ratios and higher buck/doe ratios on the Monroe and then Colorado did a comparison and found a more synchronous parturition in lower buck/doe ratio areas. So, I guess what I would say is that the sentiment that younger bucks increase the space at which fawns are born was not supported by the research that we conducted. The other thing is that it's a younger buck but it's the same sperm. So, if he gets the job done, he gets it done. The second thing we looked at was pregnancy and our pregnancy rates on those units are not a problem. So, the does are pregnant and that's how we chose to address that, as to say, are they pregnant and are we getting spread out parturition, and both of those in the current research that we've done it's showing it's not valid.

Eric Luke: Covy, on the same line, I read that study and I have some concerns with part of that. Number one, there are a couple things that we don't know. You compared a low buck/doe ratio with a higher buck/doe ratio but the one thing that that study doesn't show is the number of older age class bucks within that buck/doe ratio. We don't know if all the, in the unit that had 23 bucks/100 does might all have been yearling bucks. There is nothing that shows that. Then also, the sample size in that study was very small. So, the chances of getting the deer that were sampled could easily have been all deer that were caught on their first cycle.

Covy: I don't share those sentiments, I guess. It was a pretty good study. It was peer reviewed by several researchers, biologists. I don't have much more to add.

Trisha: Thank you Covy

Darren Olsen: I know many of us received a lot of comments on baiting and I think that is something that at some point in the future needs to be addressed and discussed there. The concern as mentioned where there is CWD and whether it's right or wrong, there has been a lot of comment feedback on baiting.

Chris Wood: Yeah, as Covy mentioned, the division is committed to meeting with our stakeholders and coming back next year, I believe.

Covy: The goal is to be within a year. It's a complex issue. We understand we need to tackle it. We're committed to do it. It's not going to be popular but it'll be a great RAC meeting.

Dana Truman: I guess I want to make a few comments. Kind of to second the Mule Deer Foundation, this mule deer plan had a lot of different perspectives brought into it and a lot of science so, I want to make sure that we all appreciate that and are aware of that as well as being a plan there is flexibility built into it. So, I like the seven-year plan. Being a biologist, it takes a long time for applications to show changes. Biologists can make changes and for even biologists that write plans. I really like the idea of putting more effort on the plan. So, I do support it.

Trisha: Thank you

Chris Wood: Dana, you were a rep on that for the BLM on that plan?

Dana: Yeah, I was. So, like people have mentioned there are a lot of complex issues and this is a guidance document. So, not everything in there is going to be perfect but there is some good science behind it. That's what I wanted to make sure people are aware of.

Trisha: So, at this point I guess I'll extract a couple of things that I've taken from the RAC and we can either make motions or not and that is fine but I'd like to move forward. We did have some concerns about the length of the management plan. Do we want to make a motion at all on that?

Motion: Darren motion to shorten current management plan to 5 years.

No Second

Trisha: I have some concerns from the RAC on the San Juan, Abajo unit.

Chris: You know what, we also had another step in this process. If I may, if there is anything that Covy or the biologist would like to clarify we have to give them the opportunity to do that. Is there anything from Covy or that biologist that you want to clarify or discuss?

Covy: The only thing I want to clarify is the mandatory reporting. We have rationales as to why we don't do that and it's because statistically, it'll bias the harvest data high. So, that's why we haven't done that. But I also want to say that we are headed towards e-tagging. That's where we hope to get to and I think that's going to get us both what we want.

Trisha: Can you define e-tagging?

Covy: Punch it with your phone. So, we hope to make progress towards e-tagging and that would be your harvest reporting. At that time the division gets data more quickly. Hopefully, it's accurate and less bias.

Trisha: Do I have to take my phone hunting? That's what you're telling me?

Covy: I don't care. Do what you like. That's one clarification. I don't know if there is anything else the regional biologist would like to say.

Chris: Guy, do you have anything?

Dustin Mitchell: So, Scoot you were right in the sense. 2016 is what you were talking about. We've been over the buck/doe ratio since then. If we look back into 2014, we were right at 20. So, it's been on that level with 2,500 permits. It was tapered down to 14 bucks/100 does. So, it has been there in the past and the last five years our trend has kind of gone up and down. We're still in the top end of it right now.

Scoot: So, in your opinion if we try to achieve that objective of 15-17 we keep throwing more tags at it, is that going to achieve that objective?

Dustin Mitchell: We'd have to either throw more tags or like Covy said, switch our structure up somehow and try to get higher success in a different hunt. Whether that be an early rifle or whatever.

Scoot: In your opinion, do you think that would be good for the deer herd on the San Juan, Abajo?

Dustin Mitchell: I don't think it would hurt us. I think we'd be right where we're at right now.

Scoot: The 18-20, even we keep throwing tags at it?

Dustin Mitchell: One thing to consider for the locals, the people that like to hunt there, if we do go with it, it may make it harder to draw every year or every other year.

Covy: So, in the back of your minds consider this, remember that on average we're increasing applications by about 5% a year statewide, big game applications. Doesn't sound like a lot but 5% of half a million which is what we hit this year, on average we're already going to hunt less frequently. So, I hate to remind the RAC to think of opportunity but as you think of these things, keep it in mind. Because it's going to be less frequently than we hunt anyways and it could be a lot less frequent moving forward.

Trisha: Thank you. Do we want to entertain a separate motion regarding the San Juan?

Scoot: I'd move that we support changing the objective for buck/doe ratio on the San Juan,

Abajo to the 18-20 which is more fitting to what it is anyway and it keeps it from arbitrarily raising tag numbers from year to year, making the hunt less desirable.

Motion: to change the buck to doe ratio to 18-20 on the San Juan/Abaho unit

Motioned by: Scoot Flannery

Seconded: Jace Guymon

Supporting: 5

Opposed: 3

Abstaining: 2

Motion passes 5 to 3

Trisha: Do we want to entertain any separate motion? Jace you brought up excluding yearlings in a buck/doe ratio count.

Jace: I don't know if we need to make a motion on it or if I'd just like the board to look into that because what I'm seeing is that it does affect. I don't know how big the sample size was but I absolutely believe it affects it and we're taking young bucks that haven't proven themselves. They haven't survived predators on their own.

Trisha: I will definitely bring that up to the board if you're ok with that. Do we have a motion on the remainder of the plan as presented?

Motion to keep the rest of the plan

Motioned by: Helene Taylor

Seconded: Brad

Unanimous

6) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2020 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Trisha: While Covy is bringing this up, I drew a bull elk tag after 10 years in the state of Nevada and it was absolutely one of the worst hunts I've ever been on. So, I want to state that by saying, we really are lucky in the state of Utah. We have a tremendous resource and I think our division works really hard to make sure we have quality hunts. The hunt that I was on and I won't state the population of the elk in the unit, it was pretty small. They gave 500 bull tags during my hunt and it absolutely didn't matter what nook and cranny I was in I was surrounded by hunters. I'm pretty lucky to live here.

Covy: Well thank you. With that, I'd like to present the 2020 big game season dates and hunt boundary recommendations as well as some rule amendments.

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: Do we have questions from the RAC for Covy?

Kent Johnson: The first one I have is about logistics. You have your new recommended HAMS hunts for the Book Cliffs unit and they listed it under the Southeast region and that is in the Northeast region.

Covy: Brad, would you like to speak to that? I should say one more thing. I love to answer any of the questions that I can but these biologists wait all year for this so if it's something specific I'll have them answer.

Chris: They know a little more too

Kent: A little?

Brad Crompton: The Southern part of the Book Cliffs is in the Southeast region so the recommendation came out here. So, it's South of the divide West of Sejo Canyon to the Green River.

Kent: OK. Another question I have is, what was the criteria that was used in the decision to put an extended archery hunt in the Green River Valley?

Brad Crompton: Similar to other units, areas where there is high depredation, we choose to use hunters to help us with that issue. It's an opportunity for hunters to help us minimize the deer in agricultural areas.

Kent Johnson: Wouldn't that be better served with doe tags if you have an excessive amount of depredation?

Brad Crompton: Yes, and we do have doe hunts as well. We have specific doe hunts. We have an archery hunt and a rifle. We just finished up a couple weeks ago. So, we target does, we have mitigation permits in the valley for specific landowners, normal buck tags and this extended archery as well.

Kent Johnson: OK.

Gerrish Willis: You done Kent? Covy, you mentioned that there were a couple of units that were eliminated due to, I believe it was public conflicts, can you describe what that would be?

Covy: In one of the extended archery units? So, in Cache Lake Town, there was a lot of conflict with deer coming into urban areas causing damage. So, several years ago we instituted that extended archery hunt. Since then, there are a few areas around the state where deer are really struggling. The Cache is one. Portions of the San Juan but the Cache population is really down. So, they don't have those conflicts in that area anymore. They've said, we're ok with the deer at this level. If they build back up, we'll probably ask the division to work with us and bring

something back.

Gerrish: Thank you.

Kent: On here I see adding new hunts. We're adding additional late season muzzleloader hunts on units that have chronically low deer populations. What is the reason behind that?

Covy: You mean the late season?

Kent: Okay. I'll give you two specifics, the Manti and the La Sal Mountains. Looking at the La Sal Mountains specifically and Southeast Manti specifically, the winter kill last year was horrendous. I'm looking at places I've been scouting and hunting and it's probably a 30% reduction in the number of deer that I'm seeing. That's not scientific and I don't have calls and stuff, it's just my observation. Do we have the deer available to put those hunts out there?

Covy: So, I can answer from a statewide perspective then if the biologist wants to speak to the specific units, that's fine. The rationale behind this hunt was to be able to, our biggest point creep is in limited entry deer and to be able to offer an opportunity in limited entry deer without converting general season units to limited entry. The areas where we've had this hunt has been received very positively. There was some concern to almost every unit when we implemented it. The plan sits at such a low number, you bring up Manti, we hunt that 8,000 permits on the Manti the plan would set this at no more than 40 permits which on that population, harvested at 70-75% is not detectable. So, that's the reality. The other component of this is it's somewhat social. So, we're trying to provide this opportunity, trying to find some middle ground. I think it's a good recommendation but the public may not like it and I understand that. They may want to do it a different way. Would you like any specific information on those two units from the biologists?

Kent: Yeah

Brad Crompton: I don't know if I have a whole lot to add. You think about the Manti and we...

Kent: What about the La Sals? We do talk at nauseum in this RAC about the Manti. It seems like other units, we pay little if any attention to them. We talk about the Manti and the Book Cliffs and that's probably where most of us in this room spend our time. That's our playground so that's where we're passionate. The La Sal Mountains are in trouble. The deer herd on the mountain is in trouble, bad trouble.

Brad Crompton: I'm going to let Dustin answer this question because I know nothing about that La Sal Mountains.

Dustin Mitchell: Thanks Brad.

Kent: Okay, so you're right, the population trend has gone down over the past couple of years there. As far as winter kill, we didn't detect a huge winter kill this year. I think it had more to do with the summer, the drought that we had. No production and fawn survival two years ago was almost nothing. That's where we're seeing a lot of the lower numbers this year. As far as you

asked if we even have the deer there for this new hunt, we're looking at eight permits so we definitely have the numbers there still.

Kent: So, you're just going to pull those permits out of the existing permits?

Covy: No. That's not correct. It would be in addition to. I don't want anybody to feel like the division is trying to pull one over on you. It would be in addition to. It would be calculated at .5% of whatever general season are. So, it would take into account when the herd starts to struggle and you reduce permits, .5% would go down as those numbers go down. Again, the La Sals has bigger problems than hunting bucks. We know that.

Kent: Yeah.

Dustin Mitchell: And CWD as we mentioned before are highest prevalence in the state on that range. We're actually starting this week in the next few days to collar deer there so we can get a better idea on migratory route between Colorado, where hotspots are, where we can do more habitat projects. So, we're looking at it pretty closely to see what we can do.

Kirk Player: Just to clarify the late muzzleloader hunt is a limited entry hunt as well as the HAMS hunt?

Covy: They are both being recommended as limited entry. So, you have to burn your points. We had, I think, the high point number we had is 17 points on these permits.

Jace: So, with these hunts what is the, you said you agree not to move them any later in November, what is the reasoning behind that? If it's to limit CWD where that's older mature bucks further into the rut the more mature bucks are going to get killed rather than the younger bucks. It just makes it overall a better hunt, people will be more willing to burn more points on it.

Covy: Jace, that's a perfect point. I think that you will see recommendations from the division, probably rifle hunts because we want to be specifically targeted in areas where we are targeting CWD. This was an agreement we made with the public when we introduced these hunts that there was a strong sentiment, don't move them later than November 10th. This recommendation we actually moved the consistency of nine day, the latest they would go is November 11th. It's just something we agreed to with the public. If we brought back another hunt that was a targeted rut hunt, which in CWD areas we may do. It would more than likely be rifle hunt.

Trisha: Scoot.

Scoot: So, if one of the reasons is to try and target some of those larger bucks that are more susceptible to CWD, is that one of the reasons?

Covy: Not now. This is strictly to address point creep, not convert anymore general season units. That's the reason right now. But in the CWD plan as it goes through, I think you'll start to see strategies being implemented and recommended but we're not recommending any tonight.

Scot: So, a follow up question to that, if it is considered to be one of the reasons so, we're taking more of those mature bucks in the rut, wouldn't that pass the buck so to speak to the younger deer? Wouldn't they just do the same thing as the bigger deer? Wouldn't it just go from herd to herd?

Covy: There's a lot I don't know about CWD. What I do know is that Colorado has some of the latest data on this. They implemented targeted fourth season hunts and on those fourth season hunts, the prevalence... So, the unit prevalence they calculated was in the 30% range. When they implemented targeted fourth season hunts, the bucks that they were killing, over half of them were positive and over time, they had data that shows that they were able to reduce prevalence. I don't know all the reasons why but they took a unit that was 30-40% prevalence and they bumped it back down by targeting the bucks that were infected. It's going to take time. It's a weird disease. We don't understand, we've got to be able to solve and we have it, it's called criteria of the (??) and we don't understand it there either. We spend a lot more on humans than we do on deer. We just don't understand it all.

Trisha: OK, I'm going to move to questions from the audience.

Questions from the audience

Travis Pearson: When they decided to do these later hunts and give more limited entry opportunities, did they ever look at the CWMU's and looking at re-strategizing the amount of public tags given to them? So, since we're on the San Juan we're surrounded by three CWMU's basically, generate all the deer. When you do the buck/doe counts those numbers count against the public because when they are doing those counts it does produce a high buck/doe ratio which then we get more tags but where do we give the tags to? The general season. So, we hammer the general season part but we don't target the CWMU's. So, did they ever look at maybe, I mean that's a good way to get rid of point creep as well.

Covy: Yeah. In this plan we did not specifically address that. I think that's a fair point. That's come up a lot in public comments. Honestly, I see both sides to that. I see the CWMU operators and what they are trying to do. I feel pretty lucky to have access to those lands. Addressing the splits, not at this time.

Adam Black: That's a poor answer. It's really not fair to the public hunter in greater CWMU areas like that, but you guys count those deer and then generate your public tags off of them. Like Mr. Pearson just said, there protecting CWMU deer, hammering the public deer that are in less number per capita to

Trisha: Adam is this going to become a question?

Adam Black: Yeah. The question is can we change the percentage of .5% to be a more accurate count to what public deer numbers are instead of whole unit deer? That way our numbers can come down for how many late season monster mature deer we're killing.

Covy: I did a poor job of answering that last question but that was a poor question.

Adam Black: Can we make our deer counts more accurate to reflect public tags?

Covy: Can we exclude CWMU's from buck/doe classifications? That is very difficult. I know there are areas where biologists will avoid areas of known migrations and say, I don't want to artificially inflate this because these animals are not ever available to the public. We try to do a good job at getting the representation of what the unit actually looks like. It's not a perfect system. I'm not going to say that it is. There are flaws at times we have flaws in the data. It's science, right? But it's not rocket science.

Adam Black: But can we allow for exceptions instead of having it a blanket statewide .5% can we take I unit specific data and say, it's going to be 13 bucks, that's what it's going to be for the San Juan, Abajo's. 13 bucks.

Covy: So, if you want to change the language in the plan you would say, instead of setting it at .5% you might want to change the language in the plan that would say, recommended up to .5% or something like that. Then that would be an annual recommendation instead of being set by the plan.

Adam Black: And that's allowable?

Covy: You would change that tonight if you were to do that.

Adam Black: Okay.

Jace Guymon: I believe that's what the Southern Region recommended, up to .5%.

Covy: This that a better answer?

Adam Black: Thank you and I wasn't yelling at him. I was yelling so he could hear.

Tim Pilling: I've a question more specific to the rules. This revolves around baiting. Currently, there is a state statute that makes baiting illegal, it's statute 23.20 section 3 section R. It's been a state law since 2009 so, explain to us why the DWR been silent on this statute for so long?

Covy: It's a state statute that gives the authority to the wildlife board to make baiting illegal. So, the statute doesn't make baiting illegal. That statute gives us the authority to make baiting illegal.

Tim Pilling: Why has the DWR, big game board not invoked this statute for 10 years?

Covy: You're going to have to ask someone else. Ask those guys 10 years ago, I guess I don't know that answer to that.

Tim Pilling: We know one of our premium deer units is the Henry Mountain's deer unit, we know baiting is very common there. We talk about CWD. Have we ever tested baiting sights for CWD to see if it's present?

Covy: No. It doesn't work that way. We'd have to test deer.

Tim Pilling: Earlier you mentioned that if you congregate deer...

Covy: It has been found. The prion's have been found in plant materials but that wouldn't be a very efficient way to test when we can test deer.

Tim Pilling: You mentioned that they find it in the soil and it never leaves the soil for decades. I was just curious if that would be a good way to find out if it's present.

Covy: It's more highly concentrated in the lymph nodes of the animal and that's where a more effective and efficient test is done, or the brain stem.

Tim Pilling: I guess my final question, this all revolves around baiting, you said the deer committee voted to make baiting illegal, the state statute says that baiting can be illegal if you put it in the proclamation. I'm just curious why are we waiting? What's the purpose of the delay?

Covy: Because when we wrote the rule, we realized that we would eliminate feeding too and we hadn't had those discussions and we didn't want to be sneaky. So, the division, believe it or not, we try our hardest to be transparent. I'll stand up here and be as transparent as I can. I'll take my licks and be disagreed with, whatever it takes but I don't want anybody to think that I tried to sneak something past them. That's the reason why. We have more conversations to have.

Colby Hunt: My name is Colby Hunt. I have a question on the Green River extended archery. What would the dates be on that?

Covy: It ends earlier. It would go through October 15th. September 12-October 15 is what we recommended to target valley deer.

Guy Webster: In reference to your HAMS hunts I understand you don't have specific numbers on individual units but I think in order for the public to say we either support or don't we need to have a general idea. Let's take the Floyd unit, are we talking three tags, are we talking 30 or 300 tags? Can you give us a general idea of what those tags would be?

Covy: Guy, that's a very fair point. We are thinking of starting these very, very slow. Speaking for the biologist, I'm not going to commit to an exact number but I wouldn't assume that there would be more than five. Very low numbers.

Tim Vetere: Tim Vetere, I want to ask you a question about the archery in Green River. You're talking about depredation is why you are doing that hunt...

Covy: Brad would you like to answer that?

Brad Crompton: That's the main rationale on most of these extended archery hunts.

Tim Vetere: Are you blaming depredation on me as a known farmer or are you trying to say I'm

the cause of that?

Brad Crompton: Not necessarily.

Tim Vetere: I want a straight answer Brad.

Brad Crompton: You and others. How's that? Sound fair? There are other operators in the valley. Deer eat crops and our job is to try to minimize that and we're trying to use hunters as a tool to help us with that.

Tim Vetere: So, Brad knows me really well. Brad was in that position when he first started. When I first started coming to these meetings. He wasn't sitting back there with the big boys. He was right there. So, he knows that I'm an avid wildlife person. As of four years ago, we're regulated by the federal government on our watermelons. So, whenever a deer goes to the restroom in our field, we have to stake it and we cannot go within 10 feet of that area. A lot of people don't know that. The other thing, when you do the depredation, you guys come down and shoot does, correct?

Brad Crompton: And young bucks.

Tim Vetere: Now, you're going to come in and shoot deer that are in the rut that will stand five feet away from me you're going to kill mature bucks. Who is going to get those tags? Who is going to get that archery tag?

Brad Crompton: To clarify, it is September 12- October 15 so it's pre-rut. The corn will still be up so there will be some cover around and these are general archery. So, if you put in for it and draw.

Tim Vetere: So, everybody can draw? It's not for certain people?

Brad Crompton: Whoever puts in. Just like everything else that way. The brilliance of this process is that this is a social issue and there is a tolerance for, if deer are more tolerable than hunters in the valley, that's the point of this meeting. It was an idea we presented to reduce depredation but if it's not something the folks around here really want, that's why we're here tonight.

Tim Vetere: So, you know that we had 300-400 antelope out on the farm. We never raised an issue with that. With our deer we've had a lot of issues and we've never raised a big issue but I think you guys need to hunt the deer during the summer if you want to hunt them. I think that should be an opportunity for somebody that can't hunt somewhere else. They need to come and do a depredation hunt in the field. Which that would be welcomed, I think.

Brad Crompton: Good advice. Legally we can't hunt before August 1. So, August would be the earliest we could go but targeting more of that earlier in the season is something we could do. We try to address that mainly through mitigation permits on private lands and things like that. That is good advice.

Tim Vetere: Because we do have a right as a property owner if they are doing damage, we can kill them. We can call you and you come and get them. We've got to give you 72 hours. So, I just want to clarify that. If that's where everybody wants to go, we can go there. That's not where the Vetere's want to go. If the DWR wants to go there, that's ok. A lot of you guys, this committee has changed a lot of rules with the mule deer and I liked you're question to this gentleman about the mature bucks. There are no more mature bucks. You call a mature buck, he might have four points and he's two years old and when they count them, I think that's something that you guys need to look at. You might have 20 bucks but how many mature bucks?

Trisha: Thank you. Any more questions from the audience? Chris is going to do a quick summary of the online comments.

Chris Wood: Yeah. For southeastern respondents we had 5% opposed and 63% in support of the proposal with 31% being neutral. Statewide, it was 21% opposed, 53% support and 25 % neutral.

Comments from the audience

Trisha: So now we are going to take comments from the audience. Remember three minutes if you're an individual five minutes if you are representing an organization. First, we have Tim.

Tim Pilling: Thanks for the opportunity to address the RAC. I'm 99% in favor of this proposal. The main issue is baiting in the state of Utah. You know there are social issues, there are ethical issues, biological issues. I think Covy has done a great job. He's pointed out the biological issues around baiting. CWD is uncontrolled. It's not monitored very well out in the wild. We have one of the best deer units in the Southeast, the Henry Mountains. Baiting is very common on the Henry Mountains. I talked to numerous archers this year that were shooting deer under 20 yards over apples. The survey that they did, 43% thought that baiting should be illegal. So, the public sentiment is to make baiting illegal. The law is very specific. If you read the statute, it does not address feeding. It addresses taking animals over a bait. The definition of the state statute of "take" is to harvest or kill an animal. If you look at the language of the law in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona and Nevada it's illegal to bait in all of those states. They define it as to hunt any game animal by means of baiting. That's Idaho, Montana. Baiting is unlawful for anyone to hunt or attempt to hunt with the use of any bait. Wyoming has a little attitude for baiting if you have a disability but for the most part, we cannot take a big game animal over bait. Utah state statute reads, "possess or use bait or other attractant to take protected wildlife which is prohibited in this rule, title or rule, proclamation or under the wildlife board." It's silent on feeding. If I want to feed deer in my back yard I can still feed. So, my request is for the RAC board to make a proposal to the wildlife board to address baiting. So, I'm hoping that someone on the RAC can make a motion to say, I want the big game board to review baiting. I think it's a big problem and it's getting worse. I've got countless pictures this fall on social media, and videos off of YouTube that people don't even want to watch where they are taking a deer over a bait. A 15-yard shot is a long shot over a bait. If you want to ask me a question, I've done a lot of research on this topic. Any questions.

Trisha: Thank you Tim.

Colby Hunt: I'd like to comment on the Green River archery. I'm a landowner also and I think that's a bad deal to allow the archery hunt down here on Green River. I do applaud you guys for the HAMS thing. I think that's a great thing. As overcrowding is becoming a bigger and bigger issue. I think some of that country up there, that's a good hunt. I'd also like to recommend that maybe on the 24 down to Lake Powell, that desert country that runs down to Lake Powell be opened up for a general hunt too. There are a lot of desert deer that aren't getting killed that would be opportunity for people to hunt.

Trisha: Thank you Colby. Next we have Tim Vetere.

Kent Johnson: He bailed.

Trisha: Next we have Chris Fowler.

Chris Fowler: I'm a Green River resident. The HAMS deal, I like that. I like the opportunity. I think that would be a really cool hunt. It's a good opportunity for people. On the extended archery I see issues with it just as far as, I like to archery hunt, I like to muzzleloader hunt and rifle hunt but I don't like them crisscrossing. So, the season dates, my initial thought was when I heard extended was it was going to be really late then I was concerned about mature bucks getting easily taken out. They are too vulnerable. But once I saw the season dates up here, it still concerns me just as they overlap the muzzleloader hunt. It'll overlap the rifle hunt. Does archery had to wear orange at that point while they're out muzzleloader hunting? I'm just not for the extended archery here in Green River. That's just my opinion for those reasons.

Trisha: Thank you Chris.

Guy Webster: Yeah. I'd like to just speak in behalf of the HAMS hunt. I'm not opposed to that hunt if those tags on the Floy unit come out of the South Book Cliffs overall tags. Book Cliffs as a whole is in a bad way. A couple years back, they increased the tags. You know every bit of the management plan that we were currently under was worded at that time that you either maintain or some triggers even showed slight decrease. If you're going to go ahead with the HAMS hunt, I'd ask you to at least make sure that they come out of the allocated South Book Cliffs tags and not in addition to.

Trisha: Thank you Guy. So, at this point, that was all for public comment. Do we have comments from the RAC?

RAC comments

Gerrish Willis: I've got a comment. So, I remember about three years ago maybe four there was a lot of discussion here about fair chase in relation to both the ability to see animals with scopes that would basically hone in on animals from a long way away then the caliber (stopped speaking into the microphone) and it was all about fair chase. So, I am very sympathetic to the hunts that the wildlife board would limit baiting or eliminate baiting entirely because I don't see how it fits in with fair chase situation. It seems like if hunters are going to hunt, they ought to at least try to stick to the principles of fair chase and shooting a deer over bait to me just does not seem to fit in

with the hunting ethic that was so hotly debated several years ago.

Trisha: Thank you Gerrish. Other comments?

Kent: Yeah. Do you just want me to go through all I have and be done? I received multiple calls from a lot of people from the valley here and I'm pretty sure John (?) baled and I'm pretty sure he's opposed to the extended archery hunt. Based on that and my own concerns about the boundary over that with, you're putting the general season hunt overlapping into a limited entry hunt. I'm opposed to doing it too. That's one of the reasons I'm opposed. There are some other reasons and pretty much everybody that I've talked to in the valley is opposed to it. They don't want it here. So, that's one comment and I would make a motion to that when the time comes. The other comments I had have to do a lot with hand guns. Right now the handguns on the HAMS hunts, it's question/comment, I have concerns about allowing, ok you're going to have people out there trying to hunt archery and you're going to hunt with a muzzleloader with iron sites, that limits your range and if you're hunting with a traditional revolver or pistol, straight long cartridge then you kind of fit in with that group. You're short range, you're limited but there are those specialty pistols that even with the iron sites, if you do your homework, 350-400 yard shots are not difficult at all. I have one I've taken prairie dogs in excess of 400 yards with it. It has a scope on it but we're talking about specialty pistols made by Thompson singer, Remington quit making theirs but they fire rifle cartridges. I would like to see the division address that in these HAMS hunts. I would make a motion to that effect.

Chris: I think Covy might have a comment regarding that right now if you want to hear it.

Covy: That's a very good point. When we wrote this rule, we wrote it in a way that, there are some crazy things out there that people are calling pistols. So, we wrote the rule in a way to try and address that. So, it's not any pistol. It can't have an extended butt stock or any form thereof. Nothing that you could put up against your shoulder. We wrote it in a way to try and address as best we could a traditional hand held pistol.

Kent: I have a comment that maybe would cover that. Just restrict it to traditional straight long pistol and revolver cartridges otherwise in compliance with the handgun.

Covy: I can take that comment back but we did put it in rule. I don't have the big game rule right in front of me, we can look at that after and I can show you and see if that also fits what your intent would be.

Kent: I'm just concerned about people using stuff like that. You've got some guy out there that's trying to put a stock on a buck with a bow and some guy is laying across the canyon with a Thompson Contender chambered .308 Winchester and lays it down in front of him.

Covy: The way that it's currently written they should not be able to use that. It's hard because we had to write it in a way where we still have to meet the minimum foot pounds but...

Kent: But you can do that with .45 Colt or a .44 Magnum.

Covy: That's the point. I'll go over the language with you after.

Kent: The deer numbers we talked about but something we haven't talked about would primarily looking at the deer hunts right now. The only comments I have is on the elk on the Book Cliffs continuing to go downhill, I would personally like to see the cow hunts eliminated in that area completely. The elk for the most part, are gone and they are at a fraction of what they used to be. They are going downhill on the road part and then with these new HAMS hunts maybe it will be a good idea to look at, if we're going to have spike hunts on the Book Cliffs, make that a HAMS hunt. Then you knock out guys with better... a lot of that area out on the road area on Bittercreek, there's nowhere to dump the high(?) and you've got guys sitting up there with a 330 and are blowing spikes away at 700 yards. Maybe we could reduce the pain a little bit and still maintain the opportunity to hunt. With baiting, I appreciate what Covy said about baiting and having them watch the language because there is such a thing as a law with unintended consequences. We've got to be careful about any language. We've got to be sensitive to trapping and bear hunting and we've got to be sensitive to people that are feeding animals for purposes in the wintertime or maybe they just like to watch them in their backyard so they put out apples. I think we've got to be sensitive to that too. Whatever language the division comes up with in regard to that needs to be sensitive to all of those issues. One other comment, I had heard and I don't know if it's true. I was told by one individual that there was some pressure from Salt Lake with the division to put extended archery hunts in every region. I don't know if that's true or not. I had just heard that. If that is the case, we also have the issue with Castle Valley and their request. Maybe instead of having the extended archery hunt here in the Green River Valley, maybe we just do an archery hunt only and make it a little bit extended so that we've got a little bit more time and do that in Castle Valley because those people, all they want is to archery hunt there. They don't want anybody doing anything else. So, that might be something we can look at.

Chris: Bring that up in an hour.

Kent: I'm going to but I thought I bring it up in the comment now to get it on the table so we can discuss that maybe even make a motion to that effect here.

Eric Luke: My comment is somewhat on baiting as well and I appreciate everybody's concern. I had a lot of concern with it as well. To me, I don't like seeing trophy bucks shot over apples but having said that, it is very complex because, what about the guy that is planting clover? That's essentially baiting, that's bringing deer in. So, I think we've got to be sensitive to the fact in what Covy said, they are looking into that. But the division needs enough time to get with all entities to sort out all those particulars so that we don't end up penalizing the wrong people.

Gerrish Willis: Can I comment on your comment? I also remember a few years ago there was discussion about our law enforcement officers using good discretion and they are trained and experienced. To me somebody that is, your example of somebody planting some clover I think has some merit but it's a lot different than somebody that's going to go out and dump a couple bushful of apples, planning on tracking some deer in just to shoot. So, I think they could be specific enough in the rule that law enforcement officers would be able to figure out if there was an infraction or not.

Eric Luke: You're right but there's always that one law enforcement officer, I don't think there are any of them here but there is always that one who lives by the letter of that law and we see it time and time again, people get in trouble for doing something that's not necessarily bad. They just need time to work through that. It does need to be addressed. It sounds like they have plans to do that but it is a very complex things that's got to be worked through.

Gerrish: And I would say that if someone is planting clover as an attractant so that they can hunt deer, that would probably fall on the side of the rule I would hope that it's considered baiting versus someone who is planting clover because they like to see fawns out there frolicking in the field.

Trisha: Okay. I'm going to state, I want you to make your comment but we're about halfway through the agenda. That's all I'm going to say.

Scot: I'm going to make this quick. I'm opposed to the late season muzzleloader hunt because we have some mature bucks that are lucky enough to survive the on slot of the general season and each year that hunt is going to take away a margin of 14 (?) bucks in that pack. I think that that ship has probably sailed so I would support up to .5% or give them some leeway to be able to reduce that number of tags each year than just a blanket .5%.

Chris: So now we're to the point where if any biologists want to make an clarifications or Covy, do you guy have anything to say?

Dustin Mitchell: I just wanted to give a little information on the classification data that we get around CWMU's especially on the Abajo's. We look at that as probably, we classify around 1,000 head of deer on that whole unit. Probably 200 of those deer come from those areas. So, it's roughly 20% of what we do classify. Also, I do take into account, I'll exclude those numbers and just look at those areas that are nowhere near CWMU's and it always comes out right around the same. It's pretty dang close.

Person from the audience: When do you do those counts?

Dustin Mitchell: November 15- Mid-December

Trisha: Thank you. At this point I want to start pulling out different motions before we accepting the remainder of the recommendation. So, Kent do you want to talk about Green River?

Kent: Sure. I would make a motion that we do not approve the extended archery season in the Green River Valley and look at placing an extended archery season in the Castle Valley.

Trisha: Let's just deal with the first part of your motion.

Kent: Ok. I make a motion that we do not approve the extended archery season in the Green River Valley.

Trisha: I have a motion by Kent and a Second by Eric to remove the proposed extended archery hunt in the Green River Valley. All in favor? Seven in favor and two abstentions. Great. Scoot, do you want to talk about late muzzleloader?

Make a motion to not pass the extended archery hunt proposed in the Green River valley

Motioned by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Eric Luke

Motion Passes: 7

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 2

Scoot: I make a motion to make a proposal to change the verbiage changed to up to .5% instead of the blanket .5%.

Covy: I just want to clarify. I think, that's on the agenda I think we're ok with that motion as long as the RAC is ok with reopening the deer plan. Because what that would be is an amendment to, where it already passed, and you can do that. That's possible just make sure that you state that clearly that we understand that we are amending the motion that we passed the remainder to include this motion.

Eric: So, do we need a motion to reopen that?

Chris: Why don't you just add that phrase at the beginning?

Covy: Not to reopen just that it's an amendment.

Eric: So, why would that need to be because this is limited entry?

Covy: Because those are set in the deer plan. Because those are the late season muzzleloader permits, the deer plan recommended a .5% so, his motion just recommends that it can be recommended up to .5% not set at .5%. I just want to make sure we're clear for the board.

Scoot: So, I move that we change the verbiage to amend the deer plan (all units) as well with all the previous changes to the deer plan. Up to .5%.

Trisha: I have a second by Kent Johnson. All in favor? Nine in favor and one abstention.

Motion to change the verbiage in the state wide mule deer plan so that late season muzzleloader permits can be UP TO ½ percent of the total permits, in all units.

Motioned by: Scoot Flannery

Seconded: Kent Johnson

Motion Passes: 9

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 1

Trisha: What do we do about baiting? Do we just make a recommendation to put it on the

agenda for an action item?

Eric: I think it's already an action item.

Trisha: I think so too. So, we don't need a motion on that. We just all acknowledge that that is going to come to play. At this point are there any other things that we want to pull out or do we have a motion to accept the remainder of the recommendation? We have a motion by Brad to accept the remainder of the recommendation. We have a second by Kirk Player. All in favor? It looks like it is unanimous. Good job. Thanks, Covy, you're done. Way to go. Now we have Chad representing CWMU management plans.

Motion to accept the remaining Bucks, Bulls & OIAL

Motioned by: Brad Richman

Seconded by Kirk:

Unanimous

BREAK

7) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2020 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2020

- Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: So, at this point, don't go away Chad, we'll have questions from the RAC. I actually do have a question. Can you go back to that Minnie Maude? You said you added 10 elk but it looked like the acreage went down?

Chad Wilson: A lot of times it correlates with acreage going up or down but there are other factors such as the amount of elk. So, they have probably seen more elk in that area even through the acreage dropped.

Kent: So, how many of those increased tags are public?

Chad Wilson: So, it depends on the split. It would be really hard to break that, are you talking specifically Minnie Maude with that pie? It depends on where they were and which split, I don't have that right in front of me but if they did the 90/10 split and they were at 10 tags, then it would be one more public tag. But if they were at 13 and went up to 18 they were already giving two public tags and there wouldn't be extra. So, it all depends.

Eric: You showed the total number of permits in the state, do you have that broke out by region?

Chad Wilson: I don't. I could get that for you.

Eric: I'm just curious to see how many are actually in the Southeastern Region.

Chad Wilson: We have a database that I can break that out and get that for you.

Eric: Thank you.

Trisha: So, at this point I'll take questions from the audience. No questions. Chris has the summary.

Chris Wood: Summary for the Southeastern Region: 42% of people supported the proposal and 5% opposed the proposal with 52% being neutral. Statewide: 53% supported it, 21% were opposed and 25% were neutral.

Trisha: Now, we'll take comments from the audience. I have Ash Jenkins.

Question from the audience

n/a

Comments from the audience

Ash Jenkins: My name is Ash Jenkins and I represent the West Ridge CWMU. There are three of us here tonight. So, Roan Cliffs CWMU dissolved and is trying to become a three, two landowners want to make their own separate CWMU's and then the third landowners are wanting to join with the adjacent CWMU. So, to bring you up to speed a little bit of how the process went, there was a little bit of conflict between some of the landowners in August and that's why I requested an application from Brad Crompton to fill out. So, I actually filled out the application and never sent it in because the landowners decided that they were going to try and work it out for another year or so. There was a conflict that came upon them during the hunting season in September where they said, listen we can't do this anymore and you're going to need to send that application in. We submitted the application on September 26th, the application deadline was August 31st. So, since then, basically, we want to make a new CWMU that I would be the operator for. I currently operate two other CWMU's right now and then the other two gentlemen, one wants to be with the Roan's CWMU as well the other one wants to join up with a neighboring CWMU. Basically, what we're coming here for is a recommendation to allow us to continue in the CWMU program as separate CWMU's just because we turned in the application in late. I think one other thing I wanted to mention, Brad Crompton has been our biologist for 20 years or more and we've got a great relationship. I actually did a renewal application last year that I submitted on September 24th, which was late and it wasn't because I was late or Brad was late. Life is busy, it was right in the middle of our hunting season and it just happened that it got renewed that day but Brad and I had been working on it back and forth. It wasn't like there was a problem, I guess you'd say. So, I was a little bit surprised that we weren't able to be able to get this worked out. Are there any questions that need to be asked of me?

Kent Johnson: I have questions. One, we don't know if you've met the criteria. We can't know that as a RAC. Another thing is, you're requesting, is the deadline just a guideline for the

division or is it in state law?

Chad Wilson: The way I understand that, in our rule it states that August 1st is the deadline. We have another policy that says they can go 30 days late. So, that puts us at August 30th. That's the reason we didn't accept that is we want to follow the rules. It's the only way to be fair with everybody. I can't say what's happened in the past, I'm three months into this position. I'm going to follow the rule.

Darren Olsen: So, just to add to that, does that mean they would have to wait another year? Would it come up next year?

Chad Wilson: Yeah.

Chris: Chad, so I thought Staci Coons said that this RAC had the option to approve the request. I think he makes a good point, they don't know if it's been approved or what they are approving.

Kent: We don't know what we're approving.

Eric: Do you guys know if they met the criteria?

Chad Wilson: Yeah, we received the application and I believe on this application they were wanting deer and elk and they didn't meet the elk criteria. That's part of the... and Chris is right, you guys have the ability to do that. This was the process. We can't recommend it because it's not following the rule. They can come and ask and you can grant that to them. But that is part of the concern with any late application is that we don't have the time to vet it like we would any other application. They don't meet the elk amount.

Ash Jenkins: So that's one of the requests that I would make as well. So, we are sitting at about 8,400 acres and you're supposed to have 10,000 for elk so, we'd be requesting a variance to be able to have the elk CWMU under 10,000 as well. Which has been done in the past. I don't know if any of you are familiar with Jump Creek CWMU, that one just went through a couple of years ago and it's 7,500 acres but it's a good CWMU. It operates well, it's got a lot of elk on it. From talking to Brad obviously, the division can't recommend to not follow their own rule so, that's why we have to request a variance to get under 10,000 acres and as far as the application being approved or not, other than the elk variance... everything I've done with Brad, the CWMU would qualify and is defined by the division other than the only problem is that we submitted it three weeks late.

Chad Wilson: One other clarification if I may. The elk variance by our rule is supposed to go through the CWMU advisory committee meeting in February before it goes so there is another process to get an elk variance.

Chris: And then it would go to the wildlife board? It'd go through this variance committee and then it would go to the wildlife board the following fall?

Chad Wilson: So, the way that this should have happened was, if he wanted an elk under 10,000

acres for this year, in February he needed to do the variance request to the advisory committee then do the application. The advisory committee advises whether they should get the variance or not and then that's taken into consideration.

Trisha: So, my comment is unless we have other questions for Ash, we'll take other comments and we can discuss this during our comment period. Unless you have other questions.

Kent: Let's wait until we're done with the rest of the CWMU stuff then deal with this.

Trisha: Do you have a question for Ash?

Dana: I was just wondering if there were any maps?

Ash Jenkins: We can pull up the map of the CWMU that is currently for 2019 that will be separated into chunks.

Trisha: Okay, so we will do our other comments and we'll come back to that. So, let's have Daniel Lawford.

Daniel Lawford: That's correct. Hi, I'm Daniel Lawford. We've been in a CWMU for many, many years. We started out at (?) Canyon CWMU then we joined with Roan Cliffs CWMU and like they just said, the middle man decided that ground wasn't going to have us in the CWMU anymore so it split us. I'm left with the rug pulled out from under me. It was all done after the application dates and just recently happened. We're just trying to get back in so we can have a CWMU again next year. We've always treated our public hunters the best. Out of a 61-day hunt, they hunt 56 days. We always try to be good and fair with them. I'm just hoping that we can get in and be able to continue a CWMU for next year.

Trisha: Next we have Travis Person. So, Todd Hinkins.

Todd Hinkins: I'm Todd Hinkins. I've managed the Roan Cliffs CWMU for 20 years. I also managed _____?? CWMU. Like they said, the first of October of this year I was notified that the middle person that was connecting Dan and I together no longer wanted to be part of the CWMU. So, we missed that deadline by two months. I talked to the landowners on the Pappas Ridge that I manage and _____?? and myself are in contact with them as far as contiguous acres. We're losing about 2,000 acres difference; we'll actually have more acres in this new Pappas Ridge than what we had in the Roan Cliffs. So, acreage wise, we're at about 25-26,000 acres. We're fine with acreage on both deer and elk. We're dropping our numbers from 36 private to 18 on the deer and from 18 elk to 16 to make the difference up. So, we're just hoping we can get, even though it's late, we were just thrown into this situation not by choice. We're just hoping we can get through for next year then we'll reapply to do some other stuff after that. Does anybody have any questions? Thank you.

Trisha: And the last comment from Tim Pilling.

Tim Pilling: Thanks, I'd like to state as a public consumption user of wildlife, I think the ability

for people to come to the RAC and change rules that have been in existence for 20 years, I think that needs to be thoroughly vetted. I think you shouldn't be able to come up here and change rules and say, well I missed the application. If I renew my driver's license, I lose my driver's license. This isn't like it's a new CWMU that hasn't been in existence. That's my comment.

Trisha: Thank you Tim. So, at this point, let take comments from the RAC.

RAC comments

Trisha: I guess I do have a comment and this is just me being a school mom. But I do try to kind of institute in the people that I teach that you have to be on time. I do think it's a life skill that's really important and it's not like we missed it by a day or two, it's a couple months. And the variance was long. I just think considering a variance isn't really on the table. That's just me being a school mom.

Dana: Working in government agencies there are reasons why we have deadlines. There is good opportunity to develop a good proposal. I don't have a lot of information at this time so, rush decisions often don't go well. There's an application period next year and that's the (can't hear her).

Eric: I don't know if it's too late to ask questions I'd like to understand some of the circumstances behind why it got delayed so much. If it was just lack of not getting it done then that's one thing. If it's for circumstances that, I don't know I guess it needs to be handled. I do agree that there are deadlines but I think that there is a chance to get these guys what they are after. The variance, I would be very opposed to that. That needs to go through the correct process so, I don't feel like that's an option but as far as approving them if they meet the criteria, the only thing I'm worried about is what kind of precedence are setting moving forward.

Trisha: Brad, I think it'd be best to hear from you if you understand.

Brad Crompton: Just for clarification as far as the deadline, none on them had renewals that were due this year. So, they weren't really planning on applying for any sort of application that was due on August 1st. Things blew up in September and this is all kind of reactionary. So, just to clarify that part. I'm not pleading anyone's case that's for sure.

Eric Luke: So, Brad if the RAC said, we're not doing anything, do they still have the option to operate next year as they were, since they didn't have a renewal?

Brad Crompton: No. Someone pulled out so the CWMU would not function and no one would hunt on the CWMU next fall as it stands right now. Just because none of them meet the minimum acres

Eric: If they could work it out amongst themselves to stick it out one more year, would that be an option for them?

Brad Crompton: I believe that would be an option for them.

Eric: I don't know if that's a possibility or not.

Kirk: So just for clarification, there were three landowners, the middle one decided after the date, I'm gone completely gone, so it then left the Roans on the right and the left high and dry.

Brad Crompton: Yeah.

Kirk: And just for clarification from you and Chad, if this was approved, is it your opinion that you will have the time needed to properly vet this application or no?

Brad Crompton: Yes. We have two of the applications in hand. We visited with each of these entities just in case, whatever the RAC or wildlife board decide we've got to have the options in place to know how many permits and how many acres and things like that. A good bit of that has been analyzed already. So, yes.

Kirk: Go ahead Chad, too.

Chad: Yeah, there was on the one that Ash is proposing an incident a couple of years back that was brought to our attention that I'd like to look into a little bit more. It was with a public hunter that actually got kicked off that landowner's land when he had the right to be there. That would be something that I would want to look into more. The other two, I haven't had any complaints.

Kirk: That's the one that's going to be striking on their own?

Chad: Well, there was two that were trying to do it on their own.

Kirk: The one is joining with an already existing.

Chad: So, the one in the middle that pulled out, that's the one that I'm saying.

Kirk: That was the bad apple that kicked them off the land? The middle guy?

Chad: Yeah. That landowner did it.

Kirk: It's like a soap opera.

Chad: Then there is the one that's trying to join another CWMU but the other one that didn't leave is also trying to do a new CWMU.

Kirk: Go ahead Scoot

Scoot: No

Kirk: Just to confirm, on your YouTube?? You do not see any negligence on them sitting on paperwork and just not doing it on time it's just that they got thrown into it a little bit late as far as you are aware?

Chad: Yeah. I mean talking to Ash it sounded like there was that possibility earlier on but then it really came to a head later.

Kirk: It smoothed out then when it came to a head it was after the deadline.

Chad: Yeah. So, it was just bad timing.

Kirk: So, what did you see the time lapse from when you knew it came to a head and he was pulling out to when you had the application in your hand?

Chad: So, when it really came to a head, that was really quick for Ash. The other two I think for a little bit didn't know it was going to happen so, it took a little more time for them to turn one in.

Kirk: Because they didn't already have one ready.

Chad: Right.

Trisha: Do we have the ability to kick the can down the road meaning, just kick it to the wildlife board?

Chad: I guess you can handle it however you want. They also probably have the option, they brought it here, they can all take it to the wildlife board too.

Trisha: Right. I've seen the wildlife board handle this stuff.

Kent: This is convoluted at best.

Trisha: Right. I guess, I would feel more comfortable having the wildlife board

Kent: I don't know about the rest of you but I'm not tracking with this.

Trisha: Yeah. I would feel more comfortable having the wildlife board deal...

Kent: I don't have enough information and I have nothing in writing that I can sit and look at the steps and...

Chris: Will the wildlife board have a map in the proposal and descriptions and that kind of stuff in front of them?

Chad: If they bring it.

Chris: Okay.

Chad: So, it's not our recommendation that we're not accepting applications so, yeah that would have to be brought by those parties.

Kent: I feel for you guy's situation, I think it sucks that you got thrown into that but looking out for the good of everybody, and the wildlife, the public and the division's interests and everything else, I'm going to make a motion specific to this that we leave it alone as a RAC and we send it with you guys to the wildlife board. Take better information with some maps and hard numbers and proposals and talk to them.

Trisha: So, we have a proposal by Kent Johnson that the three individuals that are asking for

Eric: Let me ask a question. We have a member of our wildlife board with us, is that procedure acceptable?

Darren: Yeah, if that's what you prefer as a board.

Kirk: Let's all just make Kevin decide.

Kevin Albrecht: Kevin Albrecht, wildlife board. So, we do see these a lot and when they come to the wildlife board, they do have a lot more prepared and we're able to vet them at a high level. So, to be able to say, we want the wildlife board to look at this, we don't have enough information here, that's fine.

Brad Richman: I second that motion then.

Trisha: Ok. I have a motion by Kent Johnson that the individuals requesting a CWMU extension that that be promoted to the state wildlife board. I have a second by Brad Richman.

Motion- Due to lack of information, pass the CWMU operators' requests on to the Wildlife Board

Motion by: Kent Johnson

Seconded by: Brad Richman

In favor: 6

Opposed: 1

Abstention: 3

Gerrish: I'd like to explain why. I don't think it's our role to be making motions to tell individuals what to do or not to do. To me, it just doesn't seem right. So, I'm sympathetic to their problem and they have the right to go directly to the wildlife board directly if we don't take any action and that's what I would advise them to do without making a motion. It seems like, if I were going to be investing in a CWMU with some other landowners I'd want to have some kind of paper that legally bound them to abide by the terms for a period of time so that this situation doesn't come up. I don't know if that's something that some of these guys do or not, but it seems like having a legal agreement so that you're not left high and dry would be to your benefit.

Trisha: Do I have a motion on the remainder of the CWMU management plans and permit numbers? OK. So, I have a motion to approve by Kent Johnson and a second by Gerrish. All in favor? It's unanimous. Excellent. OK, Lindy how you doing back there?

Motion to approve the remainder of the CWMU

Motion Kent

Second Gerrish

Unanimous

8) Proposed rule amendments to address point creep, lost opportunities and equity in the hunt drawing process

- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: Questions?

Eric Luke: With your dedicated hunter draw, or not being able to put in for both, what about lifetime license holders?

Lindy: They would have to pick. So, if a lifetime license holder wanted to go with the dedicated hunter program, they would have to forfeit their opportunity as a lifetime license holder.

Eric: Can you do that or does that breach a contract?

Lindy: It does not. They do it now if they do a group application. Lifetime license holders can go in a group app for general season and they have to say that they don't want their lifetime opportunity.

Eric: I'm pretty sure my lifetime license says I'm guaranteed a deer tag every year.

Lindy: You guys can change it. This is how it is running but it's not breaching contract.

Kent Johnson: I just have a couple questions. You put the odds of drawing up there for elk and deer is that just everything lumped together? Limited entry, premium, CWMU, it's all one?

Lindy: Yes, it's all limited entry deer and elk lumped into it.

Kent: On that, it's not really clear on the loss of your preference points if you buy an over the counter tag. The way it was written in the information and the way it's put out is you lose your preference points if you buy any over the counter tag. Is that the way it is or is it species and sex specific?

Lindy: No. So, if you buy a general season permit for deer

Kent: So, if you give up your deer tag and you go buy a cow tag left over, you lose your preference points for deer? So, it's species specific? Ok. It's not clarified in the wording where it

is or isn't. I just wanted to ask that question. I assumed it was but it's not clear.

Lindy: And we can make it clearer if we need to. If you buy a permit for that species you lose your points.

Darren Olsen: I guess this is curiosity on my part, what does it take to get a variance for illness or injury? Would you qualify because you sprained your ankle? What does that take?

Lindy: I broke my ankle. I'm just sucking it up. I actually would. I'd have to get a doctor's note saying that I can't hunt and this is the reason why. He would have to say that it would damage what I did. I review these applications for variances. It's a lot of paperwork and it's a lot of questions. I talk to the hunters very detailed and find out exactly what is going on to see if they actually are being legit.

Trisha: Okay. I'm going to move on to questions from the audience.

Question from the audience

Reed Pendleton: I just have a bunch of questions actually about the whole dedicated hunter/general deer stuff. They are two different points right now.

Lindy: Correct.

Reed Pendleton: So, are they going to stay two different points or is it just going to be a general deer and you have the option of choosing a dedicated hunter.

Lindy: Not the way I'm proposing it. It'll be two separate apps. So, when you go to apply right now you can pick dedicated hunter and general season. But if you picked dedicated hunter it wouldn't let you pick general season.

Reed Pendleton: Okay. Then my next question would be, my wife just finished dedicated hunter, she has two general deer points, what you're proposing is that if she draw dedicated hunter next year then she loses the two deer points that she's already banked.

Lindy: No, because they are two different point systems. So, if she draws a general season...

Reed Pendleton: But doesn't it say that you're going to lose your preference points if you draw a general deer tag?

Lindy: So, the dedicated hunter is a dedicated hunter COR and a general season deer permit. So, if you have dedicated hunter points and general season points. So, if you look at your list of points that you've accumulated over the years, they are two different levels. So, if you draw the COR you lost those points or if you draw a general season you lose those points but not...

Reed Pendleton: That's just what I'm trying to clarify. So, if you draw a dedicated hunter, you don't lose your general deer points even though it says you lose your preference points.

Lindy: Because you don't purchase that over the counter. Now if she didn't draw a general season then bought a leftover permit, she would lose her general season permit points.

Reed Pendleton: So that's my next question. If she applies for dedicated hunter and gains the point there but she buys a leftover tag, she would lose her general points but not the dedicated hunter?

Lindy: Correct

Reed Pendleton: So, they are two separate programs but you can only apply for one?

Lindy: Because they come out of the same quota. That's the reason why we're trying to let you pick either or. What is happening is people are going for the same hunt and they have two opportunities pretty much.

Reed Pendleton: Right but everyone has that opportunity.

Lindy: Everyone does but like I said, general season currently right now is, people want a permit every year so the division has been asked to look at ways to get permits into hunter's hands more often.

Reed Pendleton: But doesn't give you the opportunity to apply for one tag twice? Doesn't that give you two opportunities to do that?

Lindy: It does but like I said, this is a social issue. You don't like it; you can make a comment to change it.

Trisha: Chris.

Chris Wood: Report from the public poll had a very high approval rating. 74% of the people approved your proposal with 10% opposing and 16% neutral.

Eric Luke: Trisha, I've got one more question please. So, currently I can put in for a limited entry deer tag and a general season deer tag?

Lindy: Correct.

Eric: Have you considered making people choose that? You're basically do the same thing with the dedicated hunter program.

Lindy: The reason we're doing the dedicated hunter is because it's the same quota. If we went to one point system the division is not ready to go that direction. That's a whole different... even management, the way we manage deer in the state of Utah, it's just not one point system into one. So, at this time the division does not want to go down that route. But I get what you are saying.

Comments from the audience

Jeremy Anderson/Mule Deer Foundation: Once again, thank you for the opportunity RAC. I've said this at all the RAC's so far and it's worth saying again. I commend Lindy and the team that put this together. This is a lot of work and I think we all know what it's about. It's about point creep. It's a drop in the bucket. I've heard that a few times. It's a couple drops in the bucket. Something needs to happen and this is a really, really good tool. It's aggressive and I like it. I mean, there are some things in there that I even, we had some sour taste on the dedicated hunter thing for a while but she clarified that's 1000 tags. So, it's a good deal. One comment that we heard at the Central RAC. A young man walked up and said, "I am purchasing or buying or drawing out an opportunity to hunt. I'm not getting a 350 bull. It doesn't say 350 bull on their tag." I think that's pretty prevalent and relevant where these guys are turning in their tags because of a drought, a fire or they didn't see their 250-inch mule deer. This is a great tool and I commend the division and the Mule Deer Foundation supports it in full.

Trisha: Thank you Jeremy. Let's take comments from the RAC.

RAC comments

Jace Guymon: I have a couple. So, currently when someone surrenders a permit, even if it is prior to the 30 days, even if that individual has 26 deer points, he turns his tag in, he was a max point holder but when it's reallocated it goes to the random draw, correct?

Lindy: Correct.

Jace: I would like to see a change in that. Especially if we're putting in all this effort in making sure people turn them in 30 days prior to the hunt. I think we have plenty of resources and time. If that was a max point holder, it should go to a max point holder not just to someone with two points that doesn't really care and just gets lucky. So, I think that's a major issue that we should look into and address. If a max point holder drew a tag and turns it in, it should be reallocated to a max point holder.

Trisha: So, then are you saying if it's just a lottery draw then it... it goes back to where it came from. I see what you're saying.

Jace: Yeah. My second comment: when the point system was created it was to give people an opportunity if they were willing to stick it out for a long time and draw that special tag that they get to hunt where ever they want basically. So, by taking their points entirely, I can see the point of it, but I think no point gain for the next year, eventually everyone is going to catch up to them so they're not going to just keep turning in like that... I know who it is. This is his sixth year turning his tag in. He's not going to be able to do that because eventually the point still catches up to him and he won't be in the top of the pool. So, I don't think it's necessary to take his points. We created this monster, we created the point system, he's bought into it all these years. Those are your points; you own them and I feel like you shouldn't lose those even if you turn it in because eventually, you're not going to be able to roll it over if you're not gaining a point. Maybe one time is all that you're going to do because you'll fall back behind everyone else in the pool that is catching up to you. So, I'd like to see that taken off. I think just not getting a

refund and not gaining a point is enough.

Kent: Can I add on to that? I kind of have the same comment and the same concern. I wrote down an idea with that. If you go in less than 30 days if it's a OIAL then you are ineligible to apply the next year and if it's just a limited entry or premium limited entry, then you incur the waiting period.

Jace: I think that would be a good way...

Kent: That would be a good enough way, an incentive without going scorched earth on somebody.

Jace: Then they wouldn't be gaining a point for that year and the next year, so they would fall two points behind but they still have a chance to hunt that premium unit.

Dana: Can I just ask a clarifying? If you surrender before the deadline of 30 days prior, you're fine. We're only talking about the penalty for 30 days before you hunt. You better know what you're doing at that point.

Jace: Yes. A lot of issues can come up in that 30 days. Someone has waited 20 years to hunt that tag, I hate to take all their points from them.

Kent: Yeah.

Eric: We had this same conversation before and it was brought up that, if it's something like getting hurt and it's still that 30 days, you can appeal to the wildlife board. Yeah, it takes a little more effort and time to do that but the wildlife board has reinstated points, they'll give variances for certain things like that. This is basically to deter these guys that are turning their tag back year after year because they're not finding the quality of animals that they want.

Scot: There are things that aren't listed there as reasons why you would get your points back. So, to take every one of their points away, that's pretty harsh. One point, that's still significant.

Jace: Even Kent's suggestion of making them ineligible the next year, that's two points. On the Henry's that the difference of maybe five years of getting a tag with the way the points are going. I strongly disagree with that because punishing them, it's a point system made by the division to allow opportunity. So, you're punishing them for your own animal basically.

Lindy: Can I just make one comment? In regards to the bonus point using the alternate list, so you understand how that process works, easier said than done. Granted we can get the max point draw list but when we have 2000+ permits turned into the division in a three-month time frame, you're asking an admin nightmare to look at every single tag. 26 points, I know you're at max points. Now I'm looking at this hunt, what was the max points? So, I saw 800 permits are surrendered that are limited entry and OIAL, that doesn't include general season. General season is a whole different game. It's ridiculous how many general season permits are surrendered into the division. So, I see what you're saying.

Jace: Maybe if I narrowed it down because general season, you're low enough on points I don't think it matters as much.

Lindy: We don't do max points with general season. We don't reallocate those but we still have to handle them and process them and surrender them. We're still getting them. The reason why the division has always used the random list is because of the volume. We've also noticed that most of those people that we call are high point holders because they have so many points. Once in a while, we'll get someone that had one or two points but the majority of the time, they are high point holders and that's why we can't get them back out because they are saying, I'm going to draw out in the next year or two, why would I take a hunt that's a week away. We can get those permits back out if I call the person with one point. They are like, heck yeah because I know I can't draw that tag in 30 years. So, you guys can do what you want and have a discussion, I just wanted to explain the process behind it.

Kirk: One thing that would change I would imagine if we adopt this, is... How many tags did you say you get turned back in?

Lindy: Over 2,000.

Kirk: I bet it's 400 next year.

Lindy: I hope.

Kirk: That's going to be the 400 that didn't read the rules.

Lindy: Well, we would definitely educate. We don't want to hurt someone.

Kirk: Some of that might be a little easier to differentiate versus max point.

Eric: I think she brings up a very valid point. If I'm a max point holder and they call me a week before the hunt, I'm not taking that tag because I can draw next year and have the full experience.

Kirk: That's true.

Covy: Can I just say something? I just want to validate what Lindy said. They don't take them. We've called them and they don't care. The other thing is I just wanted to make sure I clarify that points are not property. Legally they are not property. We made sure to write that in the code for that sentiment exactly. Points are not property. This is an opportunity. Everything Lindy presented here tonight is an opportunity. It's a choice. Anything that is an illness, death or injury, you still get your points and your money back. But everything on here is a choice. The problem is that individuals right now are making the choice, that are taking away the opportunity from the rest of the public. So, if you look at this very selfishly, everything she presented will affect somebody if you choose to make that choice. But if you look at it holistically, everything that Lindy presented will help all of us hunt more often. That's the goal and that's why it's a package deal. If you start to pick it apart and I understand as a RAC that is your job, but if you get too far

down that road, it won't do anything. It won't accomplish the end goal. I want to make sure the RAC understands that.

Dana: To me what was telling was that table that she presented that if permits are surrendered less than 30 days, they're not reallocated. And that's what I guess concerned me that, if you read the rules and you're educated on this, you now make that decision 30 days before the hunt and then we can get these permits reallocated.

Trisha: So, we can talk about this forever and I don't want to do that. Let's start to get down to a few fine things. She made 16 recommendations so we could be here for a long time.

Eric: So, this is to do with the dedicated hunter thing. I've received a lot of feedback and a lot of comments from the public. I think that over the years, we've taken away so many things from the dedicated hunter program. We take away one more thing and there is no reason for anybody to want to get into dedicated hunter. We used to give a tag when you returned your unused tag, you were put in a drawing. That's gone. They've upped the number of service hours. We've just taken away, you used to be able to hunt all three hunts if you drew a limited entry tag. You can't do that. I really think that this could be a bad thing for the dedicated hunter program. I think when you take some much away from it, nobody is going to want to put in for it again. Other than just the extended period of time to hunt, there's no incentive to for that and if you have to choose now...

Scot: I'll still choose dedicated hunter.

Kirk: I didn't draw this year. I blame you. So, apparently people are still trying because I didn't get it. This is the first year I didn't get a deer tag that I was living in the country.

Eric: But next year if you have to choose dedicated hunter, if you don't draw, you're not going to get a tag at all. You can't put in for a general season tag as well.

Kirk: I didn't do that this year either because I'm not smart enough to figure that out. It's not going to affect me. I have the point for it but I think part of, to address point creep and to give opportunity, just kind of a general rule we all need to think about when stuff comes here, we have to make the ethics of hunting we have to decrease it. We have to make it harder. We have to make it harder to kill animals and then more people will be able to hunt.

Eric: All we've done is made it easier.

Kirk: Exactly. I know it's counterintuitive but it has to be harder. It has to be harder to hunt. You have to go in farther and you have to get closer and all of that. So, I don't think if the dedicated hunter program goes away, I'm going to be onboard until then because I'm with Scot. If they're going to let me hunt all three then I'm going to do it. But if it goes away so it's harder to hunt then that might actually mean more people get to hunt. You know, point creep is an animal that I don't worry about as much for me but I worry about for my kids. I'm kind of in the game and I'll get to see some benefit of it but my kids, they might be 70 before they can draw one of these premium hunts then not be able to hunt.

Eric: But you're talking about two different things. The dedicated hunter has no effect of your limited entry premium hunts. It only has an effect on your general season.

Kirk: But it gives you more opportunity to hunt and more people are killing on dedicated tags than they are on general.

Eric: I disagree with that because most of your dedicated hunters don't kill

Trisha: Okay guys we could be here all night going back and forth. Maybe that's a discussion for after?

Chris: After?

Trisha: They can stand outside. We need to come up with, if we want to pull out some items and make independent motions. If there are none, we'll make a motion to accept it as she has presented.

Kent: Can I take a stab? At the risk of doing something wrong. I'm concerned about someone giving up all their points especially on OIAL. I think that if someone turns in a tag less than 30 days before the hunt that they lose the point for that year and they are ineligible to apply the following year for that species.

Trisha: And this is for OIAL, limited entry, both?

Kent: Let's do it for everything.

Trisha: OK. So, I have a motion by Kent Johnson that if an individual, surrenders a tag less than 30 days prior to the hunt that they lose their point for that year and they gain a one year waiting period. Do I have a second on that? I have a second by Jace. All in favor? Is there anything else that anyone wants to pull out?

For OIAL and limited entry permits, change the penalty of someone turning in a tag <30 days, to losing a point and incurring a one year waiting period

Motioned by: Kent

Seconded by: Jace

Motion Passes/Failed: Passed (7)

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 2

Motion to approve the remainder of the proposal as presented by the division.

Motioned by: Kent

Seconded: Jace

Motion Passes/Failed: 9

Abstention: 1

Opposed:

9) **Big Game Application Timeline**

- Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator

Kent: I kind of feel for the division to have to go through and do all five of these marathon meetings.

Lindy: I'm running on three hours of sleep. I can answer any questions if you have any.

Chris: We're good. You feel for us. We're getting paid at least. You guys are volunteers.

Kent: I appreciate your effort.

10) **Town of Castle Valley Request**

- Alice Drogin and Harry Holland, Town of Castle Valley

Alice Drogin: I'm Alice Drogin and this is Harry Holland. We serve on the Castle Valley town council and we're here tonight representing the town of Castle Valley. Madam Chair and RAC board, thank you so much for having us here, for keeping us up late. We don't get to stay up this late very often. Anyway, we are here tonight to present a request. We are seeking to change the hunting designation in our town to archery only in areas that are immediately adjacent to the residential parts of the town. We're seeking to do this for the health and safety of the residents and the recreational users in that area. So, what we'd like to offer now is a rebuttal of the letter that I know you all received from DWR Director Fowlks. We'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Harry Holland: Thanks again for having us. We appreciate you hanging in there. We're volunteers down in Castle Valley too so we know what it's like. We hope that we've saved a good controversial issue for the last agenda item. So, for those of you who don't know already, Castle Valley is about 15 miles East of Moab near the La Sal Mountains. We're surrounded by mostly public lands, mostly administered by the BLM down there. So, I just wanted to go through, I know we've sent you a lot of information. Hopefully some of you have seen it in your packets. I'll go through these maps for you. It's a little complicated. We've tried to simplify it but still when I look at it up on the screen it looks like kind of a mess of lines. So, what we've got down in Castle Valley currently, is a residential area. That's what the big red line is. That's all residential area, we've got five acre lots with houses. To the East of Castle Valley, we have two hunting zones. The first one, the farthest East is open to all hunting weapons and the one closest to the residential areas is open to archery, muzzleloaders and shot guns. Also, within our boundaries we've got a separate residential unit out here. We call it the upper 80 because it's about 80 acres. It is surrounded by all the hunting areas. The white hashed area that you can see is Utah open lands. They've got some land within the town boundary and then they have about an equal amount of land outside the town boundary. So, what this is really all about for us, we are trying to increase the safety of the town residents that live next to the hunting areas and

especially the upper 80 area that is surrounded by hunting areas. We know that modern muzzleloaders have just about the same range and velocity as other hunting rifles so we're really concerned about that. So, this is a map of our proposed boundary. What we're proposing is, we want to keep the designation the same on this piece of land, that's with all hunting weapons and then on the other piece of land that's currently shot gun, muzzleloader and archery, we'd like to see that designated archery only. So that we protect the residents up there in that part of the Valley. Also, this green line is the main road that goes through Castle Valley. It's Castle Valley Drive and it continues on into, it crosses UOL land here so this is all hunting areas and it's the main access into and out of the upper 80. There are also a lot of other roads that are being used by hikers and bikers. We're getting more recreational users up there. We've got hunters and ranchers up in there too. So, it's getting to be a little bit of a crowded area. So, I'll put these side by side just to give you a little bit better idea of what we're looking at. The current boundary, like I say, what we're trying to change is the muzzleloader, shotgun and archery only area to archery only in that same area. So, that's really what it boils down to and it's a good summary of what we're trying to do with this designation change right now.

Alice Drogin: So, here's a little bit of Castle Valley history. Back in 2007, acting on many requests to address safety issues the town went through the DWR process and the town of Castle Valley ended up passing an ordinance saying, we would like to have archery only within the boundaries of our town. We put up signs saying that, archery only. So, for several years the incidents reported to the town dropped drastically and everything was great. Then in about 2017 we were notified by the state saying, you guys can't say that, we didn't acknowledge your ordinance so you have to take those signs down. So, we did and we put up new signs that said, muzzleloaders and shotguns and primitive weapons would be allowed there. During that time, we really don't understand what happened. We know that we sent people here just as Harry and I are here tonight to present our case to the RAC and to the wildlife board. But all the paperwork and documentation of that seems to have disappeared. So, we're starting the process over. That's what we're doing here tonight. We would certainly love to have that archery only designation because it worked for us. It was something, during that time that we had it, it was maybe about 10 years we hardly had any incidents reported. I think your report reflects that. Director Fowlks said, well there aren't enough incidents being reported for us to justify changing your hunting designation. I'm here to tell you that there are incidents happening all the time and they're just not being reported for one reason or another. A lot of times people don't want to be seen as tattling; they just want to handle it themselves. People don't want any kind of law enforcement involvement. The one thing I hear over and over again is that the time element works against us. You can be up there riding our horse in the back country and you might witness an incident and it's going to be an hour or two before you can get home to a phone to report that then it might be another hour or two before the game warden can get out there to investigate that and that's a best case scenario. Often, it's a few days before someone gets out there or even a week. So, people have this fatalistic attitude, they think what's the point of reporting anything? All I can do is tell the game warden, yes, I saw something but I don't know who they are, I didn't see a vehicle, the carcass is gone. People are saying why should we bother reporting anything? So, for many reasons these incidents are not being reported to the sheriff or the game warden. They are reported to the town however. So, we're the ones that get that. So, we would love it if we could have archery only there because we felt that it's a very easy thing for people to comply with. The boundary that Harry was just suggesting, a big part of that boundary is a road and it's just very

easy for people to see on one side of the road you can hunt with a gun and on the other side, you hunt with a bow. We feel like by making the boundary easy and making the understanding very clear, it will help people to comply and that will help to promote the safety of the residents. We'd love to have archery only because it worked so well for us in the past. We're pretty sure that that is the reason why there are not very many incidents reported because we had those signs there for a while.

Harry Holland: So, as Alice mentioned over the last several years since we've changed the signs back, safety concerns have begun circling and before making any changes to our ordinances, we really wanted to understand what our residents thought. We've got a very diverse community that includes hunters, hikers, bikers, ranchers, horseback riders. So, in response to requests from all these residents and from recreational users that use the Valley, we went out and asked for public opinion on changing the hunting designation. We did a survey. We started back in January 2019 and did a survey of all our residents. We got about 86 respondents. We also had an open house. Chris came down and met with us and answered a lot of questions. I think Dustin was there a couple of times. So, I'll just go through the survey really quick. We sent out about 250 requests for feedback and we got 86 back which is pretty good response on a survey like that. So, we kept it pretty simple. The main question we asked was in the hunting zone closest to the residential areas of town, do you support changing the types of weapons allowed from primitive weapons only including shotgun, modern and antique muzzleloaders and archery equipment to archery only. We got about 80% of people responded, yes, I agree to that change. The next question, we wanted to find out who was in our audience and what they thought about hunting. We asked, are you a hunter? About 20% of the people, 17 people responded that they were a hunter. We thought it was interesting that 13 out of the 17 hunters agreed with changing the designation to archery only. We did ask our residents to comment and asked if they had any comments or questions that they would like to share with the town or the division of wildlife. We got about 60 comments. They ranged all over the place. We got everything from, "I used to hunt I'm a gun owner and avid shooter my feeling is that there should not be any hunting within 1,000 feet of a residential area." So, that was kind of indicative of a lot of people that commented. We also got, "all areas within safe distance to residential, 600 feet should be open to all firearms for hunting and recreational use in my opinion. Support our right to keep and bear arms." So, you can tell we have a diverse group of people in the valley but our survey did show that an overwhelming number of people supported the designation change, almost 80%.

Alice Drogin: So, Director Fowlks also said that the proposed hunting ordinance would restrict hunting on large blocks of federal land. Not really. Look at that there. It's just a tiny little thing. It's not even 1,500 acres that the town is requesting to change to archery only. We're not looking to prevent hunting. I wouldn't dare in a room like this. There's no way you would go for that but we do want to restrict the hunting just in this tiny area because we want to protect the people that live there and the people that are using that area recreationally. Director Fowlks had stated that existing laws already protect the public because there is a state law prohibiting a person from discharging a firearm within 600 feet of a building without the written permission of the property owner. If I interpret this correctly it means that with the property owners, you know I could invite a hunter on my land and say go for it and they wouldn't have to be 600 feet away from my home. But if they are on my property, they are certainly going to be less than 600 feet from anybody's home. So, I we just don't think that's a safe distance and I certainly wouldn't want to

see kids playing in the yard, people out enjoying their yard, we don't always have a visual of 600 feet. Because of the terrain there, you're often in a drainage. You don't even know if there is a house or how far away it is. I think it's pretty difficult to even judge how far 600 feet is. We don't know how this was determined to be the safe distance but we do question it. There is a very simple way to test this. Not that I'm recommending any of you try this but a simple way to test it would be to stand in the window of your house and get a rifle and go 600 feet away to take aim at you. Would you feel safe with that? I wouldn't. So, for public safety, we would like to create a wider buffer zone around the residential area.

Harry Holland: So, we'd like to go back to Director Fowlks letter again. He states that towns were part of the ordinance, prohibits the possession of firearms. Like Alice said the last thing we want to do is restrict the gun owners in Castle Valley. I know that if we tried to do that, we'd have a huge uproar in the valley. The ordinance that we were proposing would only require that a hunter with a firearm, keep their gun holstered while in the area in question. To clarify, tonight we would amend our ordinance to drop the ambiguous language that Director Fowlks referred to and we'd take out the language that we included and we'll get rid of. The language that he was referring to was, "open carrying and uncased firearm under conditions which may reasonably be construed as hunting with a firearm." So, we'll take that out and replace it with, "within the archery only zone, it's unlawful for any person to engage in the act of hunting with a firearm." Hopefully, that would reduce some of the controversy over our ordinance. I want to change subjects a little bit here and talk about Utah Open Lands because they own about 300 acres within our town boundary and about 300 acres right outside our town boundary. So, this is looking out over their land. Castle Valley knows that we can't regulate UOL land and we don't want to. What we would like is for the DWR to work with UOL to regulate that land inside our boundaries and outside our boundaries. Nobody from UOL could be here tonight but we did get a letter from their executive Director, Wendy Fisher and I'll just read you a paragraph out of there. She says, "Utah Open Lands agrees that hunting is a useful management tool and we are not opposed to hunting. We do however, have concerns regarding increased firearms on the property in close proximity to residential homes and the risk that poses to us as an organization from a liability standpoint." Once again, we know that we can't regulate the UOL land. That has to be something between UOL and DWR. Another thing that we'd like to clarify that was in Director Folks letter, this is you Alice.

Alice Drogin: Finally, there is the concern by Director Fowlks that the proposed ordinance does not recognize exceptions for law enforcement or wildlife management. I'm happy to say, he got this one right. We just didn't even think of that. We had no thought about wildlife management or law enforcement but we certainly have no complaint with that and we would welcome it. There are a lot of people in our valley that feel there are too many deer. People are very concerned about CWD. So, we would welcome an opportunity to work with DWR to cull the herd somehow. But to do it in a safe manner. So, we are still providing for public safety. Our residents are very concerned about this. Some of the deer never actually leave the residential parts of the valley and that is a concern to a lot of people. We would welcome DWR's help in that regard. We want DWR to do whatever is necessary to manage the herd and for that reason we have agreed to amend our ordinance to add the following language: "nothing under this section shall be construed so as to prevent the Division of Wildlife Resources from controlling, maintaining or otherwise managing wildlife within the town of Castle Valley." In conclusion, the

town of Castle Valley invites DWR to join us in working proactively to safeguard human and health and safety by doing everything that we can to prevent hunting accidents. Please don't wait until an accident happens. Let's get in front of this. I urge you to please approve our ordinance tonight. Approve the town of Castle Valley's proposed ordinance to have archery only in the residential sections of the town. Thank you.

Questions from the RAC

Trisha: We'll go through the usual process. We'll start with questions from the RAC. I have a question. With these designations or the original designations, who designated that? Just the town of Castle Valley?

Chris: Can I answer that? So, I've studied this extensively. In 2009, the town of Castle Valley went through the proper channels. They went through the RAC process and the wildlife board to make this a archery, a primitive weapon and shotgun only area. In 2007, it's our understanding that it didn't go through the RAC and board process. There was some meeting at the capital if believe but nobody can actually find a motion from the wildlife board. So, that 2007 archery only ordinance, never got approved through the wildlife board.

Trisha: Okay, so currently it was designated by the wildlife board as primitive weapon.

Chris: Yes. But for 10 years, it was mis-signed throughout that area.

Harry Holland: We did think that it did get approved by the DWR.

Trisha: OK. That's my question. Other questions from the RAC?

Dana: Just to clarify, that's BLM that is incorporated into the state part of the town?

Harry Holland: Yes. The BLM administers everything, this is the town boundary, but it's administered by the BLM. Then the lighter area here is Utah Open Lands.

Scot: So, is this considered winter range?

Harry Holland: Yeah, that's one reason the UOL has that land there because it's winter range.

Scot: Do you think this is the reason why you had no incidents during the time it was designated an archery hunt?

Alice Drogin: It's not that no one was hunting there, it's that people were not reporting getting frightened by having gunshots go over their head.

Scot: So, of the reported incidents, how many have been or would have been otherwise legal despite the current designation?

Alice Drogin: We don't really know. We don't have...

Kirk: 600 feet of a structure that would be illegal no matter what we say here. So, how many of those were already within 600 feet? Meaning, they were already illegal no matter what we say here. Or trespassing?

Alice Drogin: We don't know.

Trisha: Can Adam, you've been around now for a couple of years, how many instances have you had?

Adam Wallerstein: The lieutenant actually pulled the reports and totaled them up.

Roger Kerstetter: I spent 32 years in this region. Prior to Adam, taking the Moab district we had TJ Robertson there since about 2006-2007. One incident where a Castle Valley resident shot a deer with a muzzleloader, this is coming from communication from TJ, on his own five-acre parcel essentially and he was too close to the neighbor's house. That's the only incident I know of.

Kirk: Just to clarify on that, he would have been too close to his structure either way?

Roger: The neighbor's structure. He had moved into Castle Valley and he had a muzzleloader permit, he shot a deer with a muzzleloader on his own five-acre parcel but because of where he discharged the firearm, he was too close to a neighbor's house.

Eric: Didn't have the neighbor give permission?

Roger: No, he didn't have permission. He was issued a warning at that time and that's the only incident I know of since 2016.

Scot: That's illegal because of the 600-foot law?

Roger: Yes, of another person's dwelling without their permission.

Kent: I've got a question while you're up here. Correct me if I'm wrong but I believe that under state law, a city can enact an ordinance that prohibits the discharge of a firearm within the city limits.

Roger: I'm sorry, run that by me again.

Kent: I believe under state law, a city can enact an ordinance to prohibit the discharge of a firearm within the city limits.

Roger: That's correct, under city ordinance.

Alice Drogin: We do have that in our town.

Chris: So, this is where it gets interesting, I think. Castle Valley includes a big chunk of BLM land in their town boundary whether BLM honors that as being part of the town is a question to be asked.

Kent: Oh. Okay. We don't know who has right of passage of property. The BLM disputes their boundary, is that what we're looking at?

Harry Holland: That is something that we are looking into. That's a big question for the town right now is, who has jurisdiction over that boundary.

Gerrish Willis: I've got a question. Would this be precedent setting in some way? Most archery only designations in my understanding are by hunt line units, which are typically large areas. So, would restricting a smaller area like 1,500 acres or something be precedent setting within the state or is this going to be basically compliant with other areas in the state?

Chris: The town has pointed out on several occasions there are a few places in Utah, the town of Alta, I believe that does have some federal land within their town boundary where a hunting restriction has been passed and is honored. I don't know where there is any instance where there is a larger chunk of land on the edge of the town residence, I guess. Do you know of any others?

???

Kent: Part of Salt Lake County because of an urban issue already. Up on the Wasatch Front and Salt Lake, Davis county. I know Salt Lake County is.

Gerrish Willis: Kent, I think, my understanding is that's a separate hunt unit divided by the Wasatch Crest.

Chris: I don't think so. I think its part of a larger unit.

Kent: It's part of the larger unit. It's just on the Salt Lake County side.

Gerrish: That's what I was asking. If this is another example within the state, for public safety reasons.

Chris: This wouldn't be a new hunt unit. It would still be part of the La Sal unit. It would just be a restriction within this area of the unit.

Alice Drogin: Basically, I don't know how many towns have this kind of isolated unit but you can see how those people in that little chunk we call the upper 80, they're pretty exposed. So, what we're looking for here is to just get some protection for those people. And also, that's just become a very popular recreational area too. That's the reason why we are seeking this.

Roger: If I might clarify something, on your previous slide where you changed the wording, where you had the slash...

Chris: It was towards the end wasn't it?

Roger: If you look at this within the archery only zones, "it is unlawful for any person to engage in the act of hunting with a firearm", you're regulating the possession of a firearm. Not the discharge, but the possession. Our concealed weapons statute in Utah are pretty sacred. I think with that wording you'll probably run into some issues because I can carry a firearm with me hunting archery equipment by state law. The rule can't supersede the state code. I think that your city ordinance can regulate the discharge of a firearm but not necessarily the possession of a firearm.

Harry Holland: You know, we'd be willing to work with whomever we need to.

Trisha: I'm going to bring us back and kind of move us along. It was an excellent comment but we're getting into that so let's finish off and come back to comments from the RAC. So, let's take any questions from the audience.

Question from the audience

n/a

Comments from the audience

Pam Hackly: Thank you RAC and Chairman Hedin. My name is Pam Hackly. I live in Castle Valley and I'm one of the people along with my husband Bob Litman who live in this little odd section called the upper 80. In fact, we're on the Southeast end of it. What I would like to do tonight is to say, I'm in support of what the town is proposing. The town has worked a lot in the last two years to bring this to the RAC. We complied as you can see in your packet, a bunch of comments about incidents with unsafe use of weapons in the area over the years. To give you a personal example because my husband and I have experienced it. What got this whole ball rolling as Alice said, it was in May of 2017 on a Sunday and people came up the road into the upper 80, their dogs had treed a bear and they parked on private land, and went to go out to the treed animal. We couldn't tell how far they were but they shot within very close range of our home. We called Adam and he was out there as fast as he could. I was amazed at how fast he got out there, within 45 minutes and we live 25 minutes from the post office in Moab. By the time he got there, the hunting party had left and they had a legal permit apparently and it was all fine but the fact was that the shot was taken really close to our house. When we reported this to the town and DWR and the sheriff, it got the ball rolling to realize this is, in part of what Chris was saying, the ordinance that the town had passed in 2007 was invalid. In terms of DWR's regulations. So, it reverted back to what was passed in 1997 which was the primitive weapon designation which is still, this land as Harry pointed out the land delineated is the same for what we are proposing now for the archery only. Back and getting to the point of having no complaints after we had the archery only signs up, that went up in 2008 the reason why the 2007 ordinance was passed is because in 2006 we had the warden on our roof deck and we were looking out over two the East towards Round Mountain and there were three hunting parties of multiple people all converging on the same small herd with one buck in there. These are real instances that are happening. Then you have archers out there that are being cross fired over. The

great nun who has lived in Castle Valley for 30-some years has a letter in the packet that you have that details some of the incidents. So, this is a matter of public safety for all of us that live up there. I'm a hunter, I'm not now, I used to hunt in Montana, upland game birds, big game. I don't do that now. My family still hunts. Hunting is important in our lives. I want to emphasize to the RAC here and to the wildlife board that for us who live in Castle Valley, this is a safety issue. Our hearts go out to the young man that was shot by a random bullet across the road a year ago. Thank you very much for your time. I know everyone is ready to get home. Thanks for your consideration.

Eric Luke: I have a couple questions for these people? Number one, who would enforce this? If it was passed as archery only, who is going to be responsible for enforcing it? Does the town have...

Harry Holland: The town doesn't have any enforcement capability. So, we rely on the sheriff and DWR to enforce these things.

Eric: Okay. What you're asking for, I can appreciate the concern for safety but what you're asking for with archery equipment, typically animals don't die right on the spot. Are your towns people ok with an animal being shot running over and dying on their front lawn? Because that is very likely what will happen with archery equipment. That's a very good possibility.

Harry Holland: That's a good point. I think the residents would probably trade the safety issues for that kind of thing especially if you explain to them what the scenarios could be.

Trisha: Okay. So, let's move on to comments. If you want to take a seat, we'll bring you up if we have random questions. This again may be something that we either take action on or we can kick it down the road again.

RAC comments

Trisha: If you don't mind, I'm going to make a comment. I spoke to couple people that grew up in Castle Valley, avid hunters, and their concerns I think are probably what a lot of what our concerns are. We're taking public lands, multi-use public lands out of the hands of hunters. At least, that's a concern for me. It's a slippery slope ideal that concerns me a bit. One thing that they said, that they felt was a compromise was to just leave it as primitive weapons but we all know that current inline muzzleloaders are no longer primitive weapons. So, I would throw out this idea, I'm just talking about a compromise. We've been using this term HAMS, so maybe we throw that back out on the plate because those are open site muzzleloader. The people that I spoke to were pretty concerned about manipulating public land and taking it out of their hands. It makes it a slippery slope that we fall in to. I will state, I'm a hunter education instructor so I try very hard to make sure that my hunters know what is in front of their target and what is behind their target. So, I hope that those that are instructing people are doing the same. So, that we are producing safe hunters.

Jace: To put it into perspective, I just mapped it out on the hunt maps and from that green loop road, that Round Mountain Circle road, it's 666 yards to the closest building in the upper 80. So,

we're looking at a really big tract of land. So, that's my only issue is that we're taking from that closest main road to the closest house, all that Round Mountain and the upper country, you're at close at 666 yards to the nearest building. For bird hunting with shotguns and things... I've never been there so I respect that their opinion on what needs to happen but I think that's a lot to ask for to close that much off to archery only. I don't know what compromise needs to be.

Kirk: My reservation would be especially in relation to shotguns. I imagine there's doves, you might have some waterfowl coming through and turkeys. People can shoot flying birds with a bow and arrow but I can't.

Trisha: I can't shoot one standing on the ??

Kirk: So, taking a shotgun away is... you're basically saying you can't bird hunt.

Scoot: All over Utah there're towns that have hunting right next door to them. I grew up just on the Escalante. Everybody _____ in this town. The difference was people were used to hunting and they know that people don't stand 600 feet away and aim at your house and shoot at you. It's not how it works. That's a credit to our hunter safety instructors. When we say it's multi-use, we're going to have growing conflicts throughout the state of Utah. More people out on the trails, walking their dogs, all kinds of stuff. You do not want to set the precedence in every case where that happens that hunters want to use.

Trisha: I meant to say something similar but my brain stopped working about an hour and a half ago.

Gerrish Willis: I'd like to make a comment. I can appreciate Trisha's concern about this being a thing where if it happens here there is going to be less public land but when you look at the vast amount of public lands around Castle Valley, Forest Service is not very far away to the East and it's surrounded by SITLA and BLM land. This is such a small area that I don't see that any hunters are going to be negatively affected by this small of an area being restricted to Archery only. I don't really share your concern. I'm not really paranoid about losing areas to hunt in either because I don't hunt. I know this area pretty well and we're talking about a really small area that would be restricted to archery. It's not like all of Castle Valley, it's a really small area that they are asking for. I think it's fairly reasonable to think that this would work. The other thing is, rather than the town passing an ordinance, I think it would be much better if it we just mapped that way by the division by order of the wildlife board. That way all the maps would reflect what is on the ground and it wouldn't be up to Castle Valley to enforce it, it would be up to the division to enforce it.

Eric: I guess my concern, I agree with you Gerrish, it's a very small area. Number one, it's public ground. I'd like to know how the BLM feels about that because that's the BLM ground. That's our ground as well. My biggest concern is setting precedence. We talk about that with CWMU. We're taking public access away when I feel in all reality there are already laws in place that protect the town citizens just like everywhere else. It's no different. That 600-foot law is everywhere. I have some reservations about passing it for that reason.

Gerrish: I lived about two blocks from the edge of public land on the Wasatch Front in an area South of Parley's Canyon where archery elk and deer were around. These guys would be up there in white suits in the middle of a snow storm hunting really hard. Nobody in that neighborhood was concerned at all. And the reason that it was archery only is because of the proximity to that residential area. So, from a precedence standpoint, I think the state has already set the precedent in certain areas that it's reasonable to limit the weapons allowed for hunting. I don't really share that concern too much.

Kent: It's out in the sticks. It's not an urban area. Salt Lake is urban. Castle Valley is not. You could have urban if it was in Moab but not Castle Valley.

Gerrish: People who live in Moab wish to take care of some of the urban deer that roam all over the place but that's a different issue. You're right. Castle Valley, in this area with the exception of that upper 80 is more urbanized. That upper 80 is urbanized but the surrounding lands like you said, are very rural.

Brad Richman: I'll say one thing. In the interest of safety for Castle Valley, I feel like it's a small thing for the RAC board to at least endorse their proposal. That's all I'm going to say.

Jace: Can we make a motion?

Trisha: Yeah, we make a motion to either accept their proposal, we throw out a different proposal that might be a compromise, or whatever. Go Jace.

Jace: I'll take a stab at it. I propose that we accept their proposal but to allow shotguns so that people can still bird hunt that area then ship it off to the board and see what they have to say about it.

Trisha: So, I have a proposal by Jace that we accept the proposal with the exception of rather than archery only we add shotguns.

Dana: Can I ask a question? How is that different from the HAMS?

Jace: Shotgun only.

Trisha: And they're open site muzzleloaders but still you can shoot quite a ways.

Lots of folks talking over each other.

Gerrish: To me it sounds like what you're saying is accept their proposal and add shotguns to archery.

Jace: Yeah.

Eric: It will allow upland game and turkey hunting. I think it's a good compromise.

Dana: So, what you're saying is as is, does that mean we'd be accepting...

Jace: I think. Because they can't overstep any laws that are in place. They will have to clean up their language obviously. I can put that in the motion.

Trisha: OK, Jace do you want to try it again?

Gerrish: Jace, how about rather than put it on Castle Valley to come up with an ordinance, what if we recommend to the wildlife board that they accept the designation of that area and restrict it to shotguns and archery and have the wildlife board act on it. And Castle Valley can then back out. They won't have to do anything legislatively. It would be up to the wildlife board.

Jace: Well, they've got to bring the proposal to the board.

Eric: If they want it to pass the board, they've got to get the verbiage and the language such that it doesn't conflict with state law. Otherwise, it will never pass.

Jace: So, to clean up... Motion to pass their recommendation with addition to shotguns and archery only. So, it's shotgun and archery equipment with the stipulation to clean up the verbiage to comply with state law.

Trisha: Do I have a second on Jace's motion? Seconded by Brad. All in favor?

Motion to accept the Town of Castle Valley's proposed hunting restriction, with the inclusion of shotguns and cleaning up the verbiage so that it doesn't contradict existing state laws. Motion: Passed

Supporting: 7

Opposed: 3

Adjournment

11:50 pm

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on Dec. 5, 2019 at 9 a.m. in the Department of Natural Resources Board Room, 1594 W. North Temple, in Salt Lake City.

The next Southeast RAC meeting will take place on Dec. 11, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at the John Wesley Powell River History Museum, 1765 E. Main, in Green River.

NORTHEASTERN RAC MEETING SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

Utah Wildlife Resources Office

318 N Vernal Avenue, Vernal

November 21, 2019

Welcome and Intro Appreciation

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES- Brett Prevedel**

Welcome to the Northeast Region, Regional Advisory Board Council Meeting for December 2019. We will get started. The process tonight will be that we present an item, then we'll ask questions from the RAC, we open it up for questions if there is something needing clarified from the public. Then we'll take comments from the RAC and also from the public. That's why you have the cards if you want to make a comment you need to fill out a card. Then we have a new process where we have the online comments and we will summarize how the comments came in for the region and also state wide, online. Then the Board will discuss and take action on each agenda item as it's listed. We appreciate everyone coming, and we know you're passionate about wildlife, I assure you all the individuals up here who are volunteers, do not do this unless they're passionate also. So it's very important to us that your comments, even though you may have a lot of emotion about it, they stay.. If it goes over the line I will just say that you're time is up. And I hope you appreciate that, but we need to keep this meeting business like. With that I will ask the RAC for a motion to approve the agenda for tonight.

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**
MOTION to approve the agenda as presented.

Dan Abeyta

Natasha Hadden, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to approve the minutes from the last meeting.

Natasha Hadden

Dan Abeyta, second

Passed unanimously

- **REGIONAL UPDATE - Miles Hanberg**

Ok, we've had a pretty busy fall going on there with the Division of Wildlife so I'll take just a few minutes to go over some of the things that have been going on in our various sections. In our aquatics section, they just completed a fish screen above Pelican Lake, this will help keep carpe and other undesirable fish out of Pelican Lake in the future. A lot of people know that that lake

had been treated to remove carpe and things are looking good down there. Our water quality is looking good, so this will help from it being invested with carpe in the future. At the same time there has been another project with constructing ponds on the canals and inners into Pelican Lake. Again that's to catch a lot of sediment that's coming down there to keep the water quality in good shape. Some of these lakes like Pelican we're losing storage capacity in the life of those lakes because the amount of sediment that comes into them. It's a good proactive approach that will benefit not only the aquatic resources there, but also the water users. With our law enforcement section, the caseload has been a little bit lighter this fall which is good news I believe. We'd also like to share that Sergeant Randy Sheets has completed the canine training and has a canine here in the region. Already within his couple months that the canine has been here we've been able to uncover some evidence in a couple different cases already, so that's going to be a good tool for our law enforcement cases this year. This year was kind of a strange year, we had a number of bear and cougar incidents, of hunters encountering those out in the field this fall. Both cougars and bear so it was an increase this year over any recent years we've seen in the past. Our law enforcement is also in the middle of investigating a wildlife commercialization case here in the region, so hopefully we'll be able to make some good headway with that in the near future. Our outreach section we have a new staff member, his name is Wes Smith. Wes Smith is our new outdoor recreation specialist, he'll be working on a lot of our wildlife recreation events, seminars, outdoor activities as well as our walk in access program. We're excited to have Wes, he's been in the Vernal area for some time, or maybe you're whole life? Most of his life. We're excited to have Wes here. This is just his first week. In our wildlife section, the biologists will be beginning the post season deer classification soon. That classification we try to do during the rut period, and that will be ongoing. If any of the RAC members would like to participate with that, reach out to one of our biologists and ride along. We also have deer captures scheduled here beginning in the early December on the South Slope, the Book Cliffs, and we'll also be catching deer over on the Current Creek unit. GPS radio collars will be placed on all these animals, looking at migration patterns, survival, a number of other valuable data points that we use for a lot of our management activities. We'll also be collaring additional cougars in the Book Cliffs this winter, as part of a cooperative study with USU that's looking at various things. One of the main things they are looking at is whether or not bears are coming in and stealing cougar kills, and requiring the cougars to kill more often, so those are a few things that will be resolved with that study. BYU is still completing a fawn and calf survival study in the Book Cliffs. Where we've had collared fawns and calf elk. The survival has been fairly poor this year. Fawn survival as of current has just dipped below 40% and the calf survival is at about 50% right now. So far the majority of the loss is due to predation, that is cougar followed by bears. Our habitat section is busy implementing a lot of watershed restoration projects in cooperation with a lot of our Federal partners. There are several bullock projects going on. Some of those around Blue Mountain, Monument Ridge and Atchee Ridge in the Book Cliffs. There's also several fire rehab projects that are ongoing. Some other restoration activities

in Rabbit Gulch, Lake Canyon, and Meadow Creek in the Book Cliffs. Take a minute to update the RAC on the Book Cliff working group. Just a quick history, this group was formed due to low fawn and calf survival but also as we capture deer and elk in the fall those animals were experiencing very poor body condition into the fall. Which would indicate that they are not getting the forage or the nutrition on their summer range. So I formed a group to look at some of these issues and try to come up with some causes, and one of the things that has been done is analysis of the forage that is being produced on good and poor precipitation years. As well as the amount of usage that we have out in the Book Cliffs. And what we found is, at least in the area between Seep Ridge and Willow Creek, on a good year we're basically breaking even. On a dry year we've got more demand for that forage out there than what's being produced. So we started looking at what are some of the causes for that? And one of the big things is stray horses. We did a survey out there and we probably have more than 200 stray horses on the Book Cliffs summer range. If you take the horses out of the picture it brings us much closer to balancing the demand vs. the amount of forage available. So the group has identified a few things that they're wanting to address. One of them is the stray horses. Also looking at wild horse numbers. Looking at grazing distributions and if there's any improvement that could be made there. Water and vegetation improvements to help spread some of these demands. Predation as I mentioned before is something that's being looked at pretty closely. As well as potential hunt strategies to be able to work through some of these issues. There's going to be much more research coming down the next year or so to help answer some of these questions and this group is going to be developing an action plan soon that will help guide some of these tasks and efforts here in the future. So, I think that's the main things that I'd like to talk about. So I'll turn it over to Brett for a couple of other things.

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE- Brett Prevedel**

Thanks Miles. An update on the Wildlife Board Meeting. If you remember the topics that were on the agenda last time were the private fish ponds rules that went through our RAC without much controversy, and it was passed unanimous up there. And then the bighorn sheep plans that we had all the discussion on, they accepted our recommendation and where we revised the wordage, what left our RAC with the suggestions we had to the Wildlife Board their motion was to approve the bighorn sheep plans with all of the suggestions from the northeast region. So it went very well in that respect. Then the conservation permit audit was the only other topic they had. It was kind of a light Board meeting. That was the summary of the Wildlife Board Meeting.

Brett Prevedel: Then a couple of issues I'd like to bring up, we have here in the region. One of them is the release of pheasants. It became an issue here in the region and it's also statewide and there are some safety concerns coming up and also some ethics. I got to see that first hand, I volunteered and the last thing Tonya said was don't get shot, and I kind of laughed, but she wasn't joking. So we've got to do something as an agency, cause we've created a not very good

situation where people are waiting for the releases to happen, competing and there's some safety issues. My truck got shot over before I parked. I didn't have time to get out of my truck. And Tonya had the same issues, so we're looking at solutions for that. I don't think anybody, if they saw what was going on right now would approve of it. So we're looking at putting birds out during the night, random times, just kind of keeping it secret. It hasn't been as smooth as we had hoped. We had hoped it would be a real positive deal, and I'm sure it has some positives, but it has a whole bunch of negatives right now. Would you like to add anything to that Tonya? Or did I summarize that ok? So we're looking at options, we'd like to keep it, but just my opinion keeping it as is I'd rather not have it. Just because of the safety issues that are coming out of it. But I think we'll come up with a middle ground somewhere and hopefully bring it back to a positive thing. The baiting issue, I know I've talked to several people in this room and baiting of big game was initially going to be a topic this month, but the Division felt they weren't quite prepared to move that forward right now. If you wanted to talk about baiting, we can do that tonight, and we'll do it in number six with the bucks, bulls, and hunting regulations, and then there won't be specific action on the baiting issue tonight but it's still on the table for discussion and we could if we wanted as a RAC to make whatever recommendations towards the Wildlife Board on that topic, after tonight. So with that, I believe we'll move into the agenda. One more time on the process, if anybody wants to comment on a subject you need to fill out one of these green cards and bring it up and we will call you by name. We don't have a huge amount of comments here, but we'll try to limit it to three to four minutes of constructive comment tonight. Covy Jones is here to present the Statewide Deer Management Plan.

- **STATEWIDE DEER MANAGEMENT PLAN – Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Covy. I will now entertain questions from the RAC regarding this presentation.

Questions from the RAC:

Jamie Arrive: My question is, just some clarification on the CWD transport, is it illegal to move it within the state of Utah from an area that is infected to another area that is not infected?

Covy Jones: That is a really good point. We've had that brought up at a few other RACs because we have infected areas inside the state, currently how it is written it is not illegal. What we've run into is if you're in the whole state in Colorado, you can move your deer around, you can get to a taxidermist, you can beetle your skull or do whatever you need to do and that's easier. But if you're on the La Sals you might not be able to find a meat processor on that unit. So what we elected to do is to educate the public, if you're hunting these units, the La Sals, the Manti, the areas that have it, here is how you should properly dispose of the spinal cord, the brain matter and here are some proper ways. So instead of making that illegal, we feel like its a better match

to educate our public on that.

Jamie Arrive: Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Other questions.

Dan Abeyta: Covy, not really a question so much on this presentation, but it's kind of related, what month does the Division present the unit numbers to the RAC? What month does that discussion happen through the RAC process? The unit by unit numbers. The population objectives and estimates and stuff like that.

Covy Jones: So when do the unit deer plans go through the process?

Dan Abeyta: Yes, that's the question.

Covy Jones: We've brought those through both in this RAC and in the spring RAC. Sometimes it just depends on what's going on. But it's always in the big game RAC. So we bring them through on a five year rotational basis. So each region will bring theirs through every five years. So it's either this RAC or the spring RAC usually.

Dan Abeyta: Ok thanks. And then the permit numbers are annually in April, is that right?

Covy Jones: They are always annually in April, as far as unit plans we haven't stuck to the same RAC consistently.

Dan Abeyta: Ok thanks.

Brett Prevedel: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the Public:

Jerry Slauch: I did have some questions while I was watching that and writing them down here, so hopefully I can get through them decent. We're talking in the mule deer management plan, fat, healthy deer and what makes them healthy and obviously there are multiple things right. My question was are does in the first estrus cycle is it better for them to be bred when they hit their first estrus cycle, or... Because I know that there is two, maybe three, I don't know. So is it healthier is what I'm asking for a doe to be bred when she first comes into heat vs. if she misses and goes into the second one?

Covy Jones: So that question, I think that most of your deer come into their first estrus at a time when, on average, they would drop that fawn at the best time. So the answer is, on average years, yes.

Jerry Slauch: It's best for them to be bred when they first go into.. So the mule deer gestation period is about 200-205 days, something like that. So if a deer is breed November 1st, that deer

would drop at the end of May, May 20th is basically the calculation. So if it's healthier for a deer to drop in June as the winter is really bad in May, she'll hold on?

Covy Jones: Well, no..

Jerry Slauch: Well I mean..

Covy Jones: So it's more complicated than this. But what exactly are you trying to get at? I'm trying to understand.

Jerry Slauch: I'm wondering with, if it's better for the herd to manage for all does to be bred during their first cycle that usually continues from November 1st through mid November. But we know the breeding goes on into December, so I'm wondering if 15-17 bucks able to get that done in the first part of November?

Covy Jones: Ok, so that's a good question. So what is good is synchronous partition, right? Regardless of when it happens the more synchronous the partition the better chance you have to swamp the predators. And that is what mule deer try to do. Lets get them all out on the same day around the same range so that we have a better chance of some survival. So there is good data, there were two studies published on this and I could get them to you after if you'd like about the synchronicity of partition cause I've heard this a lot. Well you only need 5-7 bucks to breed all the does on the landscape. 5-7 bucks per hundred does breeds every doe. But the argument and some school of thought from some biologist as well leads to partition that isn't very synchronous. What we do know is there have been two research articles published that at the rates that they evaluated a unit in Colorado, I think it was about 25, they evaluated a unit in Utah, evaluated Monroe and at the time I can't remember if it was 17-18, but it was lower and the lower buck/doe ratio actually had a more synchronous partition than the higher buck/doe ratio.

Jerry Slauch: Based on that study.

Covy Jones: Based on the study. And there isn't a study that contradicts that right now.

Jerry Slauch: And that's why I'm asking, in my mind it makes it seem that when that happens it would be the... Um what percentage of fawns need to survive to grow. I know that's a broad question. If there are 100 does and 40 of the fawns survive.. I mean are you shooting for 40% are you shooting for 75%? Are you shooting for 100? Most does have twins. Are we trying to go for 100%? What number usually causes the herd to grow?

Covy Jones: Ok, so you can evaluate this by looking at the numbers you'd need to have a positive lambda. Westwide average for mule deer survival is 85%, so on average 85% adult doe survival. So if you assume that, you assume that it's average and you have 85% adult doe survival, you hope to have 60 fawns per hundred does for the following year classification. If you're at 85% adult doe survival, and 60 fawns per hundred does, you can lose 50% of those over the winter and have a slightly positive lambda and about break even, right? If you're adult doe survival starts to drop off for any reason, so every 1% decrease in adult doe survival, you

need to increase by 3 fawns per hundred does to make that up. So at 84 you need 63. $83/66$. So the problem is if you're starting to cut into your adult doe survival, you're fawns aren't going to survive better, so those are the magic numbers.

Jerry Slaugh: That's what I'm looking for, the magic numbers.

Covy Jones: And again, it's more complicated than that, but if you have 85%, 60 fawns per hundred does, you could use half of them and have a slightly positive lambda, and what I mean by that is slightly positive population growth.

Jerry Slaugh: Ok, perfect. So last thing, the collared deer, is that public information that you can get somewhere? Out of curiosity. I've seen more collared deer this year than I had, so I'm curious if that's public information if I can get.

Covy Jones: Some of it is. So the survival rates, and things like that, we try to get those out. We email those to all the RAC members and BYU is developing a website right now and partnering with the Division to be able to get that data live to sportsmen, so you can see what survival rates look like. Location data however is protected. And that's under state code.

Jerry Slaugh: Ok, thank you for your time.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you, and I would like to add on that, I believe on the deer captures which I believe they do in December, aren't you finding 100% pregnancy rate on the does?

Covy Jones: It's always high. It's always 95-98%.

(inaudible)

Brett Prevedel: I understand you're question, I just wanted to throw that out from a population standpoint, it's almost 100%. Ok, any other questions from the public? If not we'll move to comments from the RAC.

Comments from the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: I have one I'll start it with. Joe Arnold, RAC member, had some issues and he couldn't make it, and he asked me to mention to you that he would like to see a trend of moving some of the better quality limited entry hunts towards premium hunts where the point creep is such, it takes 15 years to draw out anyway. He felt even though it would have an impact on that, waiting a few more years for a tag, and he used the Book Cliffs for an example, and I know that one is kind of a hot topic right now, but he would like to see maybe another category there just between the premium hunts and the limited entry hunts with a higher buck to doe ratio to improve the quality. Any other comments? Ok we have a few comments from the public. How about Kenyon from the Mule Deer Foundation (MDF) would you start please?

Ken Powell: I'm Ken Powell with the MDF and I'll just read what I have to say, that will be the

easiest way to do it. I'm Ken Powell and I'm a member of the High Desert Leadership team of the Mule Deer Foundation. Thank you RAC for the opportunity to comment. Thank you Covy for your presentation. MDF was represented in the statewide mule deer committee from the regional director Jeremy Anderson who couldn't make it tonight. Jeremy asked me to give approval and support for the MDF for the entirety of the management plan. I also got the opportunity along with other volunteer members of the MDF across the state to hear the plan and was asked to pick it apart a couple of weeks back. With Covy and other members of the Division. It was great to get clarification on many items that I was unclear of, or didn't particularly care for. Even with our leadership group, there were disagreements. But this is the type of plan and so many moving parts that we trust in the DWR to make their own new technology of collaring that this plan is the best for our future. I approve of this plan as presented, and thank you. I just wanted to say one thing, as a personal person, as Ken Powell, not with the Mule Deer. You're taking about doing the does and harvesting does, you're doing all these extended archery permits. I feel like maybe we should move that into November as doe only in those areas so we can help manage the deer population. Thank you.

Blake Bess: Representing the Sportsmen, I'm a dedicated hunter myself. Tonight I'd like to address the RAC, I believe for northeastern Utah, this seven year plan is too long with our harsh winters. A lot can change in seven years in northeastern Utah. After last winter our deer herd health, northeastern Utah is not good. With poor survival rate of fawns. I disagree with these doe hunts especially for northeastern Utah. I disagree with your buck to doe ratio, if you only have a hundred does left, but you've got your 18 bucks, what good do they do you? Let's get the population numbers up, mother nature will take care of herself. I encourage the RAC to discontinue the late muzzleloader deer hunt on the South Slope Yellowstone unit. I've hunted this unit the last three years as a dedicated hunter, and I've never pulled the trigger on nothing on the three years on public land. Hunting all days of the muzzleloader and rifle hunts all three years. This unit is beyond in trouble, and I believe it's time this RAC stands up and does something. This spring I've encouraged the RAC to encourage the Wildlife Board to lower the permit numbers, because we've had poor survival rate, but the Wildlife Board shot it down. I encourage the RAC to address this issue on our northeastern deer herd cause they're in trouble. And last, about around October 11th they got on our local radio and Covy Jones was saying it was the best hunt in the last 25 years for the deer hunt. That aint right here in northeastern Utah. I can tell you that it was the worst deer hunt I've seen in northeastern Utah in my life. And if you thought it was bad this year, please wait til next. Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Blake, just one clarification, Blake was referring to the late season muzzleloader hunt on the South Slope. That one has already been in affect. The proposal, Covy, I believe it's in the next section, right? Where you were talking about the late season muzzleloader hunts? Or is that the topic now?

Covy Jones: It's in both, it's in the plan as well.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, just so the public knows, that hunt has already been happening on South Slope, I don't know if it was a pilot test project or what it is, but now, the proposal now is to add it on all general season hunts, but it has been in existence on the South Slope.

Covy Jones: The previous plan was written differently and it was allowed on several units if they were managed for 18-20 bucks per hundred does and above objective. This plan is recommending it a little differently.

Brett Prevedel: It was targeted for the ones that were above objective. Ok, thank you.

Kevin Norman: Kevin Norman representing Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife (SFW). Thank you guys for letting me have a minute. SFW has a fulfillment committee where Covy comes and presents to everybody from all over the state and we form a stance on these issues and SFW supports the new mule deer plan with the exception that we would like to see the late muzzleloader hunts stay as is, on the higher buck to doe ratios. I'd like to take a second and speak for myself, Kevin Norman, speaking to this late muzzleloader hunt. I'm from up in Cache county and our deer are in awful shape. I have a good friend that is on our SFW committee up there, he is heavily involved with the biologist up there and loves to go counting, flies with them, he knows what he's doing. He's been out counting deer for the last eight days, he's counted 227 deer, of which four were bucks. One four point, a 3x4, a two point, and a spike. Which equals a 1.7 buck to doe ratio. I know it's probably obviously going to come in higher than that, but this late muzzleloader hunt, the way it's written would add 33 more buck tags to the Cache. We're nervous if there's enough bucks to breed all the does. So by adding this could be detrimental, and it seems like we're going backwards. What my personal recommendation is, which passed in the northern, was having a safeguard in it, that if the buck to doe ratio is under objective, it defaults to five permits only. Right now it's written that it's five or half a percent, whichever is greater. Half a percent is 33 up there and it just cannot happen. Also, I would like to recommend we have this new HAMS hunt in place, and I think it would be a great idea to have this late muzzleloader be the HAMS hunt as well. I have a long range muzzleloader and just killed an elk at 671 yards. They're not muzzleloaders anymore, they're single shot rifles and I myself, no ones going to police themselves on holding back on what were doing. This HAMS hunt will keep the hunt in the hunt and I think that's what we should do. It will be a lower success rate, provide opportunity, and I appreciate your time.

Brett Prevedel: Covy would you clarify that? Is that a permit number that would come in the spring that would be discussed, or is that a fixed number the way it was presented? The late season muzzleloader?

Covy Jones: Yeah, that's a good clarification. So the way that it is currently written in the plan is it would be recommended at .5% or 5 whichever is greater, just like Kevin said. So other RACs have felt uncomfortable with that and have written it, could be up to .5% or the way Kevin said it.

Brett Prevedel: Is it a recommendation that could be addressed at the time of the permit numbers by the RACs?

Covy Jones: It could be, but the way it's written now, it would be.. It's more set in the plan. You'd want to change, if you want it to be a recommendation instead of a set number, you would

want to change the verbiage in the plan.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Miles will address the comments on this subject that came in electronically.

Miles Hanberg: So this actually the second RAC where we have had the online video presentations and then the ability to let folks submit electronic comments. Basically the comments allowed the comments for the commenters to either support, remain neutral, or disapprove or oppose the proposals as they were presented. It also gave an opportunity for the commenters to leave some feedback. The RAC members were all provided a copy of those individual responses and have had the opportunity to look at those comments. I'm going to summarize basically what the percentages were for this proposal. So for the statewide deer plan, overall for the state 45.6% of the respondents supported the plan. 24.22% remained neutral. 29.23% opposed. In the northeast region, our comments only equaled about 6% of the total statewide comments, but specifically to the northeast region, 42.86% of the responders supported this proposal. 25% remained neutral. 32.1% were opposed.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Covy, could you give me a brief summary of what the other RACs have done with this?

Covy Jones: It's been a long couple of weeks, I don't remember exactly what all of the other RACs have done with this. It's passed with various modifications. Most of the recommendations have been focused around this late season muzzleloader hunt, wanting more ability to adapt that.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Does anyone on the Board or in the public need any clarification on any issues before we act on this?

Dan Abeyta: I've got a question, maybe just some clarification, you've probably already mentioned this, but since there has been a lot of discussion about this late season muzzleloader hunt. The proposal is that the unit would have to be at or above the objective?

Covy Jones: No, not anymore. That's how it was written before and what we realized is, that was a really bad way to write it. When we wrote it that way we didn't realize the negative impacts that would have. We had folks showing up at RACs saying hey I really liked this late season muzzleloader, I want to add more general season permits. Because if you do, and you manage for the buck/doe ratio that you're supposed to, they'll take that away from you. And we don't want to write an incentive to not manage to the objective. So we wrote it differently this time, and really this is completely social. What I said before is what the Division is trying to do is provide a limited entry opportunity without converting more units to limited entry. And if the RAC and Board feels like they want a little more control over these unit numbers, we completely understand that.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, if there is no other discussion I would entertain a motion from the RAC on this topic.

MOTION to support the Statewide Mule Deer Management Plan as presented with a change in the verbiage on the late season muzzleloader hunt, that the language read up to .5%.

Ritchie Anderson

Brad Horrocks, second

Ritchie Anderson: To me it seems like it would give the managers the DWR a little more management leeway. And I think the more leeway we can put in management, the better off we are, so we don't get locked into something we may not want.

Brett Prevedel: So I understand that, up to .5%, with a minimum of 5?

Ritchie Anderson: Correct. I think that would give the leeway.

Daniel Davis: So with that, I think the way I feel and has been perceived is that we try to set a cap for some of these units that are in poor areas and now, maybe it's my misunderstanding, to have more than a half percent could lead up to 30, 40, 50 bucks in that late season. What the fear is is being too many and that half a percent is set. So the way it's understood is its .5% or five.

Brett Prevedel: The motion was up to .5% to leave the discretion annually to the DWR to make a recommendation up to .5%.

Daniel Davis: Correct. So, based on the total number of permits, we would go up to .5% and that was the concern brought forward, is having too many permits based on the total objective that's put out there. So I'm leaning towards more of a 5, 10, 15 tier type ratio based on herd health and buck to doe ratio objectives, and keeping that top end number from getting so high. And those are the concerns that I feel came from the public, and not having too many permits for that late season in that manner.

Miles Hanberg: So at this point we'd need to modify the motion or else vote on this motion.

Brett Prevedel: I think we need to address the motion that is on the table unless somebody withdraws their motion and changes it, or...

Ritchie Anderson: Well I think by changing that verbiage it would allow the DWR to decrease those if the population wasn't there, or the buck to doe wasn't there, they could.. We have to go by their surveys, that's the only number we have, so by changing that verbiage that would allow them to decrease it. Right now the way the verbiage is, I don't see how they could decrease that. They have to give that .5% on that late muzzleloader. But if they change the verbiage, they don't have to do that.

Brett Prevedel: The motion allows them to pick a number up to .5 with a minimum of five.

Ritchie Anderson: I hope I'm correct.

Brett Prevedel: So Dax, straighten us out here.

Dax Mangus: I'm the wildlife manager, just thought I'd give a little bit of context to help you guys making this decision. So the current mule deer management plan says units that are managed for 18-20 are exceeding that objective, so postseason buck to doe ratio if they are exceeding that, so they're 21 or higher, then we have these permits on those units. Then on our region we have several units that were in that category the SS Yellowstone, the North Slope, the Nine Mile unit, and the Wasatch East. So in the Wasatch East for example that's our unit that we manage with the largest number of general season deer tags, it has about 4,000 general season deer tags. One half of one percent on the Wasatch East unit would actually be about 20 permits. Just to kind of put it in context. Currently, because of the way it was written in the old plan, we went up to 1%, so actually in our region we'll have to cut permits from what we're giving right now on units like the Current Creek where it's closer to 30 something. So we would actually cut permits to be more conservative if we went with this wording in the new plan. The wording in the new plan would take away that incentive to manage above your buck to doe ratio objective and also add in those units that are managed in that 15-17 range, and also just to clarify we really manage our buck to doe ratio through general season permits. That's the bulk, the 99.5% of the permits are going to be general.. And that's the tool we use to manage our buck to doe ratios. Statistically an additional 5-10 permits on these units where we give literally thousands of permits, that's not managing our buck to doe ratio. We manage buck to doe ratios with general season permits. So when those general season permits, if our buck to do ratio failed, we would lower general season permits which would in turn lower these permits. Just to try and provide some context of what we're doing now vs. what it would look like in the future, if they made the change as recommended.

Dan Abeyta: Dax, to take that a step further, as Covy I think mentioned the largest state in the unit is the Manti. So how many general season tags is there on the Manti? Trying to put this into context.

Covy Jones: 8,000. 8,800 sometimes. 8,600 right now. Over 8,000 so you'd have like 40 some of these.

Dan Abeyta: So that would be an additional 40 tags? Roughly?

Covy Jones: Yeah.

Ritchie Anderson: Hey Dax. I appreciate the clarification. So I missed that part I guess. So if that buck to doe ratio is not alright, these tags are not going to be offered anyway?

Dax Mangus: That's the way it is currently. The new proposal would be that these permits would be offered on all of our units including the 15-17 and 18-20, and not just when they're exceeding but it would be offered every year.

Brad Horrocks: They go off of the buck to doe ratio count in November.

Dax Mangus: That's what we set general season permits on. is based on those buck to doe ratios and then these permits would be a function of what we do for...

Brett Prevedel: In rough times we cut the general season way back, it's going to automatically cut the muzzleloader back.

Dax Mangus: Down to the point where you get to five permits, and five permits is not going to be statistically significant. It might be to the three or four deer that might get killed on those five permits, but as far as managing a whole population buck to doe ratio, it's not going to.. Killing an additional four deer is not going to.. If that hits your herd over, you've got bigger problems.

Brett Prevedel: So procedurally, you've to a motion on the table, still got a second?

Brad Horrocks: Yeah.

Brett Prevedel: So we've got a motion and a second for up to .5% of the general season tags, with a minimum of five. That's the recommendation. I will call for a vote on that issue.

MOTION to support the Statewide Mule Deer Management Plan as presented with a change in the verbiage on the late season muzzleloader hunt, that the language read up to .5%.

Ritchie Anderson

Brad Horrocks, second

Failed, 3 in favor 4 opposed

Daniel Davis: Can I get a clarification question Mr. Chair? So Covy as this is presented, these percentages here, is this a stance by the Division to make it easier to establish that number so it's not well we took into consideration habitat, we took into consideration buck to doe ratio and all although we're allowed to give this many.. It gives the Division an easier tool to say this many or this many, does that kind of make it easier with the way the plan is written?

Covy Jones: It depends on how you want to look at it Daniel. I think Dax hit the nail on the head when he said biologically these are so few permits on a general season unit it doesn't matter. Socially, what the committees goal was to lock them in so we didn't have one unit offering 400 and one unit offering two. We just wanted to have some consistency across the state and tie it back to general season units. Consistency is obviously easier because the recommendation is done. It's done, it's set, but I understand. I see both sides of it. I see some hesitancy among sportsmen, I see where they say, hey we'd like to recommend up to.. Biologically Dax said it, it doesn't matter. Now if you recommend 8,600 permits then you're talking about 40. It really doesn't matter. Socially, we had a really bad deer hunt on some units around the state. Not every unit in the state is doing poorly, some units have maintained, no units are probably where they were at in 2016. Some units were affected more than others, so this hunt has triggered some angst in sportsmen. That's the reality. Sportsmen said, we like the idea, great hunt, bad timing basically is what it's come down to. And frankly it's kind of fun to see the RACs struggle

through this to be honest with you. But you could recommend it one way, and the Division would just set the permits and bring them forward. Or recommend it the other way, and we would probably set them at .5% and then argue about them.

MOTION to accept the Statewide Mule Deer Management Plan as presented with the exception to set those late season deer hunts to a minimum of five, and not to exceed .25%; and to provide the opportunity to have that as a HAMS hunt and not specifically muzzleloading only.

Daniel Davis

Dan Abeyta

Passed 4 in favor, 3 opposed

Brett Prevedel: I want to take just a moment to recognize Randy Dearth, member of the Wildlife Board that's with us tonight. Thanks for coming Randy, and welcome Commissioner Horrocks to or meeting.

- **BUCKS, BULLS AND OIAL 2020 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE AND RULE AMENDMENTS – Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Covy. I'll entertain questions from the RAC.

What happened to the Willard Peak goat herd?

Covy Jones: Probably a combination of we've had high harvest over the past several years, and in addition to that it could be some climatic events that have led to more kid recruitment. The population is not doing as well as it once was.

Brad Horrocks: Let's go back to the buffalo Little Creek slide, would you?

Sure, and before this, I should mention, if there is anything outside of the region that would need my perspective, I would love to answer that. But the biologist wait all year for this RAC meeting and are super excited and would love to answer any regional specific questions.

Brad Horrocks: What were your comments on the bison you said on the roadless area, with the boundary changes?

Covy Jones: Yeah, so I can explain that, or Dax can, Clints here too and he gets really excited, but what we're trying to do is direct pressure by where we need it, so in order to have roadless specific hunts, we pulled the roadless are outside of some hunts.

Brad Horrocks: But you're turning around and giving a cow hunt in there.

Covy Jones: Yeah.

Brett Prevedel: The issue is their not getting hunters to go into the roadless and their.. Clint do you want to talk about.. Clint will tell you what's going on out there, we talked about this the other night at the Book Cliffs thing.

Clint Sampson: Wildlife biologist. So basically we're forcing more harvest to take place in the roadless. When we counted last year, we were right up to our objective with 450 wintering adults, and the majority of that population objective was in the roadless area itself. So it's us trying to force peoples hands to go in there and hunt. And there is a demand, it's the same thing we do for elk. We split the limited entry elk permits, we have the roadless or the Little Creek hunt, we have the Bitter Creek South hunt as well. Basically doing the same thing there.

Brad Horrocks: Alright, thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Any other questions?

Jamie Arrive: On your bighorn sheep hunt, I'm not finding the boundaries for that Wasatch West. Is that going to be separate from.. Cause I know it used to be the Wasatch, right? Did that include the east side of Indian Canyon?

Derrick Ewell: Biologist for that area. So next year there will not be a hunt on the Avintiquin unit. Sheep population is down so low and there are so few rams left, so we decided to just discontinue that hunt. Does that answer your question?

Jamie Arrive: Yes, thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Any other questions from the RAC? Ok I will entertain questions from the public, this is not the comment cards. If there are any questions to clarify any issues, now's your time, please step up.

Comments from the RAC:

Brett Prevedel: I have one Covy, this time of year there seems to be a pretty big division of people that love the extended archery buck hunting, until November 30th and those that really don't like it at all. Has that been a topic around the state? Ken recommended to stop the buck hunt a little earlier than the doe hunting, right?

Covy Jones: It really hasn't been a topic around the state. I know that there are some division sentiments around this overall I think the plan is to eventually have these extended archery units become stand alone. Right now what we're dealing with mule deer, were dealing with about 90,000 permits and about 160,000 applicants, right? Everybody wants to hunt deer every year, they also want us to offer less permits, as long as they get one, everything's good. So the goal is to have enough of these extended archery units around to say hey, here's an opportunity to hunt deer, it will take your points just like everything else, but you could go hunt extended. And that's one of the reasons the Division has pushed to keep these, and expand these. We're not there yet

and we're not making that recommendation tonight, but you may see a recommendation like that from us in the future.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you. And then, before we take comments from the public I would like to address the baiting issue. We've got a lot of emails and I witnessed the bad side of baiting recently on a property two feet from a fence, baiting over a fence then they actually shot the deer with a bow, and thought it wouldn't jump back in the fence I guess and cause the law enforcement and all the other issues that come with that. Then we've seen, I don't know if those in the audience are aware of it, but baiting is a big part of hunting in the southern part of the state primarily, maybe statewide as all these comments come out. So has that been addressed quite a bit at the RAC meetings or just in the southern.

Covy Jones: No, it's come up at every RAC meeting and they've asked the Division what their plan is, and I've let them know what happened, where we are, and where we'll go and if you'd like me to do that Mr. Chair, I can.

Brett Prevedel: Yes, please.

Covy Jones: We asked the public in the mule deer survey how they felt about baiting. 44% were opposed to baiting. 33% were in favor of continuing to allow baiting. So overall more hunters were opposed to baiting than in favor of baiting. We took that back and worked through it with the mule deer committee and we came to a vote on the mule deer committee and overwhelmingly the mule deer committee voted to ask the Division to write a rule to ban baiting in the state of Utah. So I did. We went back, worked with our attorneys and started to write a rule. We wrote a rule that would ban baiting in the state of Utah. Baiting of big game is illegal in all the western states except in Utah and Oregon. Those are the only two states that allow baiting. While writing a rule and looking at other states rules we noticed a few things. Essentially to write an effective, enforceable rule to ban baiting, you have to ban placing an attractant. Because if you don't write it that way then, it's not my pile of apples man, I didn't know it was there. You can put season dates on bait but then whos job is it to clean it up. And you don't address any of the biological concerns, if you don't address making it illegal to place an attractant. You don't address the disease concerns and the other concerns. That's the way we wrote it and we realized when we finished it was a rule that prohibited feeding. We also realized that we hadn't done the work to make it a recommendation to prohibit feeding, we hadn't discussed that with all the interested parties, so what we realized is there is more work to be done. But know that the Division intends to take this on. The reason why is because, baiting and long term feeding of wildlife, is detrimental to wildlife. It's bad for deer. There's a ton of research on this that shows if you bait, you congregate, you increase disease. There's also a lot of research that shows that if you feed, you destroy habitat. Long term feeding destroys habitat. So the Division wants to address that, we hadn't done the work yet, but we intended to address that, we hope to address that in the upcoming year.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you, will you address the technology of the streaming issue on the cameras on bait stations and stuff like that at that time, or is that a separate issue?

Covy Jones: That's a separate issue. In doing some of this research some of the other questions we asked was about technology. Did the public want to be limited on technology? Overall the response was no, they didn't want to be limited on trail cams and technology. We brought that to the Mule Deer Committee (MDC) and asked how the MDC feel about that, and they said if we could put trail cameras back in the bag completely and get rid of them, that would be more equitable. They felt that would be great, but they realized they couldn't. So the MDC settled on a recommendation to the Division to ban live feed cameras. Took that back to our attorneys and looked through the law and realized that everything we do, all the authority we have is to regulate take. We don't have any legal authority over trail cameras. So that is something that the legislature would have to give us. We may work though that issue this year.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you. We'll move into the comments from the public.

Kent Olsen: My name is Kent Olsen and assigned off the Farm Bureau Board (FBB) in Duchesne county to come to this meeting monthly. But that's not why I'm here tonight. I'm here as a landowner and a sportsman. I like to hunt too. I see that there's been some changes on the issue.. I've brought this up three times, this is my third time I've brought this up to the meeting, the first two times it's the wrong meeting, and I was told that November was the meeting to bring this up at. I have 112 acres an 1/8 of a mile west of the Sundance grounds in Neola, Utah. I would like to see them stop hunting buck deer after the 1st of November with the extended archery, and the reason is, I have about 7-8 head of does in my field at all times, I've got two fields, ones a half mile south of Neola and I have does in that field too. But I don't have buck deer year round. They show up at the rut. I see you've shortened it up, it used to be in to December, right? The extended archery used to go into December? And I see it's the 30th of November. I think you've done it backwards. I think you should shut it off from the first of November to the 30th and then let them go back to hunting buck deer in December. But I had three dead does two years ago in my field from archery hunters and nobody asked me for permission to hunt my property, and if they would have, I would have given it to them. But I have 112 acres that's split into 56 and 56, it's a half a mile long right there, and my cows are in the north end and when the snow melts I put my cows on the bottom end, and when I put them in the bottom end of the 56 I have to ride with a four wheeler to check for newborn calves. That's when I found these dead deer. I'd like to see you stop. The Ute tribe doesn't even hunt after the 1st of November, their buck season ends on the 1st of November, if I'm right Jamie? (Yeah) I feel like these buck deer, the reservation is three miles north of me. Other than the Sundance grounds which is an 1/8 of a mile, and I think these buck deer are coming off the reservation. So a lot of these guys that are hunting with archery aren't hunting til the 1st of November when they start to rut, then they go after them. That's my statement.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. To clarify the deer extended archery goes til November 30th, buck and doe. And the elk goes til December 15th, bull and cow. So if anybody has any elk comments.

Bruce Dart: I'm a landowner on the North Point Ridge. Also a hunter and a sportsman. I've been watching this extended archery hunt that just started last year and this year it's very obvious that there's a disadvantage to the buck deer. They're out of their survival mind, they are into the rut, they're getting taken advantage of. The way these hunters are, they set their cameras up before

the season. They know where the deer are running in and out. When they do that they put their bait out there. I'm familiar with the baiting situation right across the fence, I can literally stand there and if I fell over the fence I'd fall right in it. I have to admit the baiting does work, they put their tent up there and the deer are sleeping right next to the tent. It's very effective what the bait does. I've kind of changed the name of the name of the extended archery hunt, I call it the bait sit and wait. I don't see the sportsmanship of putting some bait out here by your tent 20 or 30 yards away and then a buck who is not in it's survival mind walks up there and gets shot at, killed. In an instance just recently it was wounded and came onto my place and the hunter did ask for permission to get it. He said it was dead, but when we walked up to the place he said it was dead at it jumped up and wobbled off. I let them look on the place. They looked and searched for it, and couldn't find it. That night I went back on the county road and on my property to see if I could find any blood. He said it went into my corn field. I didn't see any blood trails that night, I didn't see any the next morning. The case that's kind of been.. I don't know, it's gotten out of hand. I've been bashed on Facebook about me letting the animal rot in the cornfield. It wasn't my doing. I didn't shoot the deer. I'm a taxpayer on the property, if I don't want someone running through my cornfield, destroying my corn, I'm not going to let them. It's over in the badlands like this was, it's fine, I did let them. It's been a bad deal, I don't approve of the hunt. I think the big game hunts regardless or rifle or archery, they ought to be over by October 31st. Just let the deer be natural. We're talking about conception rates, birthing rates, and here we are messing with mother nature on how they're bred. So I recommend that the hunts end on October 31st and that you eliminate the baiting. I don't think it's sportsmen like. I appreciate your time, I've been quiet over the years, I haven't really said much to anybody, but this year it just got to me. Thank you.

Blake Bess: Blake Bess representing the Sportsmen, dedicated hunter. I agree with Mr. Dart and Mr. Olsen. I'll be the first to admit that I'm the first defender on this extended archery. We're hunting these bucks August, September, October, November. They don't get a break. Our deer are in bad shape around here as we all know. They're hunting them to death with our modern day archery equipment. On our property up around Altamont, we notice a lot of bucks, we've seen several around the past few years with arrows hanging out of them. These archery hunters ain't being ethical and as Mr. Dart said, these bucks have one thing on their mind and that's women. They aren't worried about these archers. I think I'd recommend the RAC to try to do something about the season dates on the extended archery buck deer. I'd like to see it get shut down quite a bit early to give our mature bucks a rest and sense to maybe breed some does without being pressured. Thank you.

Ken Powell: I'm representing myself as a sportsman and a dedicated hunter. With these extended archery permits, they put in for these hunts and they don't draw, but they can buy a deer tag over the counter in another county, in another hunting area, and then they can come up here and hunt the extended archery. They come up here and hunt over any other place in the state. I think they need to do away with that. Just like you're talking about Covy, about putting into a special hunt, that to me is wrong just because you're a dedicated hunter, I've heard other people say, well I'm not going to burn a tag on a doe as a dedicated hunter. You've got three years. Two bucks. You can kill two deer in three years. If your first year you don't kill nothing, take a doe. Do your management part of it. Take a doe in the extended archery areas. We need to take out some of

these does for the management part of it, everybody knows that. Sometimes people get upset about it, but we need to do this. So my recommendation is no bucks in November. Doe only if you want to do it. Just to help alleviate the.. You know the farmers are having problems with it. They get their depredation tags so the fish and game won't come in and wipe them out. Cause they'll do it at night time, and everyone knows they'll do it if they have to. So that's my recommendation. Thank you.

Al Kettle: I'm Al Kettle and representing myself and landowners. On the extended archery hunt one of the problems that we've encountered on my place at my farm is, we don't hunt the deer ourselves at all at our place. We put in we go to the mountains we hunt up there. Quite often we have people sneaking in our fence. On our fence line we have a big group of Russian Olives, about 90 acres. A lot of people sneak in through the Russian Olives trying to get these bucks during the extended archery hunt. If that was a doe only on the extended archery, I feel like we'd have a lot less trespassing issues with people trying to come on and find these bigger bucks. We don't hunt them, we like to see them. So that's the fun is seeing them out in the field in the winter time we'll have 50-60 head of deer on our place, and we don't get depredation tags, we don't get any of that. We feel like that's a safe place for them and it's not causing us problems. That's what I had for tonight.

Brett Prevedel: Miles, would you address the comments that came in statewide on this?

Miles Hanberg: Ok, statewide for the bucks, bulls and OIAL 53.86% responded supported the proposal, 24.63% were neutral, and 21.5% were opposed. In the northeast region we had 39.29% support, 32.14% were neutral, and 28.5% were opposed. They were basically mirrored the state wide, just at a different level.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Is there any more discussion from the RAC? Does anybody need anything clarified, or any questions for the people that commented? Do you understand what they were recommending?

Daniel Davis: Covy could you cover again the purpose of the extended archery hunt?

Covy Jones: There are several purposes, but I just wanted to remind the RAC that with the new process that after public comment then the Division and district biologist should have a chance to rebuttal or answer any questions. The purpose of the extended archery hunt, there are several purposes and it's different in different places. Remember when we're making these recommendations that along the Wasatch Front we have areas where you cannot harvest a buck or a bull with anything but a bow. So in those areas we have to have extended archery and it's primarily on public land. There are other areas where we have extended archery and it's just that provide the opportunity to sportsmen for harvest these animals, because if not, under state code we have to alleviate the damage that a landowner is experiencing. We get asked to do this a lot. We'll come in and remove those animals under state code, or we can offer this opportunity to the public.

Brett Prevedel: Randall would you be willing to come up and talk about the local? I know you

deal with the issue daily this time of year, don't you? So you can give a little historical perspective and then maybe Covy we want to give you your rebuttal if you disagree with any of this.

Randall Thacker: Wildlife biologist, northeast region. Originally when the extended archery was created in our region one of the first ones we did in the state. The intent was to try to help reduce some of the agricultural deer. It was really intended to try to ease some of the depredation problems we had and try to remove both sexes out there. We figured at the time because the population was so many more of them, more does, that it would be higher in the doe harvest out there. I just looked real quick to get numbers, it's essentially turned into now a recreational hunt, there's folks that love it. Last year we had 545 hunters who hunted the extended here in Duchesne/Uintah County. That's our hunt here in the region. Some of those folks are very, very passionate about it, they love it. We harvested 26 does, and 122 total bucks were harvested in the extended archery last year. They kind of broke it up by counties so it's 25-30% success. So it's actually a higher success rate on the extended archery, than what we've got on our general season straight archery hunts during that time, a little bit higher. It's a good hunt, folks do love it and enjoy it, some of them really like it, we have a lot of landowners that don't like it. We get a lot of feedback from folks that don't appreciate the trespass, a lot of them are just ethically bothered I think by the concept that you're hunting an animal in the rut. To counter that though, we hunt elk in the rut too in the state of Utah. We hunt a lot of things in different seasons of the year. There are some arguments to be made either way. I think on this one it's more of a social issue and not biological. We do need some way to remove some of these animals, I'll tell you it's not removing enough does for us. Our agricultural deer populations are definitely increasing. They're just continuing to grow. We have some GPS collars out there, most of those resident deer never leave. Those are resident agricultural area deer. They may stay on your place today, maybe on your neighbors two or three miles from you, and then over the course of the year, but they rarely leave and rarely go back to the mountain except for those that do come down late season here when we do hit November like they're talking about we do start to see some migratory animals show up. Most of those show up around the periphery, around the tribal boundary and that kind of stuff, around the edge of the extended archery boundary. Down lower in some lower elevations they are very much resident deer and they aren't leaving at all. We've had a real increase over the last 5-6 years, the deer herd has gone up as you saw that chart earlier that Covy shown with the population. You're also seeing an increase of numbers of roadkill in the basin here too. That's just correlation directly with the increase of agricultural deer in residential areas that we're seeing. We're going to have to find some ways to increase harvest in some of these agricultural and rural settings in town to try to address some of that stuff too if we don't have the extended archery. But it's accomplishing part of the job, but not near enough. We're probably going to find some new ways to address some of these things in the future.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Any other biologist want to speak on the extended?

Jamie Arrive: I have one more question. So you said 26 does were harvested for the extended archery, that's hunters, right? How many permits are given to landowners to help harvest does?

Randall Thacker: I don't have those numbers off the top of my head. We do have our landowner

depredation permit program that they can get up to.. If they have deer on their property and it's an agricultural operation they can get up to five free permits each for antlerless deer on those. I could look it up for you here in a few minutes and get you the exact numbers of how many we do. I have it in my computer, I don't have it in my head. There's hundreds of those permits given out each year.

Jamie Arrive: Are they pretty successful?

Randall Thacker: As far as percentage of permits given out? No. Most of them don't fill their tags in all honesty. A lot of them seem to just want to have the tags, but we do have some folks that really do want to help remove the deer on their property and they'll be 100% success for those. But in general overall most of those won't fill the tags that they're given. If so, they'll fill one and that's about it. I can get you numbers is you're interested Jamie.

Jamie Arrive: No, I was just wondering in addition to the 26 does how many you were taking.

Dax Mangus: Much higher than the 26 that are taken through extended archery.

Dan Abeyta: I've got a question for you Randall. These bucks that are being harvested during the extended archery hunt, are these bucks affecting the buck to doe ratios that you're doing for the sub units?

Randall Thacker: Not significantly. Because they are resident deer down there we try not to go down there and take too big of a sample, classification samples. We try to be more representative of the public land animals that are up on the forest. That's usually where we do classify for the most of those. Those are higher, there's so much protection provided to them by private landowners, some that love them and some that hate them. But it's a totally different situation down there. Production is different too. We don't want to use those fawn to doe ratios in those agricultural areas where they're getting a much higher quality of feed down there then they will up high so we try to avoid those for a classification when we do those samples. So it doesn't really affect us one way or another that way, that significantly.

Ritchie Anderson: Just a comment on the extended archery, I would hate to see that extended archery removed as a management tool. We're talking about specific areas in agricultural, urban areas, we're not talking about units as a general. So those bucks that are being hunted in the rut or in specific areas, they're not being hunted in other areas of the unit in the rut, so like Randall mentioned, it's not only the agriculture stuff, these extended archery hunts are in urban areas, where vehicle/wildlife collisions are higher. Maybe it could be tweaked a little, maybe we could encourage a higher doe harvest or something, but in general I'd hate to see that extended archery removed as a management tool. As a manager of quite a lot of private land, I do allow hunters in that extended archery. I budget a certain amount of my forage going to wildlife every year. I kind of know what I expect them to take, so I kind of know what my wildlife, big game numbers should be. I can use that extended archery as a land manager to say ok, if I allow this many harvest or this much pressure, I'm going to keep my forage where those wildlife are taking it about where I want it. So like the DWR tries to manage statewide for their habitat, that extended

archery allows me to manage my wildlife population on my private land to about to where I'm willing to budget it, which is a pretty high budget. You know we estimate 2-3% of our forage is going to go to big game. So we'll manage according to that, and we're fine with that.

Daniel Davis: I'd like to make a comment. Years back we got into a big stigma about growing our population and pretty much wiped out any opportunity for a doe hunt if it wasn't depredation related. I would echo Ritchie on not wanting to get rid of that extended archery, but would like to see in the plan that we have the opportunity to bring those doe hunts back and create opportunity through the HAMS process, or what have you if we're not meeting objectives. So I'd hate to see that go away as well.

Brett Prevedel: And both of you are talking buck and doe? (yeah) Just to clarify, cause all of the comments were just about the buck takes.

Randall Thacker: The answer to the question that Jamie asked, Amy was good enough to look up the data for me, back there. On the private lands depredation type of permits, there was almost 800 permits given out. 720 of the free ones, 60 of the fee ones, the vouchers that they would pay for. Between those tags we harvested last year about 315 does basically. That's significantly more than the 26.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, remember we're talking about the big topic, and you're welcome to take out the extended archery or the baiting issue if you want, or any other issue enclosed in there. And I would entertain a motion at this time.

MOTION to accept the Bucks, Bulls, and OIL proposal as presented by the Division.

Daniel Davis

Ritchie Anderson, second

Passed 6 in favor, 1 opposed

- **CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020 AND LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2020 – Chad Wilson, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Chad. Questions from the RAC? Any questions from the public?

Questions from the public:

--Chad have you been able to do any additional research on that junction valley addition, whether that land is at all accessible that's being added?

Chad Wilson: It's accessible, it's a cliff area there's a fence on top. It's a cliffy area, you can get down in there. The biggest fear is if you get down in there and you harvest an animal you're

probably not coming back that way, you're probably going to have to trespass to get back out. Not impossible, but most likely.

Comments from the public:

Kevin Norman: Kevin Norman representing myself. I have a little issue of this addition of bringing in public land into this CWMU. The unit I hunt, I find this in several places that there is fully accessible public ground that's engulfed in these CWMUs. It doesn't sit well. I understand that in the day it was to make the boundaries easier and a little more straightforward. But with our technology these days, OnX and everything else, I have a hard time swallowing, not being able to hunt public ground inside my unit. I guarantee that if some guy hunts this piece of public ground, even though it might be nasty to somebody, somebody is going to hunt it and they are going to be ticked, that now they can't because their public ground got scooped up into a CWMU. So I would suggest that you do not approve that. Just from a standpoint of looking at what I'm looking at in my own unit, not being able to hunt. Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. Could you clarify that Chad? What region is it in?

Chad Wilson: In the northern region.

Brett Prevedel: The CWMU was intact and the only change is to add this public portion.

Chad Wilson: Yeah, so to give a little history, it was probably always incorporated that way. A lot of times those ranchers out there, they go to the fence line, right? So the fence was up on the top of the cliff, so they've had the grazing that way. They've probably practiced it that way. It was never on our record books as being public land on that CWMU. With that I was the biologist up there, so I'm pretty familiar with it. With that in mind I wanted to bring it through this process to make sure it got vetted in the public process. I think it makes sense that it is a clear boundary from a fence line and a cliff.

Brett Prevedel: It's been used for, in the CWMU this public piece of land?

Chad Wilson: According to the operator, they don't hunt that area a lot. It's just that's where they've traditionally posted it.

Brett Prevedel: Ok. Miles do you want to go over the online comments?

Miles Hanberg: Sure. In general, people didn't have real strong feelings on this issue statewide. 29.65% supported it, 51.98% were neutral, and 18.37% opposed. In the northeast region, 25% support it, but 71.4% were neutral, 3.57% opposed.

Brett Prevedel: Any other discussion from anyone on this topic? I would open for a motion.

MOTION to accept the Bucks, Bulls, and OIL proposal as presented by the Division.

Daniel Davis

Ritchie Anderson, second

Passed 6 in favor, 1 opposed

- **PROPOSED RULE AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS POINT CREEP, LOST OPPORTUNITIES AND EQUITY IN THE HUNT DRAWING PROCESS – Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator.**

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thanks Lindy. Maybe I'll ask a few questions to start. On group forfeitures, if one person in the group has an illness or something, can the other three people continue with the hunt and you just work with the one?

Lindy Varney: Yes we can. If it's due to a death or injury we kind of treat it as a separate application and we can retake care of that hunter and get his points reinstated.

Brett Prevedel: So the group can stay with their tags? (Correct) And I had one other question, the one where you had to forfeit by the end of the season. So theoretically someone could hunt almost a whole season and then forfeit their tag at the end of the last day?

Lindy Varney: Well, it says that you can't hunt the whole season, you can only do that if you can't hunt. That's actually in statute, so we can't change that. But they have until the last day of the season to turn in their permit if they were ill or injured or death occurred, as long as they testify that they did not hunt. They have to sign the written statement saying they did not hunt.

Brett Prevedel: Not because they were sick of hunting?

Lindy Varney: No, not because they're sick of hunting. It's actually because they're sick and unable to go out.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, questions from the RAC?

Brad Horrocks: How do you get on the call list?

Lindy Varney: For surrenders?

Brad Horrocks: Yeah, when you're looking for that extra person to take a tag.

Lindy Varney: We use the alternate list, so it's a list with everyone that applied for that hunt. We use the lowest draw number so they are the additional ones that would have drawn out. It's just a generated list that will draw numbers.

Brad Horrocks: Ok, we can't just volunteer to be on that list?

Lindy Varney: Nope. You do by applying.

Jamie Arrive: So the part where you're saying your surrendering within 30 days, are there any exceptions to that? Like you're saying the death, illness, injury?

Lindy Varney: Yeah if there is death, ill, injured, or military, we'll take care of those hunters and reinstate their points including one for the current year, if they qualify with those reasons.

Jamie Arrive: Alright, thank you.

Brad Horrocks: You know I apply for 6-8 western states, and Utah even with these rule changes is still the most friendly state that I'm aware of in returning your permits. You know what I'm saying? Even with these rule changes, and I like where you're going with that. For our application fees and what we do, Utah is a very friendly state. Compared to the other western states.

Brett Prevedel: I have one more question, private lands elk tags, are they similar to control tags, or are they over in the you lose your point category?

Lindy Varney: They're in the lose your point category.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you.

Questions from the public:

JC Brewer: Just wanted a clarification on that waiting period change on deer? Deer is going from a two year to five year waiting period? Assuming that I had a deer tag two years ago, waited two years, now do I have to wait three more, or does that start this year?

Lindy Varney: It would start in 2020. So it would start going forward in 2020. Those drawn before then would not be affected.

JC Brewer: Ok, thank you.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chair, I had one question. In your exception there's not really anything stated that the Division could be lenient on. So you pretty much have to meet those three criteria, is that correct?

Lindy Varney: That is correct. Those are the three criteria listed in statute.

Daniel Davis: So what's the process to change that? Is statute going to get changed with some of these recommendations tonight?

Lindy Varney: Oh, are you talking about the lose your points?

Daniel Davis: Any of this.

Lindy Varney: No, none of this is getting changed in statute. The law that some of this is driven by is that we can't change it because of the statute.

Daniel Davis: The reason I ask is, especially in bus towns like you're in now, sometimes people have to take work assignments on short notice. And if it's valid and proven that if it comes up within that 30 day window, they've been denied vacation because they have to go work out of state, out of country or things of that nature. If that's been a consideration or what process it would take to get that written through.

Lindy Varney: The way it's written it would be denied, you would lose your points, but we would waive the waiting period.

Ritchie Anderson: Daniel to change that you'd have to do it legislatively.

Lindy Varney: No, to change that, that would just be rule for something like that.

Daniel Davis: You just said it was written in legislative.

Lindy Varney: Yeah, I thought you meant something different.

Daniel Davis: So that could take place through this process?

Lindy Varney: Yeah exactly through the public process. Just to be aware that documentation for work, it could get kind of admin heavy. But I get what you're saying. Some people have work, some people have other obligations that would come up too. So you've got to kind of think of it as a whole.

Daniel Davis: So on a criteria, I sprained my ankle and get a doctors note, I could get that variance?

Lindy Varney: Yeah. If you've got proper documentation, you have to get a doctor statement saying what day it occurred on, it couldn't have happened three months ago.

Daniel Davis: Thank you.

Blake Bess: Representing dedicated hunter and sportsmen. The Divisions and the liked revenue, has the Division took in the consideration on the amount of revenue lost on the 70% of dedicated hunters that apply second choice as a general season tag.

Lindy Varney: We have. If this went through we would lose those applications. That wasn't a

concern for the Division.

Brett Prevedel: Can you explain that? Aren't they guaranteed a tag as a dedicated hunter?

Lindy Varney: No you still have to apply for the COR. Once you draw out that COR then you get a permit for the three years.

Nolan Massey: I am basically here, I did a card, but you asked for comments.. I'm here as myself not representing anybody except for the people in the future, that may need to surrender a tag. So can you pull up your slide to the chart graph on how many people.. Like they had 600 people on there that surrendered their tag, how many of them are limited entry or once in a lifetime?

Lindy Varney: These are all limited entry. This doesn't include general season permits.

Nolan Massey: Basically, I'm here to oppose the rule, the change in the permit surrender. Just leave it as it is. It's pretty good, it's pretty friendly. Utah is friendly in that respect. We had to surrender a tag and so if we would have followed these rules we would have lost 23 points, right? How about on the OIL big time things go to a 48 hour prior to, instead of 30 days.

Lindy Varney: It still wouldn't be enough time.

Nolan Massey: How about notifying the alternates in advance that they possibly could end up with a tag in their lap?

Lindy Varney: That would be a lot of people to contact because we just don't know which permits would be brought in, and really everyone is possible that could be called. If you applied for that hunt, you could be called.

Nolan Massey: But you already know who the alternates are.

Lindy Varney: Yeah, every single person who applies for the hunt is an alternate.

Nolan Massey: Ok, I thought they had them like, if you gave five tags, there were two or three alternates.

Lindy Varney: No, every single person that applies has a draw number.

Nolan Massey: Ok, that's my misconception then. But anyway, they only had roughly 600 tags exchanged and 50% reallocation. So what's wrong with that? And plus they go to keep the money on the ones that surrendered their tags for the most part probably, right?

Lindy Varney: On the ones that are less than 30 days, you don't get a refund. But it's a lost opportunity. It's 408 permits that we weren't able to get back out. That was each year, you see here it has three years, each year it's increasing. In 2018 we had almost 800 permits surrendered, I already know this year's more. I don't have 2019 because the hunts are still going but I know

it's higher than last year.

Nolan Massey: Well I'm here to say that under the new rules we would have lost 22 points for surrendering the tag. And I would like to see the Board oppose this rule change. Thank you for your time.

Blake Bess: Dedicated hunter. I have five general season deer points and basically with this rule change to me they are worthless. I wasted my money acquiring them because I will always put in as dedicated hunter. I believe that the Division is losing revenue over this situation because this year going in, re-putting in for my dedicated hunter, I could also put in for a general season with my five points that I have and they would get my \$10. They're losing a lot of money and I don't think it's fair to the dedicated hunter that puts in a lot of time and effort and good sportsmen out there that do a lot of the Divisions projects. I don't think it's being fair to the dedicated hunter, not being able to put in general season second choice. I'd like to encourage the RAC to disregard the Divisions recommendation of not being able to apply second choice for general season. There are several thousand other dedicated hunters like myself that their general season bonus points that we've paid money for, and acquired are basically worthless if we put in for this choice dedicated hunter. Thank you.

Sherry Massey: On your 800, what's your percentage that you refund back? Do you refund back all of those, do they all go through that process?

Lindy Varney: The one that's surrendered more than 30 days, you get a refund minus 25.

Sherry Massey: Ok, but the ones that you've done now, have you refunded all of these 800?

Lindy Varney: No we did not because the ones that were surrendered less than 30 days, so it's about 370ish-380 were not refunded.

Sherry Massey: So I recommend that that's wrong because I'm the one that surrendered her tag this year, of 22 years for injuries, and I did it within three weeks. I missed your 30 days, but I waived my \$500. Because you know, life happens. Not all of us are the guy that drew 10 times and turns it back, he has an ulterior motive for that. For me, that would be a punishment. 23 years is a long time to wait to draw out a tag. That's kind of wishy washy. And yes you do work with us. The ladies here at the local office were awesome. I filled out the right paperwork, and I sent it in like I was supposed to, I returned everything but there's got to be some.. I mean I get this that you don't get to resale it, or you don't get to reallocate it, but these are OIL hunts, that's a lot. You gotta really think about that before you pass it, cause.. And I get where you're coming from, there's 800, but how many of those are one guy that his wife doesn't let him hunt? Well, lose your points for those, but injuries and whatnot they happen.

Lindy Varney: Can I clarify? If it is an injury we'll take care of you and reinstate your points and refund.

Sherry Massey: I know, but if you do..

Lindy Varney: Those aren't included in this.

Sherry Massey: Those are not?

Lindy Varney: No, if you surrender the day before the hunt starts because of injury or the day before the hunt ends because of injury, we'll take care of you. I'm not changing that rule. These are the ones surrendering the day before the hunt starts with random reasons, not because they're injured.

Sherry Massey: Ok.

Lindy Varney: Not because of medical or death.

Sherry Massey: Ok.

Kevin Norman: Kevin Norman representing SFW. Lindy thank you so much for your hard work on this. SFW supports the Divisions recommendation with the one exception that.. Kind of like this gentleman, our committee feels like so many things have been fully taken away from the dedicated hunters, and it's such a valuable program that we run the risk of it not being appealing anymore, and this being one of them. So SFW accepts the recommendation with that exception of believing we should still be able to apply for the general and the dedicated as we previously had. Speaking for myself, I think Lindy has a tough job of pulling the bandaid off here. The system has just been used and abused and I think it's safe to say that the majority of these tags being turned back are max points being gathered by guys that are just shopping deer. It's going to take the hunt out of the hunt and they don't see what they want the day before so they turn it back. It's the harsh reality that if you draw the tag you've got to go make the best of it and not rob 400 people of that opportunity because you didn't find the deer that you're hoping for. So thank you Lindy, we support you 100%. Thank you.

Comments from the RAC:

Ritchie Anderson: I support the Divisions recommendations, I think we need to look at the dedicated hunter thing a little bit. I was contacted by Farm Bureau 30 minutes before this meeting stated and they apologized they weren't able to get a letter out for the RACs but they will have a letter to the state Board before that meeting. Their concern is on landowner tags, the landowners that receive vouchers, they lose their points and the opportunities to hunt other hunts. Is that correct under this proposal?

Lindy Varney: It depends on which on you're talking about. If it's the fee vouchers, then yes. Who ever purchases those permits would lose their points, but if it's the free ones that are used for depredation purposes, they don't lose those points.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok I think that Farm Bureau may be misunderstanding.

Lindy Varney: And we also offer landowner appreciation permits and landowner permits.

Ritchie Anderson: So on the landowner appreciation permits, they will not lose their...

Lindy Varney: those ones you would.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok, that's the ones they were talking about. So their thought is, they gave me an example of a guy in the Tinnick unit, receives the landowner appreciation. He likes to hunt the Nebo unit, which is every three years approximately. Their feeling is that if that's a landowner appreciation permit and that can go to.. And if I understood correctly, he can sell that permit or he can give to a family member, or something, is that correct?

Lindy Varney: He can't sell it. It's what, immediate family? It's different for each program, it depends on the program. It gets kind of confusing, do you want Covy to explain? He knows it a lot better, because he helped develop it.

Covy Jones: You can't sell it.

Ritchie Anderson: But he can give it to a family member or.. (Yeah).. Ok.

Covy Jones: So for the landowner appreciation permits, those are only the landowner. For the landowner permits, for every 640 acres they own in the unit, they get a permit. That can go to a family member, that can go to a landowner or a lease.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok they were talking about the landowner appreciation ones then apparently.

Covy Jones: Probably both the landowner and the landowner appreciation ones I assume. Those are both buck deer programs.

Ritchie Anderson: Ok so I guess they lose their opportunity to hunt another unit if they accept that permit. And they don't want to kill two animals in the same year, they just don't want to be locked in to hunt their specific deal if that's an appreciation tag for allowing wildlife mitigation or depredation. Then their feeling is these landowners should be able to.. If they're not going to use that appreciation tag themselves, they should still be able to hunt these other units. Which I can understand. I mean is it an appreciation tag, or is it their hunting tag?

Covy Jones: Ok, so from the Divisions perspective and I understand what you're saying Ritchie, but from the Divisions perspective, the appreciation part is they get to skip the line. The rest of us have to wait to draw sometimes three years, but if you own property inside the Nebo unit, 100 acres of ag you want to put in, you skip the line. If you want to do that every year you can. Now I understand if you own property in another unit but like to hunt a different unit, you have to choose, but you still get to choose. Your son could draw that permit or another family member could draw that permit and if you really want to hunt another unit, you get to hunt the whole unit on the Nebo. And with these permits, they're not limited to their private land, they're able to hunt the whole unit. So what we're really facing is we have 160,000 applications for deer. We have 90,000 opportunities, we're trying to balance that. What that means is everybody, under

Lindy's proposal if you look at it holistically, we can all think of reasons why we don't like one thing or another. If we exempt everything, we accomplish nothing and that's why we presented it the way we did.

Ritchie Anderson: I think under their concerns too is maybe the Division has put in a lot of effort to encourage landowners to allow wildlife habitat and usage, also it may discourage that. If they're going to choose if they may want to hunt another unit, and they aren't going to accept the appreciation tag, they lose a little bit of incentive there. But to tell you the truth, I'm going to let the Farm Bureau, as I didn't have a lot of notice of their concern, I'm going to let them address that further with the state Board. Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, thank you.

Daniel Davis: I go back to them variance approvals for forfeiture and I really have a hard time with work related issues. Cause that is our livelihood. If it wasn't for that we couldn't go play. It gets in the way sometimes unfortunately. I think there are ways for proof for that, and I feel that when it comes to work related issues on being reassigned or sent to a different area during that time frame that you shouldn't be punished for it. Cause you're not going to quit your job, that's just the side note, but when you put in for 15 years, it's a big investment. Another concern I had was along the same lines as the dedicated hunter. Little on the fence about some of the things there cause being able to apply for both, I too have four or five general season points and I'm a dedicated hunter. Next year I'm guaranteed a general season permit. So in a four year period I'm killing three deer, so I get a little more opportunity. It's a general season opportunity, I've put in my time, I dedicate everything to it. Lindy is the Division opposed to putting those under the same drawing? To where I have a choice to draw either dedicated hunter or general season and combine those points?

Lindy Varney: We're not opposed to the idea. We're kind of opposed to combining the points. It becomes more of a legal issue than anything, because preference points, dedicated hunter and general season are a little different. If that's the route you guys are thinking about going, it's worth looking into. It couldn't be for 2020 just because we've got to notify the public for that big of a change. Let me start over. We can change the program so we can put those both into one application. Apply for dedicated hunter for your first choice, your second choice can be a rifle tag, third choice muzzleloader. We can do that, but what I've been advised through our Attorney is that we would have to notify the public, by at least a year or two, and tell them that hey this kind of program is changing. Use your dedicated hunter points. And then moving forward after a certain date, this is how it's going to work. I was advised that was the best way for the public to do that big of a change. So if it's something that you want, then make a motion for me to look into it, and come back with a recommendation. But it couldn't be for 2020, it would be more like 2021ish.

Daniel Davis: So these recommendations don't fall in to like a management plan, where it's a cyclical time frame, you're only going to come around every 3 years.

Lindy Varney: No, mine are more social issues. If something needs to be changed then I can come out every month and see you guys.

Daniel Davis: So can I get some clarification for myself the difference between the points of general season and dedicated, weather preference or bonus? I was under the impression that they were both preference.

Lindy Varney: They are both preference, but you have dedicated hunter preference points, and general season buck deer preference points. It's two separate applications. So you can accumulate a point for each, because they are two different things. When you apply in the big game drawing, you can go in and submit application for dedicated Hunter COR and pay the \$10 application fee, and then your next application you can apply for general season hunt, pay the \$10, and if you're not successful on either of those, you'll get a point for dedicated hunter and general. It's two different programs, but using the same quota.

Daniel Davis: So that said, to me, it would make more sense if it was more appealing to the public that we leave it as it is, instead of a change this year and a change again next year. From the feedback that everybody has in the concerns about the dedicated hunter, that's kind of my stance on it. If there is a better way to potentially do it through this public process that's come forward, then we don't touch it. Leave it as is, apply for both and then look at combining those.

Brett Prevedel: That's an option to make that recommendation. They're actually getting to play two pools, and those of us that's not dedicated hunters, just get one, right?

Lindy Varney: Correct, that's how it currently is.

Brett Prevedel: They've got a pretty sweet deal. I just have one comment and I'll shut up. The private lands elk tags are very similar to the control tags, they're used as a management tool. Specifically in the Northeast region. It will probably tie the hands of the biologist if you take away points on the private lands tags. Because there's really no difference between a control tag and a private lands tag in its purpose. Different area, same elk management unit. Would you like to address that Randall? Or do you agree with that statement?

Covy Jones: I think before, we need to clarify that it's the Divisions recommendation that those those do take points. So the recommendation from the Division is that they do take points.

Brett Prevedel: Just on the private lands but not on the control.

Covy Jones: Just on the private lands but not on the control. And the rationale behind that is, and Lindy can pull up the data, but it's what I said before. We do want to address elk on private lands and we also want to allow people to hunt. If we keep exempting things, if we exempt this and land owner buck permits and everything else, it's still a choice. It's all a choice. And if we exempt everything we don't address point creep. And Lindy has some extra data she could show the RAC if they wanted to see what that means on over the counter elk sales. It's big.

Lindy Varney: If you want to see it Tonyas got to come..

Brett Prevedel: Ok, did you want to move on, or did you want to comment Randall?

Miles Hanberg: Statewide electronic comments. 53.24% of the folks supported the proposal. 23.5% were neutral. 23% opposed. In the northeast region, it was quite similar. 53.5% support. 14.3% were neutral. 32.1% opposed.

Brett Prevedel: Ok, I'd like to move this along if we can, I think we've at least brought to attention all the issues, hopefully we can come up with a motion that addresses the way we want to go.

Dan Abeyta: I have a question. So this debate that we are having over the proposed change to only be able to put in for dedicated hunter or general season, was this an issue statewide Lindy? And if so, was there a consensus on how to deal with this?

Lindy Varney: Overall it's been a discussion at every region. The dedicated hunter vs general season. But the consensus is they've been improving the concept, except for central, they kind of went with they'll approve it, but they want me to come back to them later with it combined into one application. So they approved for them to only apply for one, but come back with how we would combine them into one draw. The rest of the regions, it's been like you guys. Talking about it, figuring out what it means. A lot of people are passionate about it. In the end they've been approving it.

Dan Abeyta: It seems like what's in jeopardy is the preference points. How are they... is that just something that if we approve it then those who had you know four or five preference points for a general season, or a couple preference points for a dedicated hunter application..

Lindy Varney: They have to make a choice of what one they want to apply for. Those points won't go away. They just need to make the choice, do they want to be in the dedicated hunter program or do they want to apply for the general season unit. So it's a choice.

Brett Prevedel: But if they draw on one, it will not take the points from the other.

Lindy Varney: No. They will just lose the points from the program they drew from.

Dan Abeyta: I guess my feeling is that, it seems like the state is doing everything they can to increase opportunity. You know in many different ways. And this is just an example of taking a little bit of opportunity away. And I think, another comment to, is it seems like, not sure who made this but somebody made his comment earlier, that the state is really trying to accommodate protecting hunters who have things to come up, you know as far as reinstating the points and refunds and things like that. It seems like the states really conscientious of doing that. So that's good.

Jamie Arrive: I have one more question. With this dedicated hunter or general season, with them

having to pick, have you guys ran any statistics on how many more opportunities that would...

Lindy Varney: It would have been almost a thousand permits this year if they had to pick, a thousand permits would have given another hunter a tag. Does that make sense?

Brett Prevedel: Ok, I'm going to open it up for a motion.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chair, can I make a couple of smaller motions?

Brett Prevedel: If that's the best way to handle it, we can break it up.

MOTION to accept the Bucks, Bulls, and OIL proposal as presented by the Division.

Daniel Davis

Ritchie Anderson, second

Passed 6 in favor, 1 opposed

Ritchie Anderson: I think there is some credence to what Daniel is saying, especially in our area right now with our economy and our work situation and guys getting sent out of town a lot. And we have a lot of very avid hunters here. I would like to amend the motion.

MOTION to approve the Divisions presentation as presented with the exception of the Division adding an exception to include employment issues within the 30 day window.

Ritchie Anderson

Brad Horrocks, second

Passed unanimously

- **Big Game Application Timeline INFORMATIONAL - Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator**

See Slideshow

Brett Prevedel: Thank you Lindy.

Dan Abeyta: I was just curious, do any other states that you know of have e-tagging in place?

Lindy Varney: Yeah they do. We are working with those states, and communicating with how it's going for them, what they're seeing, what's working best and what's not working best. There are some states that do it. They're more back east though.

Brett Prevedel: Thank you. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MOTION to adjourn.
Brad Horrocks



GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

BRIAN C. STEED
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

MICHAL D. FOWLKS
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 18, 2019

To: Wildlife Board

From: Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

Subject: **Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit (CWMU) Advisory Committee Members**

According to R657-37, CWMU Advisory Committee members must be nominated by the Director and approved by the Wildlife Board. Several positions need to be filled due to expiring terms, so we are asking the Wildlife Board to approve the following committee member nominations and their terms:

- One Sportsmen representative:
 - Clint McClean (replacing Matt Brimhall) – term expires in December 2023
- One CWMU representative:
 - Chris Robinson (replacing Wade Heaton) – term expires in December 2023
- One Elected Official representative:
 - Joel Ferry (replacing Evan Vickers) – term expires in December 2023

This committee serves as a third party representative in issues with CWMUs and will:

1. Hear complaints dealing with fair and equitable treatment of hunters on CWMUs,
2. Review the operation of the CWMU program,
3. Review failure to meet antlerless objectives,
4. Hear complaints from adjacent landowners,
5. Review changes in acreage totals for CWMUs that are under standard minimum acreage or parcel configuration requirements and evaluate the appropriateness of their continued participation in the program, and
6. Make advisory recommendations to the director and Wildlife Board on the matters.