

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

November 29, 2018, DNR, Boardroom
1594 W. North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

Revised November 26, 2018

The meeting can be viewed live at
https://youtu.be/pQw7Z7au_88

Thursday, November 29, 2018, 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– Mike Canning, DWR Deputy Director | INFORMATION |
| 5. Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation
– Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | INFORMATION |
| 6. Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan
- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist | ACTION |
| 7. Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan
- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist | ACTION |
| 8. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019
- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments
- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019
- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator | ACTION |
| 12. Flaming Gorge Reservoir Rule Amendments – R657-13
- Greg Hansen, Asst. Attorney General | ACTION |
| 13. Other Business
– Kirk Woodward, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2018 - Target Date – Archery Season Dates for Elk

MOTION: I move that we put on the action log a review of the season date change for archery elk hunting and add a survey concerning this issue prior to the next revision of the statewide deer management plan in 2022. The Division will report back next year to look at how season date changes would look with the requested change

Motion made by: Calvin Crandall
Assigned to: Covy Jones
Action: Under Study
Status: Scheduled for the November 2018 RAC and Board Tour
Placed on Action Log: September 28, 2017

Fall 2019 – Target Date – Multi-year Furbearer License

MOTION: I move that the Division research the possibility of a multi-year furbearer license and report back to the Board June 2019.

Motion made by: Byron Batemen
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois and Kenny Johnson
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: This motion was placed on the Action Log per a request from Byron Bateman on Sept. 22, 2018.

Fall 2019 – Target Date – GPS Requirement

MOTION: I move that the Division present a recommendation to the Wildlife Board next year on the inclusion of GPS data in the check-in process that requires the submission of location/time of kill site and photograph of cougar's sex.

Motion made by: Byron Batemen
Assigned to: Darren DeBloois
Action: Under Study
Status: Pending
Placed on Action Log: This motion was placed on the Action Log per a request from Byron Bateman on Sept. 22, 2018.

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

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

September 27, 2018, DNR Auditorium

1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/tCLmmUjwV9k>

AGENDA

Thursday, September 27, 2018, Board Meeting 9:00 am

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
 - Kirk Woodward, Chairman
2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
 - Kirk Woodward, Chairman
3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
 - Byron Bateman, Vice-Chair
4. DWR Update **INFORMATION**
 - Mike Canning, DWR Assistant Director
5. Youth Hunting Opportunities Update **INFORMATION**
 - Lindy Varney, Wildlife Licensing Coordinator
 - Dean Mitchell, R3 Coordinator
 - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator
6. 2019-2020 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 **ACTION**
 - Randy Oplinger, Coldwater Sportfish Coordinator
 - Craig Walker, Sportfish Assistant Chief
7. CRO Deer Unit Management Plans **ACTION**
 - Riley Peck, Wildlife Central Region Program Manager
8. Conservation Permit Annual Report **ACTION**
 - Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief
9. Conservation Permit Audit **ACTION**
 - Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
10. Conservation Permit Allocation **ACTION**
 - Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief
11. Antelope Island Additional Bison Permit Request **ACTION**
 - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator
12. Central Mtns/Nebo Elk Recommendations **ACTION**
 - Rusty Robinson, District Biologist
13. 2019 RAC/Board Dates **ACTION**
 - Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator
14. Motion to Correct Decision and Order **ACTION**
 - Greg Hansen, Assistant Attorney General
15. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
 - Kirk Woodward, 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
September 27, 2018, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 30, 2018 Wildlife Board Meeting.

3) 2019-2020 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (**Action**)

The following motion was placed on the action log, made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 4-2 with Steve Dalton and Karl Hirst opposed.

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.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we keep the artificial flies and lures restriction on UM Creek, the East Fork of the Sevier and Mammoth Creek and raise the limit on the UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier to four (4) fish.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the 2019-2020 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented by the Division.

4) CRO Deer Unit Management Plans (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the CRO Deer Unit Management Plans as presented.

5) Conservation Permit Annual Report

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented and make this informational in the future.

6) Conservation Permit Audit

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

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

7) Conservation Permit Allocation

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

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

8) Antelope Island Additional Bison Permit Request

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Antelope Island Additional Bison Permit Request as presented.

9) Central Mtns/Nebo Elk Recommendations

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Central Mtns/Nebo Elk Recommendations as presented.

10) 2019 RAC/Board Dates

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2019 RAC/Board Dates as presented.

11) Motion to Correct Decision and Order

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we grant the approval of the Motion to Correct Decision and Order as presented.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 27, 2018, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Kirk Woodward – Chair
Byron Bateman – Vice-Chair
Mike Canning – Exec Sec
Kevin Albrecht
Calvin Crandall
Donnie Hunter
Karl Hirst
Steve Dalton

RAC Chairs

Central – Kris Marble
Southern – Dave Black
Southeastern – Trisha Hedin
Northeastern – Randy Dearth
Northern – Bryce Thurgood

Division Personnel

Ashley Green
Rory Reynolds
Jason Vernon
Kevin Bunnell
Boyde Blackwell
Justin Dolling
Chris Wood
Drew Cushing
Kenny Johnson
Rick Olson
Paul Gedge
Rusty Robinson
Mike Christensen
Staci Coons
Carmen McDonald
Martin Bushman
Greg Hansen
Lindy Varney
Nic Braithwaite
Chris Crockett
Riley Peck
Chris Penne
Trina Hedrick
Randy Oplinger
Craig Walker
Dean Mitchell
Steve Newren

Phil Gray
Sarah Scott
Ben Nadolski
Mark Hadley
Justin Shannon
Covy Jones
Scott Dalebout
Chad Bettridge
Bruce Johnson
J Shirley
Ben Wolford
Dave Beveridge
Paul Washburn

Public Present

Ken Strong – SFW
Chris Carling – SFW
Kevin Norman – USFWS
Bryce Pilling
Kelly Kreis
Guy Perkins

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
September 27, 2018, DNR Auditorium
1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah
<https://youtu.be/tCLmmUjwV9k>

- 00:00:13** Chairman Woodward called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, introduced Board and RAC members, and explained the meeting procedure.
- 00:3:42** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:04:22** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the August 30, 2018 Wildlife Board Meeting.
- 00:04:51** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
No action log items at this time.
- 00:05:36** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**
Mike Canning updated the Board on the grand opening of the Eccles Wildlife Education Center, fires and rehabilitation projects, USU grouse symposium, and the memorandum issued by Secretary Zinke.
- 00:08:36** **5) Youth Hunting Opportunities (Informational)**
Lindy Varney, Dean Mitchell, and Covy Jones presented the informational topic.
- 00:39:18** **6) 2019-2020 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 (Action)**
Randy Oplinger and Craig Walker presented.
- 01:01:56** **Board Questions**
The board asked for clarification on the Sevier River access, the restrictions on UM Creek and the affects to fly fishermen, the effects of corn use, and law enforcement issues.
- 01:16:56** **RAC Recommendations**
All RACs passed the guidebook and rule with varying stipulations.
- 01:22:40** **Public Comments**
Public comments were accepted at this time.

01:28:20 Board Discussion

Chairman Woodward summarized the RAC motions. The Board discussed Mammoth Creek, kokanee limit, and the Provo River.

The following motion was placed on the action log, made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed 4-2 with Steve Dalton and Karl Hirst opposed.

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

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we keep the artificial flies and lures restriction on UM Creek, the East Fork of the Sevier and Mammoth Creek and raise the limit on the UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier to four (4) fish.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remainder of the 2019-2020 Fishing Guidebook and Rule R657-13 as presented by the Division.

01:52:48 7) CRO Deer Unit Management Plans (Action)

Riley Peck presented the unit management plans.

01:58:25 Board/RAC Questions

The board asked about potential impacts on hunters from habitat projects, winter range plans, and Nebo translocation site.

02:01:06 RAC Recommendations

All RACs unanimously passed the unit management plans.

02:01:50 Board Discussion

Chairman Woodward summarized the RAC motions and the Board discussed deer translocation.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the CRO Deer Unit Management Plans as presented.

02:05:28 8) Conservation Permit Annual Report (Action)

Justin Shannon presented the annual report.

02:11:56 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Kirk Woodward, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Conservation Permit Annual Report as presented and make this informational in the future.

02:13:50 9) Conservation Permit Audit (Action)

Kenny Johnson presented the audit.

02:29:16 Board Discussion

The Board expressed appreciation to the Division for compiling an organized and simplified audit report that makes it easier for everyone to understand.

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

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

02:31:03 10) Conservation Permit Allocation (Action)

Justin Shannon presented the allocation.

02:37:35 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Steve Dalton and passed unanimous.

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

02:38:44 11) Antelope Island Additional Bison Permit Request (Action)

Covy Jones presented the additional permit request.

02:40:38 Board Discussion

The Board asked for clarification on the request and its effect on other tags.

The following motion was made by Calvin Crandall, seconded by Karl Hirst and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Antelope Island Additional Bison Permit Request as presented.

02:42:28 12) Central Mtns/Nebo Elk Recommendations (Action)

Rusty Robinson presented the recommendations.

02:52:03 Board Discussion

Karl Hirst and Kirk Woodward expressed concerns about extending the season date due to natural disasters and setting precedence for hard hunts.

The following motion was made by Kevin Albrecht, seconded by Calvin Crandall and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Central Mtns/Nebo Elk Recommendations as presented.

02:58:16 13) 2019 RAC/Board Dates (Action)

Staci Coons presented the 2019 dates and mentioned the governor's website is accepting applications for the nominating committee through November 15, 2018, and applications for 3 new board members will open February 1, 2019, and close March 15, 2019.

03:02:04 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we accept the 2019 RAC/Board Dates as presented.

03:02:26 14) Motion to Correct Decision and Order (Action)

Greg Hansen presented the motion.

03:05:25 Board Discussion

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Donnie Hunter and passed unanimous.

MOTION: I move that we grant the approval of the Motion to Correct Decision and Order as presented.

03:06:40 15) Other Business (Contingent)

Chairman Woodward brought up the tough hunting conditions this year and how the Division addressed it. He would like to revisit the issue of spike hunting on trophy bull units and its effects on the population.

There was a discussion about a Division elk survey, how to obtain a copy, and the process of the survey.

Kevin Albrecht will be attending winter WAFWA.

03:16:36 Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meetings
Summary of Motions**

Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan

CRO SRO, NER

Motion: To accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

NRO **Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented including comments from the Forest Service and BLM regarding the need to define augmentation, introduction, re-introduction, population and native status.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

NERO

Motion: To accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passes: 9-2

Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

All RACs

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

CRO **Motion:** To add an archery only elk hunt to 'Barney Top' (new hunt) with season dates of September 11-24, 2019.

Motion Passes: 5-3

Motion: Ask the Wildlife Board to look into late season limited entry archery hunts.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: To end the late season rifle elk hunt on the Dutton

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: To ask the DWR to look at the hunt calendar

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: The central region RAC supports the general season elk hunt and would not support the reduction in spike only elk tags.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: To accept new archery only sheep hunts on the Newfoundland Mountain (December 11-31) and Zion (November 11-December 1) units.

Motion Passes: 6 – 2

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

Motion Passes: Unanimous

- NRO Motion:** Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented.
Motion Passes: For: 7 Against: 4
- SRO Motion:** To accept the SFW recommendation to make the Barney Top an archery only elk unit for 2019 and eliminate the late rifle elk hunt on the Mt. Dutton unit.
Motion Passes: 9-4
- Motion:** To accept the bighorn sheep as recommended.
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** to reject the proposal for an early rifle deer hunt on the Panguitch Lake unit.
Motion Passes: 7-6
- Motion:** to continue spike only elk hunts as they are currently outlined in the Elk Management Plan
Motion Passes: 12-1
- Motion:** to allow general season muzzleloader elk hunters to harvest a bull or cow on units that are over objective.
Motion Passes: 12-1
- Motion:** to accept the balance of the proposal as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- SER Motion:** To ask the Division to add verbiage to all hunting proclamations informing hunters of the negative impacts of putting salt baits near water sources
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To make the Barney Top area an archery-only elk hunting unit
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To ask the Wildlife Board to approve the Division to create archery-only hunts for desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in units the Division deems appropriate
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To not allow the use of airguns until those weapons become subject to the Pittman Robertson Tax
Motion Passes: 10-1
- Motion:** To remove the multi-season elk hunts on any units that are under age objective
Motion Passes: 6-4 with one abstention
- Motion:** To accept the remaining proposals as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- NER Motion:** To extend the east boundary of the extended archery unit a ½ mile on private lands east of the Green River
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To approve the two Limited Entry archery sheep seasons proposed by SFW
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To ask the Wildlife Board to define Primitive Weapon.
Motion Passes: Unanimous
- Motion:** To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

CRO Motion: To approve the change requested by Paul Phillips
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: to accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

NRO Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept 1 additional bull elk permit for North Peak CWMU
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the late application from the Mountain Meadows CWMU and date changes for the deer season from 9-10 through 11-10 to 9-1 through 10-31 and reduction of deer permits from 18 private and 2 public to 9 private and 1 public.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of CWMU Management Plans, Permit Numbers and Landowner Association Permit numbers as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SRO Motion: to accept as presented
Motion Passes: unanimous with one abstention

SERO Motion: to accept as presented
Motion Passes: 10-0 with one abstention

NERO Motion: to accept as presented
Motion Passes: 5-1

R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

NRO, SER

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

CRO Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.
Motion Passes: 6 - 2

SRO Motion: to accept as presented.
Motion Passes: 10-2

NER Motion: To accept the presentation as presented with the Division looking at hours to be 8-12-12
Motion Passes: Unanimous

Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019

CRO SRO

Motion: To accept the Division's recommendations with the exception of banning electric bikes on WMA's.
Motion Passes: Unanimous

NRO Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board not accept the E -Bike ban as presented by the Division.
Motion Passes: For: 8 Against: 3

Motion: Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the balance of the waterfowl recommendations and rule amendments as presented.

Motion Passes: Unanimous

SER Motion: To accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments-2019 as presented.

Motion Passes: 10-1

NER Motion: To accept as presented but allow e-bikes.

Motion Passes: 5-1

RAC AGENDA – November 2018

Revised October 23, 2018



- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------|
| 1. | Approval of Agenda
- RAC Chair | |
| 2. | Approval of Minutes
- RAC Chair | |
| 3. | Old Business
- RAC Chair | |
| 4. | Regional Update
- DWR Regional Supervisor | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. | Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation
- Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief | INFORMATIONAL |
| 6. | Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan
- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist | ACTION |
| 7. | Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan
- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist | ACTION |
| 8. | Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 9. | CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019
- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 10. | R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments
- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. | Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019
- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator | ACTION |

Meeting Locations

CR RAC – Nov. 6th 6:30 PM (Location Change)
Monte L. Bean Museum
645 E. 1430 N., Provo

SER RAC – Nov. 14th 6:30 PM
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main St, Green River

NR RAC – Nov. 7th 6:00 PM
Brigham City Community Center
24 N. 300 W., Brigham City

NER RAC – Nov. 15th 5:30 PM
Wildlife Resources NER Office
318 North Vernal Ave., Vernal

SR RAC – Nov. 13th 5:00 PM
Cedar City Middle School
2215 W. Royal Hunte Dr, Cedar

Board Meeting – Nov. 29 - 9:00 AM
DNR Boardroom
1594 West North Temple, SLC

Central Region Advisory Council
Monte L Bean Museum
645 East 1430 North, Provo
November 6, 2018 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by A J Mower and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written

2) Approval of Minutes

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by A J Mower and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written

3) Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

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

4) Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.

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

5) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and failed 2 to 6.

MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to direct DWR to draft an additional definition for primitive weapons for archery and muzzleloaders.

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 5 to 3.

MOTION: To add an archery only elk hunt 'Barney Top' (new hunt) with season dates of September 11-24, 2018.

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Alan White and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ask the Wildlife Board to look into late season limited entry archery hunts.

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To end the late season rifle elk hunt on the Dutton.

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and failed 3 to 5.

MOTION: To split the Wasatch elk hunt unit, with Highway 40 being the boundary, with no late rifle elk hunt on the west side.

The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To ask the DWR to look at the hunt calendar.

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.

MOTION: The Central Region RAC supports the general season elk hunt and would not support the reduction in spike only elk tags.

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 6 to 2.

MOTION: To accept new archery only sheep hunts on the Newfoundland Mountain (December 11-31) and Zion (Nov 11-Dec 1) units.

The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Alan White and failed 2 to 6.

MOTION: To keep the Wasatch front extended archery boundary the same.

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

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

- 6) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and
Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, and seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve change requested by Paul Phillips.

The following motion was made by Alan White, seconded by AJ Mower and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.

- 7) Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed 6 to 2

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

- 8) Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments – 2019

The following motion was made by Alan White, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the Division's recommendations with the exception of banning electric bikes on WMAs.

Central Region Advisory Council
Monte L Bean Museum
645 East 1430 North, Provo
November 6, 2018 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Ben Lowder, Co-Chair
Ken Strong, Sportsmen
Joshua Lenart, Sportsmen
Kristofer Marble, Chair
A J Mower, Agriculture
Mike Christensen, At-Large
Alan White, Agriculture
Brock McMillian, Sportsmen
George Garcia, USFS

Members Absent

Christine Schmitz, Non-consumptive-excused
Jacob Steele, Native American
Danny Potts, Non-consumptive
Michael Gates, BLM
Steve Lund arrived 7 pm, left 7:45, didn't vote

Others Present

Jason Vernon, Central Region Supervisor
John Bair, former Board Member
Kevin Crandall, former Board Member

1) **Approval of the Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
Kristofer Marble, RAC Chair

VOTING

Motion was made by Ken Strong to accept the agenda and minutes as written
Seconded by A J Mower
Passed unanimously

2) **Old Business**
Kristofer Marble, RAC Chair

I'll go ahead and do some updates from the last board meeting. There was a lot of agenda items so I will try and breeze through this. On the 2019-2020 fishing guidebook rule, there was a motion to keep UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier artificial flies and lures only in place and change possession limit from 2 to 4 on those waters and it passed 6 to 2.

Deer management plans... That passed unanimously.

Conservation permit report passed unanimously and all other agenda items passed unanimously. That included conservation permit audits, conservation permit allocations, Antelope Island's additional bison permit, requests in Central Mtns Nebo elk recommendations, the 2019 RAC and board dates were set at the meeting (they should be online now). A motion to correct a decision in order passed unanimously. That's the summary of the last board meeting. At this point I'll turn it over to Jason for regional update.

3) **Regional Update (Information)**
Jason Vernon, Central Regional Supervisor

There are just a couple of things and I'll try to make it quick. Throughout the central region we have 3 deer check stations where hunters can come through and voluntarily check in their deer and we'll take some body measurements on those. They're typically held in Spanish Fork Canyon, along I-15 at Santaquin and then at Nephi Canyon. There was a couple interesting preliminary data on these. We noticed on those as we put the measurements together this year, they had slightly smaller antler growth than they've had in past years and slightly less fat than average. One interesting thing is that we checked about the same number of animals as we have in the past on those units that had fires on them. On the Wasatch, Manti and Nebo we had fires off and on during the summer and even affecting some of the hunts. It seemed like the hunters were able to go into open areas and still harvest about the same number of animals that we've seen in the past.

The pheasant hunt this year was a success. We had a lot of satisfied hunters. In the central region we added 7 new release sites previous to what we had before. We have had a problem in the past with people piling up in certain areas especially down on the Utah Lake Wetland preserve and we wanted to spread those people out. Again, the initial numbers, it looks like we have spread those hunters out to some other places throughout the region. We'll continue to do that in the future as well as maybe even adding some additional release sites.

In our aquatics section, we completed the rotenone treatment of Maple Lake up Payson Canyon. That was done in mid-October. The purpose of that treatment was to remove illegally stocked goldfish. People would empty their fish tanks in the pond and the goldfish kind of took over the pond. I was up there and saw pictures of it after they did the rotenone treatment and it was shocking how many fish came to the surface up there. We suspect that is was a successful kill. There's a couple of things that made it difficult. Goldfish are pretty hard to eliminate, they are a pretty hardy fish. Also, the conditions of the lake made it difficult. They have a couple ideas for other actions to ensure complete elimination on that as well.

Habitat section: As you know we had a few fires throughout the region. The Hilltop and Coal Hollow fires were both seeded last month and they'll be chained in the new future to incorporate the seed in the soil. We're flying contracts right now for aerial seeding on the Coal Hollow fire on state and private grounds. That should happen pretty soon. Throughout the region, the habitat section in implementing habitat projects. A lot of wildfire work, a lot of planned projects that we're going to still carry through. One that they finished last week is that they installed 6 upland game guzzlers on the South Sand Pitch, the south end of the Nebo so we're hoping to have some more success with the upland on those dry systems down there.

Law Enforcement: This year seemed to be pretty consistent with past years according to law enforcement incidents, checks and contacting hunters. Our officers are working a couple of good wildlife cases and they did have a lot of positive contact with the public this last hunt and we'll continue with that.

One last thing is I think many of you have heard about the wildlife overpass in Parley's Canyon. That is coming to a completion. It is tentatively scheduled to have an opening and a closing on November 27th. They'll open it up and let the public look at it and walk across it and then they'll close it that same day to the public. We're optimistic and hopeful that wildlife will utilize that crossing up and over I-80 at the top of Parley's Canyon. We do have studies that we'll be looking at the use on that and hope it will be a successful project for wildlife. That's all I have to report.

Kristofer:

Thank You. For the record I'd just like to make one change to the updates of the wildlife board meeting. What I read was actually the RAC motion from our RAC. What the wildlife board did with the fishing guidebook and rule was keep Mammoth Creek as is and UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier keep artificial flies and lures and increase the limit from 2 to 4.

**4) Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation (Informational)
Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief**

Kristofer:

Justin, I had one question. One thing that I get asked a lot about is the private land only elk tags that you mentioned. You showed some numbers up there about distribution of elk on private vs. public land. Have you seen in units where we're doing those tags where those numbers are changing or is it too soon to tell?

Justin: Where's Brock? Brock can probably speak to this better than I can. He's been looking at the data quite a bit.

Brock: Before they implemented that program, the day after the opening of the rifle hunt 22% of elk were on public lands. The day before it was in the 40-45% or so and when they implemented to program, that shift has been about 1/3. So, there's 2/3's of the elk that go to private land and stay public land....?

Justin: That's the only collar data that we have but antidotally in talking with landowners they love it because they have the ability to solve their own problems. They can gauge how many elk they are willing to tolerate and that's been a good thing.

Kristofer: Have you seen a reduction in depredation? Or I should say, crop damage?

Justin: I think that's a harder one to tell. We probably have isolated pockets that make sense but elk and deer are smart and I think a year like this where the forbs and grasses really didn't do well on the rangeland. I think you're going to have a lot of wildlife on private lands. I think over time we will but I don't think this is the year. I think that a lot of elk were congregated.

Alan: I don't really have a question but I have a comment. I appreciate the recommendation that you have given to agriculture. I've been involved in it a long time. I remember the attitude between the division and wildlife people has changed. It used to be a lot more head to head. This is really good for sportsman and wildlife and everyone involved. I had one of the first CWMU's out in the Basin (Sand Creek CWMU) and when I talked to our law enforcement officer out there and told him that I set this CWMU up... his reaction was "oh, boy this is more law enforcement now." He didn't like that at all and that's changed. I appreciate it.

5) Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan (Action)
Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Questions from the RAC

Mike – You said that it goes from 5 to 15-25% ratio kids per counted adults. Before did you insinuate that it was previously counted...

Jace: Total counted number- adults and even young of the year

Mike: So how does that correspond to an actual increase? How many kids are you usually counting, what's the rate there?

Jace – The ration of kids to adults depends on the unit. I have this here, this might help to show it a little bit. What you have is the last 5 years each of these rows. In the far left column you can see the permits that we offered. The next column it shows the maximum number of permits that were possible for us to offer based on the old guidelines (5-15% of the population). Here in the middle you can see the maximum possible that would be possible on the proposed guidelines. You can see the permits that we've offered in the past and then this was the maximum that we could offer under the old guidelines. You can see that we're not always offering as many permits as we could have. That depends by the unit. There're some units where we're maxed out and we're offering everything that we can. Here you can see that this will be the increase of what we'll be able to offer.

Mike – So in essence the number of kids to adult is lower than I was thinking.

George – On some of the units there was no data in our packet. You showed the initial transplants like the Stansbury, the Manti but other units like the Wellville/Logan, Mt.

Naomi, Ogden Peak you didn't provide data for those units but you show those as augmentation. Can you explain that?

Jace – I think the ones that would hit on that are the ones that you're talking about: Wellsville, Naomi and Ogden. What we have there is we have mountain goats that have been sighted. I think the first sightings were in those three areas. I think the first one would have been back in 2009 starting over in Naomi. Those are just sightings that were reported to us. We have flown them, we've seen goats on the Wellsville and Mount Ogden. We've gone out and done surveys but we haven't necessarily done formal surveys on those areas. On Naomi we see a hand full of goats. I think we've gotten 5 reports or so recently. There're probably just a few goats out there. Wellsville has been up and down a little bit more. Still, less than 20. I think the biggest counts over on Ogden have been in the winter. Again, about 20. Down lower, I know of the most recent flight we only counted 1 or 2 goats on the Ogden and then the same idea... 3 or 4 on the Wellsville. Goats are there but it just depends.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

John Bair – Thank Jace and the Division. I think they did a really good job with the goat plan and the sheep plan. We've spent a lot of time talking to a lot of different interest groups and they did a super job. I just want to stand up and say I support the mountain goat plan 100%. It was a lot of fun being a part of that management committee. I think the division's being very proactive on a lot of things with our wildlife and this is an example of that. Kudos to the division, well done and I support the plan.

Greg Bird – Utah Wild Sheep – I want to echo what John said. We were fortunate to be part of that committee and we appreciate what the Division did. We support the goat plan 100%. Thank You.

Troy Justenson/SFW – I had the opportunity to sit in on those meetings and I can testify those meetings were shorter without John Bair but we do appreciate him being a part of that. Hat's off to the division. Jace provided us with a lot of information and it was good. I think we made some good inroads with agriculture and other people. We support Division.

Randy Quayle – Utah Archery Association – I'd like to thank all the board members being here tonight and listening to us. I wanted to say that we support division's mountain goat plan.

RAC Discussion

Ben – Good to see representation from the committee tonight. Support Division plan.

George – On unit plan the USFS recommends the local unit biologist be involved in that rather than one statewide rep. Our interest is to set numbers on those mountain ranges. Also, looking at monitoring our sensitive plan population on some of those mountains as well. There's not a lot of information that is known in some of these new areas where we're going to see goats. The other thing is just a caution on goats going into wilderness areas. Not so much that it's a wilderness issue it's just that when you do that, what tools are available to the DWR to go in and manage

those goats? With restrictions on helicopter use, doing the NEPA to use that tool in wilderness, just a caution on that because I know we've hit some bumps in the past. I just wanted to pass that on.

VOTING

Motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong to accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, AJ, Mike, Alan, Brock George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

6) Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan (Action) Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Questions from the RAC

Josh – I'm glad you mentioned the blip in 2008 with the nonresident's ability to put in for more than one OIAL. What's the rationale for allowing nonresidents to put in for multiple permit applications when residents aren't able? If we're trying to think of this from a point creep perspective, I like to see the increased quotas for opportunity but I'm just curious what that rationale was.

Lindy Varney, Licensing Coordinator – The main reason why is that nonresident's odds are so low. We only offer 1 or 2 permits overall for the species. They decided to let them apply for all of them to give them a little bit of a better chance of getting a permit.

Josh – Do you have the information aside of what the resident increase of what supply and demand it?

Jace – It's a similar trend. Lindy can get the numbers for us. You see we kind of had a drop off here. A lot on nonresidents were losing interest and when we opened it up so that they could apply for multiple species what that does, it doesn't necessarily help them with any one species because all of those nonresidents that were applying for one are now applying for all of them. What it does is hurt their chances actually within each species but the idea being collectively hoping to make up for that.

Lindy – For this year we had around 6692 residents apply for the hunt and 2500 just applied for a point. There were 10267 nonresidents applied for a hunt and 5900 applied for a point.

Josh – You talked about lethal removal by operators have other western states tried this?

Jace – Other states are also looking into it but as of right now that I am aware of nobody has a policy in place. Some states do have means whereby they can authorize other people besides the wildlife personnel to remove those animals but it's so strict and they're so cautious about it that it's never happened. They always take the extra effort to get a wildlife person there as soon as possible. There are other states that are interested in it that are working similarly and using the same kind of idea to figure something out. Nobody has anything in policy right now that I am aware of.

Josh – The plan that's proposed here, if this plan advances that would have to be revisited?

Jace – Yes. There would be a whole other process to developing that plan and guidelines and rules. Then it would have to come here again to you guys once it was done. Just because we pass it here doesn't mean we'll never see it again.

George – A couple of units in the plan— just a concern about separation between domestic sheep and wild. What guidelines are you using to evaluate separation?

Jace – It's hard to say, what are the risks, how far will these bighorns move? It depends on each area, depends on the habitat, population objective, age of animals, sex ratios... So, it's different for each area. Just because you see them on this list here there are definitely still issues that we have in some of these places. We want to work hard to address those issues. Overall guidelines, it's hard to give distances because it depends on so many different aspects of how we manage the population. We're looking at the distance we have, when we expect the suitable habitat to be public allotments. We're also looking into private allotments that have large herds or even just the small noncommercial herds. We try to take that into account. We try to take into account at what density do we expect to see forays or animals leaving because the higher densities we get the more incentive there is for animals to start leaving the desired habitat. That goes into it. The age structure- one of the things we do in this plan is in some places by having younger rams it provides less reason for them to need a herd. Often times when we get bighorns that are wandering outside the habitat where we would like them to be is because they are younger rams who don't have good opportunities to breed in the system. Perhaps, there are a lot of older rams that are doing all of the breeding so we'll see those younger rams start to leave. By reducing that, that's another thing that can help us. There are a lot of things that we try to take into account. You're right, it's not an easy process.

George – On the Nebo unit we don't even have sheep there. It's all cattle allotments and for whatever reason, I know when Covy was in the central region we dealt with some. I guess the ones that just trail through or were adjacent to the forest there were still issues with domestic sheep getting in there.

Jace – Even this year I think Rusty had animals up there again that he had to deal with. It's hard to say. You can imagine even something as simple as someone that has a 4H animal that they lose, it comes back to you can't eliminate all the risk but we want to make sure we have as many tools and take as many efforts and measures to make sure we can reduce it.

Mike – In the recreational goal— you talk about using primitive weapons as a means. Would you also adjust the unit objective because it seems like one argument for using primitive weapons is they're not as selective in their harvest which would then cause you to not meet your age objective. Is there anything built into the plan to deal with that?

Jace – As of right now we don't have an age objective for bighorn.

Mike – On the ewe hunts that are proposed, I know it would be controversial if you put them into play but right now, we have bighorn ewe points and bighorn sheep ram points and we talked about point creep through these discussions on mountain goats and bighorns. I would encourage the division to make them just bighorn points like we do with mountain goat and bison which would then allow a person with less points to have opportunity to hunt bighorn sheep when they see that they may not be able to obtain a ram tag. That's just a comment.

Questions from the Public

Michael Hanson – Do you have a map of where you want to introduce them on the Confusions House and Fish Springs that you could show here?

Jace – So what I do have is this general map. I don't have specific spot of where we do it. We talked about places where we don't have the issues resolved. This is a good example. We still have issues that would need to be resolved. There are still people that are grazing domestics out there. This is one that is not necessarily close, it's a ten year plan but there have been some

changes and conversions out there, that there might be the potential at one point. There is habitat. Here's an example. We've got the West Desert, and the ones you were talking about. What I can say is that we would have to identify the most suitable habitat so we're looking for the rocky habitat, real rough terrain and we have to take into consideration where our next biggest risk is coming from. There's going to be domestic grazing out on the public allotments. We'd have to work with the people that are in the area. There's a lot that would have to go into that.

Michael Hanson – Right, because there's a lot of sheep right in that area.

Troy Justenson – How many years, Lindy, would it take me to draw a sheep permit if I started putting in today?

Lindy Varney, Licensing Coordinator – The beauty of our draw is it is a randomization draw. Even with zero points you can still draw out. There's still that chance. So, to pull a number, you can't because it's random. But, if you were to apply today for let's say the rocky mountain as a resident, you have .5 almost .6 percent of drawing out.

John Bair – Some of these units on these lists for potential transplants are basically on the list because of good habitat. We all kind of agreed. I think I can kind of feel the vibes that Mr. Hanson brought up that they are worried that we're going to run out there and dump sheep on them. A lot of these units are on the list just because they have suitable habitat. Some of those units might be 30 years away if ever because of domestic sheep. Also, I think it's important to say that we did put in there that nobody on the committee was in any way in favor of any kind of forcing producers to move their allotment.

Comments from the Public

Troy Justenson/SFW – I had the opportunity to sit on this committee. Jace kind of eluded to it a little bit and it's very interesting. This committee started just after we completed the RAC's last year concerning the Mineral Mountains desert sheep reintroduction. In 30 years of doing this I've never seen tensions so high between the livestock community and sportsmen and the division. It was not fun. We walked into that room and we had the division, sportsmen and agriculture and it was not pleasant. As time went on we learned that there's got to be give and take. We came up with a plan that we felt benefited both. One of the most important parts of this plan that we as sportsmen stood by is the opportunity or the avenue to go down to allow livestock operators to remove bighorns that were in domestic sheep. The sportsmen might be thinking, "wait a minute why are we doing this? They're just going to go out and abuse it." Quite honestly if we have a bighorn in domestics we don't want them back. It provides us a valuable tool for the sense that the division can't always be there and by that time the animal has moved on. At some point, sportsmen and the livestock industry have to come up with some sort of mutual trust. We met that there. By the end of this committee, we became good friends. Part of that was because Jace made us sit by each other and the next time we came in they had name cards at our seats. It was a pleasure to sit on there. I think this was a turning point, we were either going to have a huge sagebrush rebellion or we were going to find ways to work together. I am very supportive of the plan. I am appreciative to the division, to Blair, the waterfowl guy for mediating it. I am pleased with this plan and I think it provides the opportunity for more people get out and enjoy these animals. Thank You.

Michael Hansen – I agree with what he said on getting along with DWR. We've worked with DNR a lot on different things and I know Covy well. I am just concerned about introducing them out on the West Desert because that area is the heart of where the majority of sheep in Utah go in my opinion. It's got excellent bighorn habitat. I have no doubt but it's really good for domestic sheep and they've been there for generations. That's my concern.

Garrick Hall/Utah Farm Bureau – First I'd like to Comment on Justin's presentation (I think he meant Jace) I think the division has done a great job on improving the relationship with agriculture over the last few years. I think that that relationship is a lot stronger than it has been in a long time. This plan is a great example of that. It brought some agricultural producers and representatives together and I think they came up with a good plan. As has been commented on tonight, we have some concerns with the potential introduction out of the West Desert. We realize that's a long way off if ever. We've gone a long way towards protecting domestic sheep and hold them harmless which we are excited about. We feel very positive about that. One of the key aspects of this whole process is the MOU that was mentioned. We can put together the best plan in the world but if our federal land managers don't agree to it then we don't really have much. I think that MOU goes a long way to try and get those agencies to partner with us. I would encourage the division to continue to pursue that as we go forward. The Utah Farm Bureau wants to go on record as supporting this plan and we encourage passage of it as is.

Wade Eliason/Utah Woolgrowers – Thank you RAC and thanks for the time that you put into this. As we talk about this plan as I've talked to those who served on it, they mentioned the great experience it has turned out to be. I believe it took them over two weeks of their time to come up with the management plan. I think that's a great accomplishment we've had here. In the livestock community we cautiously support this. The reason I use cautiously is because this group of people and this group sitting behind us know what we've been through. They know what the Mineral Mountain experience turned out to be. As we heard, it was not a great experience for any of us. As those people rotate through, we have a change of people that's where our cautiousness comes when supporting this. Our other concern is those proposed sites on the West Desert. As we go back to Mineral Mountain issue, it was on the proposed site for up to 5 years. It was a proposed site that maybe some day there may be sheep on there. All of the sudden we're getting sheep there now. As we move forward on these proposed sites, I think we've learned one lesson. We need to communicate as we look at these proposed sites and I would ask as we look especially on the West Desert that we take into consideration the impact on those families that have been in the sheep business for generations. Also, the economic impact. If we can come together and figure out how to work together, let's do it but let's be considerate to everyone. Thanks for everything.

Greg Bird/Utah Wild Sheep – It was a lot of work sitting on that committee. It was a learning experience for all of us. After going through the Mineral Mountains and seeing the turnover within a few months. Jace did a great job with that committee and the division for getting a great group of people in the room that could work through some issues. From the Utah Wild Sheep standpoint, we want the grazers to understand that even if sheep go on that mountain on the West Desert domestics are not coming off. That has always been our stance. We don't want anyone leaving. There's not going to be any forest conversions or sell outs. If they want to convert or sell, we're a willing partner to help facilitate that. We're not interested in you guys leaving the range at all. Regardless of someday, even if it's 20 years down the road and bighorns end up in that country, your livestock will still be there. We fully support this whole plan. There was a lot of painstaking effort and detail that went into this to help ensure that your families will always be there. Thank You.

Randy Quail/Utah Archery Association – Sounds like there has been a lot of talk on this issue. We agree with the Division's plan as presented.

John Bair/MDF – I think this is the most unique wildlife committee I have ever sat on. We went over every word of this plan with attorneys. The agriculture community had attorneys representing them. We had the division’s attorneys. We went over every word to make sure that it would stand up in court if anti hunters challenged it, if a woolgrower felt like they were being pressured, etc. There was a ton of work that went into this. I’ve sat on many committees and have never sat with attorneys and went over every word in the plan to make sure it was for protections for both sides. To me that shows how determined the division is to get it right. I felt like both sides had to give a little bit but both sides stood pretty strong on issues they didn’t feel they could wiggle on. We were able to work it out. I think it’s a great plan. I’m excited to see how it plays out with increase opportunity for sportsmen, increased wildlife viewing opportunities for those that may never hunt. I think this is a very good example of how to do it right. I support the plan and appreciate DWR going through the process.

RAC Discussion

George – I think the MOU is going to be real critical. Everyone in the room here could support the plan but it is usually external influences that’ll come in and file a lawsuit against the Forest Service or BLM that puts us in a tough situation. I want to caution folks on that. There’s probably going to be external influences down the road that could dictate which way this thing goes. That MOU to be is really critical to me. I don’t know if there’s a timeline on that to get it done but probably the sooner the better.

A J – I was going to talk on the same thing. I appreciate people coming tonight to talk about their concerns and their livelihood. It sounds like things panned out pretty good.

Ben – Just to reiterate what John said about our attorney attending every meeting. I’ve sat on a number of committees over the last several years. This is the first committee that I’ve ever sat on where we had the DNR attorney as a sitting member on the committee or even attend the meetings. I believe he attended every meeting. I believe he wrote the majority of the plan to make sure the legal ease of the plan was correct and with the intent and mindset that it would hold up in a court of law. It is the first plan I’ve been involved in where that was the case. There were certain phrases that we spent a lot of time on to make sure they were worded correctly and that they would hold up in court. It was good to be involved. I think that there were concessions made on both sides. We went into this plan and spent as much time if not more discussing protection for livestock operators as we did protection for bighorn sheep themselves. That was a very big theme of every meeting we held. I feel very comfortable with this plan. I think it’s well thought out and we’ve addressed every concern that we could think of.

Kristofer – There’s not much I can add but I applaud the committee members. This is an excellent example of what these committees are supposed to be about and how they’re supposed to work. To the woolgrowers, you’ve been heard and I just want to thank you for coming here tonight.

VOTING

Motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by AJ Mower to accept the Division’s recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, AJ, Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed/unanimously

- 7) **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments (Action)**

Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Mike – So, on your extended units, where there are agricultural areas you used the words mitigation and depredation and it helps with that, what is the purpose of the extended unit in Utah County and from Alpine to Spanish Fork?

Riley Peck, CRO Wildlife Manager – I guess the reasoning behind all of these maybe threefold a lot of them we're dealing with urban wildlife in the region and we have the wildlife coming down at different times and where we can hunt along those borders, we've been pretty effective at keeping deer out of towns. I think a good example of that is along the Wasatch Front where we have these areas and we don't have these urban deer plans in place because we've had an extended archery unit for some time. When we get into Utah county and around Herriman we're seeing some of that. Depredation and mitigation definitely play a role in that. When we are constantly having concerns and the landowners want additional opportunity and different things, we want to be able to utilize those animals in a way that's not just either the division going in and doing a removal or doe tags but to give sportsman the opportunity. I would say that opportunity is probably one of the more important ones but also to be considered. In the central region, we're not expanding in space and our deer habitat seems to be shrinking continually. We need to get creative on where we look at how we can hunt and where we hunt. I think those are three major things that apply to most of the areas that we recommended.

Covy Jones asked to add to Riley's answer. Right now in Utah County we have several cities that have approached the division for a COR to kill deer and they are killing deer. We don't have that same thing in Salt Lake County at all. One of the reasons we attribute that to isn't just the harvest from extended archery but it's the pressure. When you look at the extended archery unit you can go up there without seeing cars parked, hunters hiking and pushing those animals back up every day. When it comes down to it, we're left between a rock and a hard place where we've lost tolerance in some of these communities and we're left with the option to either offer this to the public where they can go have the opportunity or we let the cities kill them. At the end of the day, it's ok with me either way but I'd rather let the public harvest them.

Mike – I totally understand that. Do any of these cities currently offer hunting within their cities to the general public?

Covy – Yes, there are some. I'm not familiar with the weapons ordinances on all these cities but what I can say is that it's not hunting in the city in Salt Lake that helps this, it's pushing the animals back up on the forest. They're not hunting in Holliday or Draper or any of that but what they are doing is chasing deer up a little higher every day. They just don't come down. We just don't have the problems. Riley can attest to this, call volume wise, where are the majority of your calls from?

Riley – Most of them are in Utah County and additionally the same rules would apply here. You're not allowed to shoot within 600 feet of a structure and that eliminates a lot of cities from even being able to participate in someone's backyard. That's not what this is for. Some of the boundaries are written as such because it makes it easy when we use major highways or roadways for a boundary then it's clear and identified. The intent is not someone going and shooting in the backyard because there are rules already in place that limit that completely. Covy is right the intent is to utilize the space that is available and is lawful and help push the animals up on top of the mountain.

Mike – What's the buck/doe ratio on the Wasatch?

Dale Liechty, CRO Wildlife Biologist. 16, that's a three-year average.

Brock – Covy, I remember the last RAC meeting when they presented this idea of the Air guns. A question was brought up, why don't we wait until they get that approval because I don't think there's going to be any going back once you approve air guns. You're not going to come in two years and say, we're not going to do it anymore because everyone's going to start making air guns.

Covy – We actually discussed that. We're not the only state, Arizona has approved these and several other states have approved them. The condition that we put on it is most states have approved the rifle so it's a gun that shoots a Numatic projectile and they can shoot a bullet. The argument that the group that presented to us was, our arrows pay PR tax and we want to contribute but we don't feel like we should be penalized for congress being slow in what we're asking. We said, no, in good faith legalizing the portion of that weapon that does pay PR tax seems like a fair compromise. I understand the concern.

Ken – Riley, since you are over the central just a quick thing... On the sheep question that they want to protect the livelihood of the people. In southern Utah County we have a real problem with deer getting into the orchards and the orchard people are shooting the deer. I know we can't move boundaries around for different things but can you guys sit down and look at that and come up with a plan to control the deer? Maybe an extended archery hunt on these deer that are getting into the orchards and causing problems to the livelihood of the orchard growers?

Riley – I think it's something we can evaluate and we always are. That's one of those depredation situations that we deal with a lot. I think we're committed to continually looking at the tools that we have to help that. Whether it be a depredation hunt or giving them the tags that are necessary so they can spread those to sportsman or reevaluating our extended archery boundaries and potentially using that tool moving forward. We're committed to working to do what it takes to make sure we're working on it.

Would any of those orchards fall into this new Utah Lake extended boundary?

Covy – They don't and it was by strategy. We brought that up. I-15, although not natural provides a pretty significant barrier and doesn't allow the migration from East to the West. Part of the extended archery boundaries that you see, the extension from Alpine down to Hobble Creek we set the season dates to end before the rifle hunt begins. Part of that is we want to keep the integrity of the hunt that is there and not allow for the migratory deer as they are coming down lower on the winter range to be harvested on this extended archery unit. By adding that area that you were talking about to the Utah Lake extended archery boundary proposed, the dates would be off so that is not an area we want to include or combine at the moment.

Ben - Does I-15 fall into this? Riley Peck answered.

Ken – I think that does include quite a few orchards there west of I-15 and there is quite a few deer down in there.

Riley – It does include quite a few specifically if we are talking about the ones on the east side it does not. We're committed, Ken to reevaluating that and to see how that works out.

Mike – What is an improved airstrip?

Covy – There’s a list of them out there somewhere. You definitely recognize them when you’re flying. There’s one in Desolation Canyon for example that is an improved airstrip. They are defined in a list.

Questions from the Public

Ridley Griggs – I have a question on those proposed extended archery hunts in Utah County. Those are on the Wasatch Mountains West general deer unit. What is their anticipated effect on how many general season deer permits can be offered?

Riley – We don’t anticipate a change in the number of permits from the way that we manage that right now. We don’t see that that is going to cause much of a decrease. We’ve added a lot of area that is currently not being hunted with a high power rifle or is not getting utilized with muzzleloader. Our anticipation within the region is the permits are going to stay the same and it’s going to be utilized as maybe an additional opportunity.

Ridley Griggs – On the proposed archery Mountain Goat hunt, what was the success rate on our high Uintas archery hunt this year?

Covy to get numbers from Lindy Varney.

Covy – It’s higher than it was last year. It’s higher than 0%. We can get that for you.

Ridley Griggs – The reason I ask is, from a broader perspective why the division thinks that another hunt is warranted. Why is one not enough? Also, more broadly, what is the divisions goal when offering archery OIAL hunts? Do they shoot for a certain percentage or how do we decide when enough is enough?

Covy – We actually just asked the public a survey about that and I’ll go into more detail at the board meeting but we asked OIAL hunters how they felt about archery only hunts and what our goal is. Our goal would be to offer an opportunity where rifle success rates would be too high. With a lower success weapon type, if you’re willing to take a chance more hunters could hunt that species. So, where we have limited populations or we can’t expand those populations or we’re reaching our max there the only other way to offer opportunity is to have a hunt with lower success. If you’re willing to take a chance, we’re willing to provide the opportunity. When we put this out for the public review, they were very supportive. So, the general public OIAL hunters would like to see more of these especially if it increases their chances at drawing a permit. When you look at draw odds, it’s a hard pill to swallow when you realize you might never hunt one. I guess people would rather take a chance on a bow then never hunt one at all.

Ridley Griggs – I was wondering if it’s quantitatively determined or if it’s just... For mountain goat I think 2-3% of your resident hunters applied for the archery permits last year. Is it not fair to give them 50% as an extreme example?

Covy – It’s a different unit. It takes a different type of hunter to hunt that unit so you can’t say 2% of people apply for that and therefore it’s only 2% are interested. You have to poll the hunters and see how many are really interested and how many are supportive and that’s what we did.

Ben – Another thing to take into consideration when you’re looking at those numbers is currently there’s only one archery on the mountain goat so that’s a hard comparison to make because you’ve got, I don’t know how many mountain goat units we have for any weapon but there’s only one that’s available for archery. That’s a big difference than all of them being available for the rest of the hunts.

Covy – He does bring up a good point. If we go away from mountain goats and look at bison, the bison archery only permits were increased this year from last year. The applicants actually decreased from the first year to the next. So, we gave the opportunity to hunt to less applicants and they had a similar success rate over historical measures. Last year they had a 70% success rate on bison and historically it’s been in the 80% range for any weapon.

Rusty Robinson, CRO Wildlife Biologist – I just wanted to clarify a little bit on the Nebo specifically for this hunt. The thought process behind it was that we’ve got a population that is growing very quickly and so we’re increasing permits very quickly. There’re really three hotspots where the goat hang out on the Nebo and we’re getting to the point where we may be having too

much hunter crowding. The thought process was to split up the hunt so you're splitting up some of the pressure and crowding. You can provide more opportunity and hopefully get some hunters through the point pool. I don't know what success rates are going to be. We'll have to just kind of see how it goes. All these units especially with mountain goats, we'll see how it goes and adjust accordingly.

Tom Mower – Do you have the Springville Extended archery map? First, I think it's the right thing to do I think it is a step in the right direction. I've seen bigger deer and better deer. This won't happen at this point. I see it goes up Pole Haven and goes across the Camelback, goes to Squaw Peak. My question would be, is this the first step into having an extended archery like we have in Salt Lake where deer are leaving town more? The one thing we do know about it, is we get an older age class deer. Do you think in the next few years you might see where we don't rifle and muzzleloader and perhaps even go over the mountain maybe to the road up the left hand fork of Hobble Creek? Is that a possibility?

Riley – Currently that's not the region's objective nor our desires. We would love to keep the hunt the way it is and the integrity of such in place. We have an agreement with Salt Lake county where we're not going to hunt that area for deer or elk with a high powered rifle. We don't have such an agreement into Utah county. So, where that is still a very popular rifle hunt and muzzleloader hunt we don't anticipate that that will follow the steps that Salt Lake county does. Nor do we want it.

Tom Mower – Going back to one buck tag for every 640 acres of rangeland, what would be the possibility for a big bull elk tag of the Wasatch unit? Where I live, we have about 2000 acres and I don't mind fixing fence. I love elk for three weeks out of the spring. Right now, I've got about 125 beef cows on it and about 200 head of elk. I love having them and I have a lot of employees and friends that come up and harvest cow elk. Is there a possibility to have that for elk?

Covy – I understand what you're getting at and that is that these animals are great and we love them but they can be destructive at times and it's nice to have a little incentive. Remember, we don't do that on limited entry deer units. We only do it on general season deer units. The Wasatch is a limited entry unit so it would either have to be a CWMU or a Landowner Association. The division is looking hard at Landowner Associations and how we make them more equitable and more fair. That would probably be the program that would fit this situation better. We're not there yet. There is a lot to jump through here to make sure that as we manage it as a public resource that it works well for everybody. It's been tough.

Lindy Varney – 75% were successful on that unit. Three out of four harvested a goat on the archery hunt.

Scott Henry – I am predominately an archery hunter so I'm very much in favor of doing the archery only especially for OIAL. I think the reason being is that, not that it's preventing anybody else from picking up a bow and learning how to hunt with a bow. It's not just for archers. It's open to the public, it's not narrowing that segment down. Any one of us can pick up a bow if we want to hunt that and have a better opportunity. I think this is an awesome thing you're doing as a division. I support it.

Troy Justenson – Can you tell me how many people put in for the OIAL permit this year?

Lindy – Almost 500,000. It increased 7% from last year.

Mike

– One thing to note too is that he did have a valid point on the bison on the archery. Remember when that first came around, we asked for later dates and we moved them early to help us with a problem there to help kill the bison. Once we went in there with a rifle the shooting would start and the bison would go the park and we couldn't get them killed. The whole concept of that archery hunt was moved earlier to help us with that problem. The original proposal was to have it late so the success rate would be dramatically lower.

Covy – Troy is right. What is the current date in this proposal? Is it an earlier date? Mike, that's a fair point. We actually want that early and the reason why is the first time a gun goes off, those bison move. So, getting the harvest we need to manage the population appropriately is tough. The

one thing the archery hunt has done is— every time you propose one of these, it's not that there's one goal to accomplish, it's several. Sometimes it would be providing additional opportunity. For the bison, it was to actually hunt the animal, get the harvest we need and not push them off the high ground down onto the desert. It works.

Ben – I can attest to that. I was on the Henry Mountains during the archery bison hunt this year and there were several bison taken with a bow and the herd never moved. It didn't push them like it would have killing with a rifle.

Comments from the Public

Randy Quayle /Utah Archery Association – We agree with Division's management plan on the OIAL hunts.

Troy Justenson/SFW – As we have seen, there is a huge demand for what Utah is producing. These proposals are based on exactly that. Increasing opportunity while maintain quality and actually growing quality. I think we travel down a slippery slope when we start segregating ourselves and saying, "I'm an archer, I'm rifle hunter, I'm a muzzleloader hunter." At the end of the day, we're all hunters and we need to look at it that way. The other thing we need to look at too, is that as hunters we are becoming very effective at killing stuff. We have 1500 yard rifles, we have bows that shoot 150 yards, we have muzzleloaders now that are killing at 700 yard, etc. At some point we as hunters need to show some constraint or we aren't going to have anything to shoot. The SFW agrees with the Division's recommendation with a proposal (See his HANDOUT). The first one I want to go to is the Barney Top. If you are familiar with southern Utah, the Barney Top used to be a standalone elk unit. A few years ago, they combined it with the Boulder Mountain. What we'd like to do is create a primitive weapon unit. There would be no rifle hunting on this. We'd bring back the old Barney Top unit and include the Kanan, we'd also include the Kaparawits which would run down to Lake Powell. This would now become an archery only unit and a primitive muzzleloader unit. Meaning, no scopes and have to be ignited by a percussion cap or 209 primer.

Next, we'd like to propose a late archery elk hunt on all limited entry elk units which would occur over the Thanksgiving weekend. We believe that your success rate is going to be under 10%. We want these permits to be in addition to the 25% that is already allocated for archery for the simple fact that we believe the harvest is going to be so low and is actually going to help us pull some of those bulls out of the herd to bring us into objective in some areas. Also, the age class of those bulls that are taken would not be counted towards the age objective of that particular unit. Again, it would be an additional hunt.

One the back page it talks about also a primitive muzzleloader hunt for deer. We would like to do the same. We'd create a Kaparowits unit which would be basically the Kaparowits sheep unit. That's all desert country that runs down from basically Tropic to Lake Powell. It would be a rut hunt and go from November 9-16. Once again, it would be muzzleloader only, no scope, has to be percussion cap or 209 primer. We'd like that same hunt on the South San Juan. It would be the South San Juan sheep unit. It would take in Manclose(sp?) Mesa. These are areas that are walk in access and very limited access. It would be a limited entry area. We'd also like to see that in Green River. The boundaries would be the Sego unit up to the boundary of the res., come down the Green River, up to Price to Highway 6 then down to I-70. Basically, what you are doing is allowing access to deer that are coming off of the tribe and are also coming off of the Bookcliffs and no man's country there. We're not looking for a lot of permits but are giving the people the opportunity to hunt. Many of you may remember the late November muzzleloader hunt

for deer. It was one of the neatest hunts so this would just be an additional opportunity. Greg will present a little later; we're bringing it back a third time for some archery only bighorn sheep permits. Last year you passed this unanimously. The board asked us to jump through a few more hoops and we did that. I'll leave that to have Greg bring that forward.

One thing we'd like to ask this RAC to vote on is we'd like to do away with the late rifle hunt on the Dutton. The Dutton is a wintering ground for a lot of bulls coming off of different units. Sitting on the elk committee, we designed the unit management plans to allow us to manage the units individually. Those bulls are really susceptible and we feel like by eliminating that, it would save a lot of top end bulls from these different units. We'd like to see the late rifle done away with on the Dutton.

Concerning the Wasatch, we've talked about it for years. We'd like to see that unit split. Highway 40 would be the dividing line. You would have a east and a west and be able to distribute those permits and be able to manage those elk on the west unit. Once again, we'd ask that there be no late rifle hunt because of the vulnerability of those bulls.

Overall, it's providing the opportunity for hunters. The fact of the matter is, the limited entry elk and deer permits are once in a lifetime. We've got to do something to increase the opportunity to give people a better chance to get out there. We'd ask the RAC to recommend to the wildlife board to direct the division to come back with a new hunt calendar. Also, to move the elk dates out of the rut and move it further down the line so that we take the pressure off our top ends. It makes no sense that we're issuing the most permits with the most effective weapon type when the animals are more vulnerable. Right now, we have the best elk in the United States. If we make a few tweaks to our system, I guarantee that we can run more people through and still maintain or increase our quality. It really hinges upon shifting the majority of those permits out of that. In 2011 the division went through and created a new hunt calendar. I'd ask that this RAC recommend to the board that the division go back and restructure our hunt dates and take the early rifle hunt out of the run. Still offer a few but have the majority of the tags be later.

Tom Mower – I'd like to reiterate; my son and I have been talking for a few years about exactly what Troy hit on with the primitive weapons. It gives more opportunity and more success. I totally concur with what he said. If you'll look hard at that we would have the quality and more opportunity for more people. There are numerous people out there that I think would support this. I strongly urge you to look seriously at that.

John Bair/MDF – I want to support what my buddy Troy said. I have a long range rifle in my gun safe and a very high tech bow and a high end muzzleloader so I challenge anyone to define what type of hunter I am. I want to bring up something that has not been mentioned here tonight but came out of some minutes at a wildlife board meeting that disturbed me. I'd like to talk about the spike elk hunt. I believe that 30% of the yearling bulls are not spike they are two points and move on to the end of the herd. As long as we hunt big bull in the rut with the most effective weapons there are things that we can do to grow bigger bulls and spread the opportunity other than taking away the spike elk hunt or changing it in any way. It's our last over the counter family hunt that I know I can go get tags for my kids and we can all go hunting with grandpa. My dad is 74 and he scouts all summer for the spike elk hunt. It's his favorite thing of the year. He packs up his mules and goes into the Manti and that's our family hunt. If we were to do way with the spike elk hunt it compounds every elk problem we have. Depredation: We don't want to tip over our elk herd with too many bulls. For every bull that lives, a cow has to die. Don't

sacrifice thousands of permits for a few dozen that would go into the big bull hunt. I'm going to ask the RAC to vote in support the spike elk hunt.

Cody Medler – My biggest deal is this is my 1st RAC meeting and I'm really surprised at the lack of people. I have my son here who lives and dies with hunting. I hope that we can find innovative ways to allow opportunity for hunters to get out and experience it. I think it's insane that we have hunts with thousands of people on where we can get people spread out. I really appreciate the opportunities that have come up with bison and other things like that. I have 21 points for those and I'm excited to have a 3rd hunt for the rifle. I think that could be a great opportunity for a lot of people. Archers: awesome, if you're willing to go do it I think it's incredible. I'm kind of scared to do it even though I do archery hunt. I implore the RAC that you keep looking for ways to allow us to hunt as often as we can. To me, it's scary that my kids may have to wait 4-5 years to hunt a deer in Utah. The feeling that I have as a dad is that it's going to be getting crazy. I appreciate all your efforts and hope to continue to work together in creating those opportunities. Thank You.

Greg Bird/Utah Wild Sheep – We agree with proposals of SFW's on the additional elk hunts and restructuring the season dates. We propose that we add Newfoundland Mountain archery only and a Zion archery only. These would be in addition to not taking away from the current tag numbers. These hunts have been run through the RAC's twice and have been approved. We were asked by the wildlife board to run it through the sheep committee which we did. Also, they asked to run a survey which was overwhelmingly supportive of doing this. We would ask the RAC tonight and vote on it. The point is it will address point creep, increase opportunity and add additional opportunities. These hunts are going to target animals that the rifle hunters aren't going to target. They are going to be opportunity type hunts. For archery seasons it's going to be a big addition to our sheep hunting in the state.

Randy Quayle/Utah Archery Association – It's good to listen to all these proposals, we concur with Troy on SFW and John Bair proposal and along with the Wild Sheep. It creates a lot of opportunities and it's really not taking away from other hunters.

RAC Discussion

Barney Top primitive elk – new archery only and primitive weapon hunts Season date Sept. 11-24

Mike – My father would be mad since there would be no flintlock's allowed.

Ben – Flintlock?

Kristofer – Let me be sure archery only?

Troy – primitive hunt with 2 season dates archery and muzzleloader

Brock – So, in spirit I'm in favor of these but are there rule problems with this? Such as changing which primitive weapons are allowed in the state?

Covy – We currently couldn't do that. We'd need to have a rule change and it's probably a bigger thing but something to start looking towards.

Brock – That's why in spirit I'm in favor but this is the first time I've seen all these new hunts and I would like some time to think over them and get some input on them rather than just voting to approve them tonight. I'm ok with the sheep hunts. We've thought about those before we voted for them but I'm a little nervous about these new hunts.

Josh – I'd like to echo that sentiment. Just procedurally in these meetings I've got 200 pages here that I take the time to read and prepare for and this happens almost every meeting where we get one or two things where it's "let's add this or that" but there's a lot

being sprung on us. I think you made some great points and I can get behind some of these. A few of them especially kind of make me really excited that you're proposing them. But other ones, you know, sweeping all limited entry elk units you say it's going to be a low success hunt but we don't have the data to support that. The archers I know and hunt with are actually pretty lethal at killing bucks and bulls. It's a big pill to swallow at once and I want to set a precedence moving forward for some of these last minute additions.

Kristofer – Yes there are points however that is the purpose of this is the public process. I think that you're point there might be an opportunity if you were aware ahead of time to research it a little bit. However, that is the point of this process to bring these things forward. I just want to make sure that's on record.

Brock – I agree with that but part of the public process is that the public knows what's going to happen and they have the opportunity to come here and comment on what's going to happen. Yes, I am in favor in spirit. I'm just a little nervous at how fast it's happening here.

Josh – And the amount of change all at once. It's not one proposal it's several.

Ben – This is a public process to pitch ideas to us. I understand that it's a lot and that there are some things we may want to take time on but let's recognize that this is the public's opportunity to pitch ideas to us.

Mike – I agree with that and I don't know that I would be comfortable voting to put these in place today but I'd be comfortable voting on something to direct the division to look into doing this. The last time I was on the Mule Deer committee I asked my father who is in his 70s, what he would do to grow more deer and he said to take scopes off of rifles. Maybe there should be some kind of primitive weapon committee that's put together that brings all sides together and try to look at things on how to expound it.

Kristofer – We talked about primitive weapons a few years ago. We made some changes. Scopes on muzzleloaders and that sort of thing. This argument was brought to the RACs and the board at that time. There were a lot of folks that felt that we should draw boundaries rather than allowing the technology to continue for the very reasons that Troy has talked about. We may very well, based on rule today not be able to recommend to the board that we do these hunts but we certainly can make a recommendation that we readdress primitive weapons and allowing for that within the rule to add hunts like this.

Ken – I've had a lot of comments made to me about primitive weapons. Doing away with scopes on muzzleloaders, doing away with compound bows, you know the fact is we're killing more deer or elk now or as many now as we did 40 years ago when there were 280,000 hunters on the deer hunt. Because of our weapons that we have now. Going to a primitive weapon doesn't hurt a thing. Being the fact that this is a process where ideas are brought in and the RACs to decide on them, we need to decide. I think it's a great idea and it needs to go before each RAC and then to the wildlife board. In my opinion it's probably the best thing we can do. It addresses point creep and several different things.

Kristofer – With that said to get us back on track. Moving forward the first issue on Barney Top, there's two hunts proposed. There's an archery only and a primitive weapon. With that, what would the RAC like to do? DO I have any motions at this point?

Ben – Covy, you mentioned that it would require a rule change. Is this a rule that the legislature would have to pass?

Covy – The division defines in rule what is and isn't allowed. There's code which the legislature defines and under that is rule. You think of that as like the difference between a code and a city ordinance. Rule is a state ordinance as to how we do this. Currently, we don't have primitive weapon definition in rule. When we modify or change a rule, we like to make sure we give the

opportunity to get that out to the public so they can see it. I see that as one of the issues here. This would require a rule change. The wildlife board could direct us to make that change but it doesn't give us the opportunity to get that out in a RAC packet before time.

Ben – I'll make a motion that might address a couple of these, Ask the wildlife board to direct the DWR to address a primitive weapon definition. We should apply that to both archery and muzzleloader to enable hunts like this in the future.

Mike – Ben, if I understand your, motion just to make sure I have it right. You would like to ask the wildlife board to direct the DWR to draft another definition of primitive weapons as it applies to archery and muzzleloader. Would be willing to add "rifle" into the motion?

Ben – I don't know that I would because I have a hard time saying that a rifle is primitive. Leave it as is. Apply it to muzzleloader and archery. Part of that is as Troy defined a primitive muzzleloader. Part of that was the ignition system which effects the effectiveness and range of that weapon whereas there is no way to limit that on a rifle.

Kristopher – Do I have a second on that?

Ken – I second it.

Kristopher – Ok, Ken seconds. Any more discussion before we vote?

Alan – So, we are going to direct them to drafting a new rule? Is that correct?

Ben – A broader definition of what a primitive weapon is.

Chris – What is being proposed here is that we limit the technology on a hunt so to speak. A muzzleloader only hunt for example, but no scope, no 209 primers, no caps. The intention of this motion is to create a hunt with this limit which we can't currently do under the current rule which would be similar to what I believe what Colorado's definition is of a muzzleloader.

The only thing this does is eliminate the scope on a muzzleloader.

Covy – Chris, can I make a comment on this? I think you can leave the motion pretty vague and just directing the division to look into a primitive definition in rule.

(Indistinct conversation)

Kristofer – We've got a motion on the board to look at the definition of a primitive weapon.

Let's vote on that first. You've got a valid point, Mike.

Just to review one more time... Ask the wildlife board to direct the DWR to draft another definition of primitive weapons for archery and muzzleloader. Everyone clear on that? All in favor? Motion fails

Karl – Let's carve out the Barney Top...

Karl – We are just hung up on the wording of the motion. Can one of you come up with the wording of the motion?

Brock – I like to look into it because it might be a nightmare for enforcement to have multiple definitions of primitive weapons in different units side by side where you can use a scope on one and not the other. I'd like to make sure that we don't tell them to do something that's going to be hard for the general person to pick up the rule book and decide where he can hunt with a scope and where he can't.

Kristofer – Complexity plays a part in it for sure. Mike, do you have a motion that you'd perhaps make?

Brock – Make a motion to look into the potential of changing the definition or creating a new definition and adding new primitive weapon hunts.

Kristofer – We'd like to ask the wildlife board to look at a second definition for primitive weapons so we can choose which one to apply to a particular hunt. Or create a new hunt.

Kristofer – Do we have a second?

Mike – I second motion.

Kristofer – Going back to the Barney Top does anyone want to make a motion on the archery only portion on that proposal?

Ben – So moved.

Kristofer – So, Ben makes a motion to add an archery only elk hunt on the Barney Top which would be a new hunt for September 11-24. Do I have a second?

Ken – I'll second

Kristofer – Ken seconds. Any discussion on that? All in favor? Motion passed.

Kristofer – The next one is the late archery LE elk hunts. So, for all limited entry elk hunts there is a proposed date of November 23- December 5 that would be archery only. Any discussion on that?

Josh – I think of all the proposals that were given to us tonight, this one is the most sweeping with the least amount of data and information and I don't know how we could support this at this time. I think there's something to consider also just because these dates are open you need to keep in mind these animals are being pressured from the end of July all through the hunts and late season hunts and as soon as the late season hunts end you have the shed hunters going after them. It's kind of like sports, these animals get about two days a year of rest so I think we need a lot more information before I'd be comfortable with this one.

Ben – I'd like to address a couple of things that he said. I believe we have the data. We have harvest success rates for archery hunts on all of these units and as Troy pointed out a November archery elk hunt is going to be way tougher than our current August- September season. I would expect success rates probably to be half of what they are if I'm speaking honestly. They definitely won't be higher than our current archery hunts. As far as the pressure on the animals go, elk are a prey animal. They have pressure on the 24/7 whether it's from us or from other predators. That's just part of their life. I don't really buy the argument that we pressure deer and elk for X number of months. Yes, it's true we have hunts throughout several months in the fall but from my experience the majority of your hunters hunt opening day/opening weekend and by Monday or Tuesday those animals are pretty much left alone. There are some heavy periods of pressure throughout those several months but it is not a constant pressure.

Josh – This is post rut right before the heaviest snow fall. This is when they need the most amount of security and safety and every bull that you kill with a limited entry, you are taking away from the general public and the general draw. I disagree with you wholeheartedly. This is when elk need to rest the most.

Kristofer – Josh, I will say one thing and I think Troy mentioned it. These would actually be limited entry tags.

Josh – I see that. If they are killed during a limited entry hunt, you can't shoot them as a general draw.

Kristofer – I just want to make sure we understand they would be removed to different pools but it's not being taken, you would just have the opportunity to draw a different type of hunt. As far as pressure at that time. We're already doing that on the Wasatch Front up above Salt Lake and Park City on the extended archery areas with no issues.

Ben – Well the issue in Salt Lake county and Utah county is the urban wildlife interface and some of these limited entry units, you said yourself the late season on the Dutton that you want to get rid of it's because those bull are wintering there. You can't just sweep across the entire state without having a lot more data that shows what these harvest objective numbers are going to look like.

Kristofer – Well, I think, if I can address that, the way I understand it and Troy correct me if I'm wrong, all we're doing is adding a late archery hunt like we added a late rifle hunt. All the objectives as far as what the management plan spells out would still be in play and the number of tags based off success rates and the way I understand it no number of tags are being proposed here. I think what Troy and SFW is asking us to approve is to recommend to the wildlife board

that we also have a late archery hunt that comes from the same pool of tags with the same management objectives just like we added a late rifle hunt a few years ago.

Brock – I'll make one comment on this and it's not about the hunt because it doesn't matter how you kill them as long as they get dead. As you go into winter, this is when we have the most problems with elk moving onto private land and there's a real effect on hunting pressure on moving them onto private land so I'm a little concerned that we're just going to exacerbate that problem by going into November with pressure on public lands and onto private land and having conflicts with landowners who we've been trying to develop good relationships with. I think one of the points that is important to point out is part of the reason to proposing this is to reduce point creep and get more people through the system out hunting. Is that fair to say?

Troy – That's part of it. Quite honestly, a lot of our units we need some bulls removed. John pointed out earlier that for every bull there's a cow you can't have. Once again, you bring up the Dutton, there's a big difference for me being able to sit on a ridge at 1500 yards and kill a bull out on a ridge vs. getting within 80 yards to kill him. I guarantee your success rate with a rifle on these late hunts is close to 80-90%. The whole idea is to relieve the pressure to where we don't have as big of an impact and still provide the opportunity. The end result is we're taking less animals. We're already currently hunting cow elk. Our late rifle now goes almost a week prior to that. It's just a way to try and introduce more opportunity and not affect the resource.

Kristofer – Do I have any motions?

Ken – I'll make a motion that we accept the proposal by SFW.

Kristofer – Do I have a second? Do you need clarification on the motion?
Let's be specific on that. Which proposal?

Kristofer – It's the all limited entry elk (indistinct conversation)

Seconded by Ben.

All in favor? Motion failed.

Brock – I'll make a follow up motion that we direct the board to look into the possibility of adding these late season archery hunts.

Kristofer – Do I have a second on the?

Alan – I'll second that.

Kristofer – Motion passes.

Kristofer – The next proposal is the Kaparowits muzzleloader limited entry deer.

I think this might fall under the first motion that we made. Is everyone good with that? Does that make sense Troy? So, we can't do anything with it until we change the definition of a primitive weapon. The same with Green River East muzzleloader deer.

Ok, no more late hunts on the Dutton elk.

Brock – I move to approve.

Mike – I second.

Kristofer – This recommendation is based on the management plan, right Covy?

Covy – The late hunts aren't mandatory.

Kristofer – All in favor? Motion passes

Kristofer – The next proposal, split the Wasatch limited entry elk unit into two units and no late hunt on the west portion of that unit. West of highway 40.

Ben – I have some questions. We manage this unit as three units from a population standpoint. Why do we hunt it as one unit for bulls?

Covy – When you look at our units, Ben, they're deer units. So, where talking about managing two different things. One is populations and the other is...

Ben – But for population, we've got the Wasatch West, the Current Creek and the Avintaquin.

Covy – For deer populations.

Ben – No, for elk.

Covy – So when we develop those units and did that, we did that based on deer. When we look at the way elk use the landscape, we still call them that because that's what historically we're in the habit of doing but elk population

Ben – But those three units have their own population objective.

Covy – The sub units have their own population objective. I guess that's correct, that's fair. I just trying to think of how elk use the landscape and I understand what you're saying. Yes, they have their own population objective however, a lot of the elk are in Strawberry and a lot of them head back down to winter range either on the east or west until winter.

Ben – So, we had one last week that moved from Strawberry to the far side of the Nine Mile/Anthro unit. 64 miles as a crow flies.

Covy – That's my point. We can't talk about bulls and directing pressure, that's way different than cows in managing populations.

Kristofer – Any other discussion on that? Do I have a motion?

Ben – I'm still trying to think through this. I've heard this idea several times and I'm not so sure it would be a bad idea to split the bull hunters up to target bulls in particular areas vs. the entire unit. I don't know. Covy?

Covy – Really what I would say and Riley you can add to this. You can hunt bulls any way you want. You can direct pressure anywhere you want. You have to come back and think to yourself, what would I want if I had that tag? I think for the most part, philosophically I'm a fan of bigger units. They allow hunters to hunt. Elk move. Sometimes you need that area to be able to be successful.

Riley – I think as we look at this and it has been brought up a lot. Elk use a very large portion of the landscape and I think if our collar data has shown us anything is that according to hunting pressure, they have the ability to move. The Wasatch unit as a whole is pretty difficult to manage towards the objective already. I think part of the reason that it hasn't moved forward with the regional recommendation already is sometimes those animals will move across an area and just give us the best opportunity to harvest those animals as we need to manage for the objective. We've left them lumped in. With bulls, you can manage them however you want but it seems with as large a landscape that they use we just kept them the same for quite a while.

Covy – Again, there're two perspectives, right? The one perspective is, the person with the tag in their had that drew and what would they want. The other perspective is, I want that tag too.

Brock – I'll make one more comment and that is the collar data suggests that highway 40 is not much of a barrier to movement unlike highway 6 which is a really strong barrier.

Kristofer – Any more discussion?

Ken – Covy, wouldn't the barrier, if you split that unit along highway 40 you would have to chose which side you wanted to hunt beforehand? I think the unit is too big as it is and I think it would be the best thing to happen. We split up for Wasatch East and Wasatch West on deer. I just think that the unit needs to be made smaller on the elk.

Ken – I make a motion that we split the Wasatch with highway 40 being the boundary line.

Kristofer – Part of that recommendation was no late rifle hunt in the West. Do you want to add that?

Ken – I'll add that in.

Kristofer – Do we have a second for that?

Ben – I second.

Brock – Covy, is the age going down on the late rifle hunt?

Covy – I think that's actually the real concern here. On some units the older age class bulls are killed during the rut. On the west portion of the Wasatch, the age is actually higher on the late hunt. It's the west portion of that unit lends itself to long range shots where you can identify bulls and pick out the biggest one and be able to harvest that if you have the equipment and technology to do it. Again, there are two perspectives here. The answer is no, Brock. It's a higher age on

average on the Wasatch in the late hunt which is a good indicator to rethink permits. Both perspectives, one is if you have the tag and the other is if you don't.

Brock – Troy, what's the reason for it not having a late hunt? Is it because we're harvesting those old bulls?

Kristofer – Anymore discussion on that? All in favor? Motion fails.

Kristofer – Ok, this one can be a really big topic. The proposal is a new hunt calendar, no rifle or reduced rifle hunts in the rut on limited entry units. Before we get going on this, maybe if

Covy – I may be able to shed some light on this. The board asked us to send out a survey and we'll be presenting the results on that at the board meeting.

Mike – That's what I was going to ask. I think that's a more appropriate time to address it because this deals with elk management plan issues. It's much larger than this RAC. Some unit have higher success rates, late than the early so why would we want to move it later and kill more bulls? It's pretty complex.

John – Mr. Chairman, Can I clarify something and save you a little time? I think the reason for the proposal was just to say maybe throwing it back to the division and say "we'd appreciate you looking at the hunt table again." There's really nothing we can do here tonight that's going to change the hunt tables.

Ben – I would add to what John said and point out that Troy mentioned something that was going through the RACs that was informational. Many of you might remember back in 2011, it was a hunt data restructure and as I recall it went through the RAC as informational multiple times over the course of a year plus and received very favorable feedback. I was of the opinion that it was going to actually happen and then it got derailed by the 30 deer unit effort. I think that's what Troy is looking for. It's to bring that back and have that discussion again. I would agree with him. I think it's a good idea.

Kristofer – I agree. So, I believe the motion, Brock, is to ask the division simply to look at hunt calendar. AJ seconds that. Passed unanimously.

Kristofer – The next item on the list is we were asked to support the spike elk hunt.

Mike – I was going to say the exact same thing John said. I was going to include the fact that wildlife board heard about hunter opportunity for a whole hour and then at the end of the meeting they start to say that. I couldn't agree more with John.

Ben – I agree with what Mike just said. I would add to that. John pointed out a lot of really good points to the spike elk hunt. Some of my favorite are, it's the last general season opportunity we have in the state. We sell 15,000 spike elk tags for rifle and muzzleloader hunters. We sell approximately 12,000 archery elk tags. I would guess that probably $\frac{3}{4}$ of those are hunting the spike units. To lose that opportunity would be a massive loss to the public. I would hate to see it go away. This is interesting, it's a very low success rate hunt yet it's extremely popular. People love it which means we can do exactly what we've been talking about here all night. Give more opportunity because of those dynamics. I watched the wildlife board meeting and heard the comments and it was very frustrating to hear that. I think we need to send a message to the wildlife board that we did not support any elimination of spike elk hunting on any unit.

Mike – I would actually include any general season elk hunting because it's the same principle. I would make the motion that the Central Region RAC support the general season elk hunting and do not support any reduction of spike elk tags.

Ben – I second.

Kristofer – Before we vote on that I wanted to add another ballot to the box. My 13 year old son is sitting in the back and we went on the spike hunt this year and we killed an elk together. He packed it out with me and it was a wonderful opportunity and I would never want to take that from folks.

Kristofer – All in favor? Passed unanimously

Kristofer – The next one is newfoundland mountain sheep archery only.

Mike – I think we should tackle these at the same time. I've heard that this opportunity is in addition to but if there are 10 rams that need to be killed, we can only kill 10 rams. These permits are never in addition to. They're always part of the actual quota so if we're going to kill one this way, we take away from killing one that way. That's where it comes in to the division of, I'm an archery hunter or a rifle hunter, I'm not a hunter. They're any weapon tags. I would be more inclined to have an archery season for an any weapon tag holder. If they don't kill on the archery, they might go kill on the rifle. I have a hard time every time I hear that these tags are in addition to the tags we currently have because you can only run so many cows in your pasture.

Ben – Mike, I understand what you're saying but to that I would add that when you use a lower success weapon, you can issue more tags to take the same number of animals. We're talking about sheep here so tag numbers are very limited. That might only be one extra tag on a given unit. I don't know. Considering how limited sheep tags are, one extra tag is a big deal. I hate when we get into the argument about this weapon vs. that weapon. To me, it's just opportunity. I choose to hunt with a bow, I choose to hunt with a muzzleloader, I choose to hunt with a rifle. I taught myself how to hunt with all three weapons. I can't say that learning one was any easier than the other. They were all intimidating at some point. Learning how to load a muzzleloader for someone that doesn't have any guidance on how to do that is very intimidating. Learning how to load ammunition in a rifle

Mike – I don't mean to cut you off, Ben but I guess I am. I totally understand what you're saying I just hate to always think that the way I do it is the way everybody else should do it. That's my stance.

Kristofer – Do I have a motion on this?

Ben – I'll make the motion to support this recommendation.

Ken – I'll second it.

Mike – Any additional discussion on this motion? All in favor? Passed

Mike – Any further discussion on the rest of the recommendations?

Brock – I have one comment and that is on those air guns. In my opinion that federal aid and wildlife restoration act on 1937 is one of the most important legislative pieces that has ever been passed and has provided more dollars to conservation of wildlife than anything. Allowing a weapon manufacturer out of that agreement is not a good decision. I think that they need to get in the PR fund before we approve it.

Mike – So if I understand it correctly, the bolt or ammunition are currently in the PR fund.

Covy – Brock makes a fair point. Any archery tackle is and the bolt are considered archery tackle. The gun itself is not currently paying PR.

Ben – How much money a year do those PR funds come to the state of Utah?

Covy – A lot. Justin do you know the answer to that?

Justin – I think last year we had about 16 million. I could be wrong on that but that's the number that comes to mind.

Covy – We match license dollars with that and that's what allows us to do a lot of what we do.

Ben – Do you have any indication as to what kind of numbers we see of people actually using that type of weapon?

Covy – I don't. I think it's probably a novelty weapon. It's definitely close range, less effective and only used during any weapon hunts. I doubt that a lot of people would choose to use a less effective weapon. I assume that people want to be successful.

Kristofer – Is there a motion in there, Brock?

Brock – No.

Kristofer – Any other discussion or motions?

Brock – Are you looking to for a motion to accept the balance of the recommendations?

Mike – I have a couple of things. I grew up in Alpine and I can't believe how many people contacted me to discuss the extended unit. I think it's an error to say that those areas do not get rifle hunted. If you go up at the Dry Creek Trailhead, it is muzzleloader hunted and they are rifle hunted and archery hunted. The way that that is written out, Draper city and Traverse Ridge comes clear over into Alpine. Alpine doesn't allow hunting. Draper doesn't allow hunting. It's one sliver of land from second Hemagog (sp?) up to the ridge. I think we're creating an issue there that this isn't the solution for. The cities can deal with the urban deer problem on their own. Putting more pressure on those deer, I understand in Salt Lake it had helped keep them off. But Salt Lake is a developed area whereas this is a developing area. One other thing that you have to understand is from what I've seen is there is a push to remove gun hunting from the Wasatch Mountains and this will be an arrow in the quiver of those who want to stop gun hunting. I would move that we maintain the Wasatch Front hunt boundary and not include that area for that small sliver of huntable land.

Ben – I think I'm confused here, Covy does that extension down to that Timpanogas Highway eliminate rifle hunting in the area?

Mike – No, it does not. What I'm saying is that there is a contingent of people that live in the area that want to see no discharge of firearms in the mountains above there. I know that is will be an arrow in their quiver to move toward that direction. Everyone probably thinks I'm anti-archery today, I really am not.

George – That's more of a target issue though along that Wasatch Front down in that neighborhood. It's not really a hunting issue.

Mike – I agree, it is a real target shooting issue but when the fall hunts and the deer hunt comes along there's shooting again and it becomes a bigger social issue. I wouldn't do the people proper that gave me their input if I didn't bring it up. I encouraged them to e-mail you guys. That is why I propose we keep the Wasatch Front North boundary the same. I'm not talking about lower right now.

Kristofer – So, we've got a motion to keep the Wasatch Front boundary the same. Do we have a second on that? Alan seconds. Any more discussion on that?

Ben – I think I agree with George on that. The issue up there is a target issue not a hunting issue. By no means would I support eliminating a muzzleloader or rifle hunting where it's acceptable and safe to so do. If I understand correctly, Covy the reason for that extension is to tie in with the new unit.

Covy – There're multiple reasons and we understand that we need to work with some of those cities up there to start to allow hunting. We have populations that are really hard to control in that area and there's 300 head of elk that live on Traverse Ridge. And we've had to hire helicopters to to push them off the freeway twice. So, there are issues to work through but I think from the divisions perspective this is a step in the right direction to working through those issues. If we don't have it on the books, there's nothing to work through.

Ben – This is to push the animals up onto the mountain like we're doing on the Wasatch Front?

Covy – It's to start to work through some of the issues that we have with the large amounts of open space in urban areas.

Mike – But if the hunters push the elk up into the mountains they are doing so illegally because there's no hunting there. That's the whole point of what I'm saying. There's not hunting on Traverse Ridge. There's not hunting in Draper or Alpine. So, the problem animals it could actually work against you because any elk that were up on the public land there are then going to get pushed down. I would recommend that if the goal is to deal with the city deer, to move that boundary down on top off the mountain down to the city limits.

Ben – I think the whole purpose of coming down to the highway though is it's a defined boundary where the city limits are very difficult to define and enforce. With this conversation I'm inclined to support the DWR on this.

Covy – Mike, with what you said I think I need to clarify too. You're right, we wouldn't encourage anyone to break the law to hunt. That's not our perspective.

Mike – So, that can't accomplish the very thing that we want to avoid. That's my point. We're trying to accomplish something with a tool that doesn't accomplish what we want done.

Kristofer – Any further discussion on that? All in favor? All opposed? Motion failed.

Kristofer – We have the balance of the recommendations to address.

Ben – So moved.

Kristofer – Seconded by Ken. Any additional discussion? All in favor? Passes unanimously.

VOTING

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Ken to ask the Wildlife Board to direct the Division to draft an additional definition of primitive weapons for archery and muzzleloader

In Favor: Ben, Ken

Opposed: Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Motion failed 2 to 6

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Mike to look into the potential of creating another primitive weapon definition and the possibility of creating new hunts.

In Favor: George, Ben, Ken, Josh, AJ

Opposed: Alan, Mike Brock

Motion passed 5 to 3

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Ken to add an archery only elk hunt "Barney Top" (new hunt) with hunt dates of September 11-24, 2018.

In Favor: George, Ben, Ken, Josh, AJ

Opposed: Alan, Mike, Brock

Motion passed 5 to 3

Motion was made by Ken to add a late season limited entry archery elk hunt with the season date of November 23, 2018.

Seconded by Ben

In favor: Ken, Ben George

Opposed: Mike AJ, Josh, Alan, Brock

Motion failed 3 to 5

Motion was made by Brock, seconded by Mike to ask the Wildlife Board to look into late season limited entry archery hunts

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Brock, seconded by Mike to eliminate the late season elk hunt on the Dutton unit

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion made by Ken, seconded by Ben to split the Wasatch elk unit with Highway 40 as the boundary line with no late rifle hunt on the west side

In favor: Ben, Alan, Ken

Opposed: Josh, A.J., Mike, Brock, George

Motion failed 3 to 5

Motion made by Mike, seconded by Ben, that the Central Region RAC supports general elk hunting and wouldn't support the reduction of the spike elk hunt

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion was made by Brock, seconded by AJ to ask the Division to look at the hunt calendar

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion made by Ben, seconded by Ken to accept the new archery only sheep hunts on the

Newfoundland Mountain (Dec 11 – Dec 31) and Zion (Nov 11 – Dec 31) units

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Brock, George

Opposed: Mike, Alan

Motion passed 6 to 2

Mike Christensen commented on the airgun issue prior to motion

Motion made by Mike, seconded by Alan to keep the Wasatch Front extended archery boundary to same.

In favor: Mike, Alan

Opposed: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Brock, George

Motion fails 2 to 6

Motion made by Ben, seconded by Ken to accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

**8) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019 (Action)
Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Brock – Mike, who does the population surveys of these CWMU's?

Mike Wardle – It depends. A lot of times it's done by our local biologist. The CWMU association which is a nonprofit group also employs a biologist named, Ken Kleg. Ken spends a lot of time looking specifically at their private land on the CWMU doing counts. He also collects teeth that gets sent for aging.

Mike – On the moose split I know it's hard to get the 60/40 at what point does it reset if they change their COR and the public get's their tag first again? After two years, we're now back to 50/50.

Mike Wardle – With moose, a lot of times it ends up being 50/50 because of the limited number of permits.

Mike – When I was on the CWMU committee before, we addressed that by the COR when it renewed, the public got theirs first and that way it always stayed 60/40. It would

be public, private, public. That would be 66/33. Then when the COR renewed again it would be public, private, public and that held you within what the rule actually says of being 60/40. That's why I was a little concerned to see that we're going to go 50/50.

Mike Wardle – So, we made a rule change and I don't know how many years ago it was to allow for these OIAL species to have the permit distribution go across COR's and that's probably where the change was made.

Mike – That makes sense. Thanks.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

Paul Phillips/RR Ranch CWMU – We ask for a season change. We're looking for Sept 10- Nov 10 season change. A portion of the ranch falls within a migration corridor and it's simply a tool to help us be more successful in harvest and create a better experience for our hunters and public hunters. If you have questions, I can answer.

Kirstofer/RAC – What are the current dates?

Paul – We currently go to October 31st. The additional time on the end would allow for addition migration into the unit.

Mike – Is this because the COR has already started?

Mike Wardle – Yeah, we have a deadline for change applications of August 1 and this was a request that came in after. We didn't want to send it out and change the RAC packet and everything but the division is supportive of the request.

RAC Discussion

None

Ben- I move to approve the change request asked by Paul.

Mike – I second.

Kristofer – The motion is to approve the RR CWMU request for a season date change to September 10- November 10. All in favor? Passed unanimously

Kristofer – We have the balance of the recommendations to address.

Alan – I move to approve the balance of the recommendation.

AJ – I second that.

Kristofer – All in favor? Passed unanimously

VOTING

Motion was made by Ben, seconded by Mike to approve the RR Ranch CWMU date change to Sept 10- Nov 10 as requested by Paul Phillips.

In Favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

Motion made by Alan, seconded by AJ to accept the remainder of the Division's proposals as presented.

In favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed unanimously

- 9) **R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments (Action)**
Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Ben – Before we went to the 30 units, the draw for the dedicated hunter took place I believe in January and you knew the results pretty early in February and you had pretty much all year to get those 8 hours in. Then we went to the 30 units and it became part of the regular draw and when we kept the 8 hour requirement on the first year it became a logistical nightmare for both hunters and the DWR to get those 8 hours in between the end of May and June 1 and August 16 (the bow hunt). Why are we going to go back to that? As I recall it was a nightmare for both hunters and the DWR from an administrative standpoint.

Bryan – That’s a very good question Ben and it’s a question that I had to go after a bunch of different angles. Socially, certainly and also empirically. We felt as coordinators throughout the state (5 regional coordinators) that we were seeing a trend basically of two situations. One is that the number of withdrawals that we’re getting and it was quite challenging to tell somebody, basically every I think it’s 1.7 days I have a withdrawal and most of those are due to medical situations. Someone is in a hospital or some very serious situation. It’s hard to tell someone, “I’m sorry about your situation but you owe us 22 hours before we’ll let you out.” Those are challenging conversations to have with people. It’s one thing if they’re just wanting to be out because they are moving or because they just don’t want to do it anymore but the majority of our withdrawals are very challenging life situations. We looked at that and thought, how can we remedy this? Ben, I think this slide will help answer that question. It’s a little faded but hopefully you can see it. What you are seeing is service hours on a weekly bar graph here and the first column here are exactly what you said back when we were applying to get into the program in December. You knew January 1 if you were in and what that allowed for is service hours to be done the first year.

When we went to the 30 units and the dedicated hunter became part of the draw, we had this (nothing) then the draw happens and then you had to get 8 hours in really quick to get your permit by the archery season. This was challenging we did admit and that’s why we made this suggestion a few years ago to change that. If you look down on the second year it tappers out. When the rule changed and we said no hours the first year it did exactly what we wanted to.

When I saw this data I thought, wow this really isn’t helping our argument much because we’re feeling like the dedicated hunters are not doing their service until right before archery and coming in droves. So, I said, why is that happening? I did some more research here and the next slide helps reinforce going back to the old way might be a better idea.

Ben – So is the concern that so many people are buying hours that we don’t have the hours in projects that we need?

Bryan – No. We definitely provide enough projects and if you’re out in the region that is providing projects it’s a little surprising how many projects get cancelled because of the lack of support and participation.

Ben – I think you missed my question. Is the concern that so many people are buying hours that we don’t have enough people to do the projects?

Bryan – That’s not the driving concern on this but it is something that is existing. Again, it’s the dedicated hunter’s option to purchase hours. What we believe is happening is by not having to do the hours for a year and a half it’s pretty easy to forget and put it off. Then come July or August you start scrambling to get 16 hours worth and do the same

thing the following year. We're seeing these big spikes of purchased hours because they are running out of time. Although this is good and the money is useful for the division, I think we'd prefer it to be on the ground and on those projects that aren't being fulfilled. I think we can accomplish that better if we front load and have people do a few hours before they get their first permit and also it helps us make sure that when they withdraw that they don't owe us anything to be able to get out. It's kind of a two fold approach.

Ben – I like where you've gone with the withdrawal part and I see the data you are showing here and it's good to hear that you've addressed the DWR administration part of having enough projects for people to get their hours. This still doesn't address from a hunter's standpoint, I just drew a tag and I've got two months during the summer season and being busy when I'd much rather do my projects in the winter and spring leading up to that. You may have addressed the DWR side of it but you haven't addressed the hunter's side of it. For that reason, I can't support this change. What I could support and have you considered allowing people to do hours prior to entry so starting in January for potential entry assuming they draw. That I can get behind.

Bryan – We have and I'm going to answer your comment and question in a couple of ways. Being a dedicated hunter, I understand what that means. You draw and you've got a certain number of weeks you've got to get things done and it's a busy time of year. That being said, we used to get the draw results in June. We're now getting them by May 30th. What we're seeing more often than not is the draw results are happening and e-mails are out mid-May. If we count mid-May, that's 12 weeks. If you count from May 30th that gives you 8 weeks. You have all of June, all of July. That's 8 weeks and then two weeks plus a couple of days of August for those that archery hunt. Not everyone does that. So, if we do that it's 10 weeks plus a few days to get one day of service in. As a dedicated hunter, as somebody that does this program to provide service in order to get the benefits that they get, that may need to be their plan, to say if I draw, I need to dedicate one day during that summertime to be able to do my service in order to hunt. That may be a factor that makes someone decide whether or not they are going to be part of the program. We're willing to make it work and provide the number of projects to make it work. We feel like it's a challenge that we've done in the past and we're willing to go back to because of the benefits.

The other part that you asked me... That's a concept that came about three years ago as well. We looked into hoping that we could make it work and then bluntly it came to one of the RAC's and a fellow stood up and said, I'm really glad to hear that you're looking into this because my 12 year old comes with me and my 10 year old comes with me and they go on all the projects we do so by the time they can actually hunt in Utah they'll have year's worth of service done. Then, we were trying to figure out, well how's that going to work, we've got people serving to get dedicated hunter hours that aren't even in the system. They aren't even old enough to hunt. They aren't even old enough to obtain a tag.

Ben – That goes against my idea. My idea was to allow someone to put in hours from January 1 until the draw. If they don't draw, those hours are gone. They don't carry over.

Bryan – That's another thing we certainly looked in to. The comments we got back in that situation was that it's hard to tell someone, thanks for you work it doesn't count for anything if you don't draw. How long do you hold that amount of service to be valid? Do you do it for one year, two years or indefinitely until they draw? Then there's a whole system how to store that database. What counts, what doesn't? When do you let things expire? Those systems just don't exist as far as how to account for those. It's not

something I'm opposed to looking at again but when it's been brought up in the past, we called it banking. There were a lot of big red flags that came up and we said, it's probably best to do once they've actually joined the program.

Mike – Any talk about making a hunter choose their rifle season if there are two rifle seasons in the unit?

Bryan – There has not been much because they can only harvest the two deer in the three years anyway so if they harvest it in the first season they don't get to hunt the second one. Most dedicated hunters when it comes to the rifle hunt they're just like other rifle hunters. They hunt the first couple of days and then that's about it. They don't usually go back very often.

Questions from the Public

None

Comments from the Public

None

RAC Discussion

Ben – I can't support requiring hours if we've only got from May 30th on to do it. That's my opinion. If we're going to require hours the first year I think we need to allow those hours to be done starting January 1.

Josh – I've done dedicated hunter a number of times and I've struggled to get those hours completed. It is a really valid point and I'm kind of torn on it to be honest. I think the broader point if it's really the program's mission to get someone to show up for 8 hours then I feel like they are in a unique program and are given the opportunity. I kind of feel like you need to make the time for one day. Just like you need to make the time to shoot you bow or anything else.

Kristofer – Do we have a motion?

Josh – I make the motion to accept it as is.

Mike – I second it.

Kristofer – All in favor? All opposed? Motion passes.

VOTING

Motion was made by Josh, seconded by Mike to accept the Division's recommendations as presented.

In Favor: Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed: Ben, Ken

Motion passed 6 to 2

10) Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments – 2019 (Action)

Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

None

Questions from the Public

Duane Bush – What was the decision process to ban the electric bikes?

Blair – A lot of it came down to being consistent with our rules. We've tried to not allow any kind of motorized vehicle on our dykes in the past. We don't allow ATVs or motorcycles so the electric bike kind of falls into that gray area between being a bike and being a motorized vehicle. It's more to be consistent with that as well as, we've seen changes in technology quite rapidly so

we felt like it would be easier to make a hardline right now rather than try to accommodate different electric type vehicles as they become more available.

Duane Bush – Have you been having problems with the bikes?

Blair – Nothing that I'm aware of. For the most part I think they've been staying on the roadways and things like that and I know there have been some situations where people have been concerned that they will start going off road. As far as on our WMA's at this point, I'm not aware of anything.

Comments from the Public

Duane Bush – I'm 59 years old and have been hunting waterfowl with bikes for about 15 years. About four years ago I started using an E bike. It's been a blessing for me to be able to use this E bike to get access back into the marsh on the dykes. The E bikes, when you compare them to a regular mountain bike, both can be used off road the power on the E bike is quite a bit less than a motorcycle. A typical 750 watt E bike is about 1 horse power where as a motorcycle is 20-30-40 horse power. As far as off road is concerned, you can go off road with the E bikes but you can also go off road with a regular mountain bike. There's no real difference there. I think that some of the benefits of the E bike are being able to get access to areas that you'd never be able to get to hiking. A lot of you guys are deer hunters. You should be looking at E bikes. They are the future. They have zero impact on the environment. I think it's something that needs to be reconsidered when you look at Farmington Bay where I hunt, you've got 500 horse power air boats blasting around. Then you have these E bikes that have no impact at all on the environment. So, I think it's something to maybe reconsider before you make a rule change like this. I've got several friends that are using E bikes and it's just something to look at.

Kristofer – Are you asking us not to ban them all together?

Duane Bush – What I'm saying is take another look at it. I think if you haven't ridden one and you don't know what they are about they are not a motorcycle.

Kristofer – I was just asking because your comment card suggested that maybe you were looking at potentially

Duane Bush – I have a middle ground solution. Maybe banning certain classes. They come in three classes so they can be regulated that way. You have class one, two and three and that is based on power and speed. It is easy for the state to regulate that. If you have any questions, I've been doing it for a long time, it works really well. A bunch of older guys that I hunt with all use them. I think it's trying to promote more and more people getting into the sport and spreading out the hunters in the marsh. It does all those things. It's definitely a positive as far as the worry that they are going to get more powerful, you regulate them. All the bikes sold in Utah come with a stamp/sticker on the bike defining class one, two or three.

Ridley Griggs – I wanted to comment in favor of the boundary amendment for swans. It included the southern portion of public shooting grounds WMA. That WMA has five handicap blinds that I think would provide a really good swan hunting opportunity for physically disabled hunters that they don't really get much of right now.

As far as E bikes go, I rode ten miles at Farmington Bay last weekend not on an E bike. Part of me doesn't like that competition because I don't have one but at the same time, I have a hard time singling them out as a negative when we have mud motors that make more noise and have more impact and provide more access. On the whole I don't see a reason to ban them.

Dustin Carlson – I want to go back to the things that Duane was talking about with the E-bikes. I would point out that I'm a duck hunter that likes to have all the tools at my disposal. One of those just happens to be an E bike. I own a John boat with a big, loud motor on it, I've walked from the parking lot, and I've paddled a boat from the parking lot. I've done it all and I just see the E bike as another tool in our arsenal. What it does give me is the ability to get away from the rest of the competition. It gives me access to really underutilized areas in a waterfowl management area. I can get out there further. We're not getting out and competing with other hunters. We're not going to areas where the air boaters are getting. We're getting to areas where there is nobody and therefore, we're able to have successful hunts and have fun. So, I've made some quick notes. The pros to me are: they're still quiet, they are clean, they allow access to underutilized areas. If there needs to be regulation and there's an issue that's arising from their use, I think we need to address that. If people are going too fast or if they are going off road. I don't believe that a blanket ban of E bikes is really the right answer. Just for note, the federal E bike law says that an "E bike is a bicycle equipped with fully operable pedals and an electric motor of less than 750 watts and a top non pedaling speed of 20 miles an hour." These bikes are to be treated the same as pedal bikes according to federal bicycle law HR 727. It's already kind of defined there. 20 miles an hour for me, I rode the Farmington dyke this morning and 20 miles an hour is pretty fast on any kind of bike with a motor or not. I would say top speed I ever see is 14 or 15 and that feels like I'm hustling to get out of there or get back. My comment is to oppose the blanket ban and if there's an issue we just need to address the issue.

Brian Westover – I am speaking out against the E-bike ban. I believe that the E bike is an appropriate way to access the wonderful resource that we have out there. Appropriate in that it's safe and it's quite and clean and it democratizes the marsh for everyone. As Duane said, they allow older hunters as well as younger hunters who maybe can't afford more expensive boats. I also think it provides... I really do see in using them that it spreads out the hunters and allows that resource to be better used and better taken advantage of those opportunities.

Matt Clark/Utah Waterfowl Association – Supports the Division's recommendations.

RAC Discussion

Kristofer – Just so I'm clear, as part of the recommendations here tonight is the ban of e-bikes.

Blair – Yes, that would be one of the rule changes that we were proposing.

Kristofer – You had mentioned that there was no real reason for it other than just consistency.

Blair – Yeah, so consistency and more just to get out ahead of it. There aren't a whole lot of people currently doing it. You've heard from the ones that are doing it and it is a great tool. I guess our concern is that as technology develops it's going to be harder to regulate. We figured this would be a good starting point. We discussed it with some of the groups, Utah Waterfowl Association being one of them and unfortunately, we aren't aware of many of the people that are E bikers so we didn't reach out to any of them. I had discussed it with Duane a bit but it was after we had submitted everything in the RAC packet.

Ben – Blair, you say you want to get out ahead of it, I want to make sure I understand the concerns. The concern is that as the technology grows that they evolve into an electric motorcycle is that the concern?

Blair – Yes, we've seen all kinds of varieties of track machines and it falls in one of the gray areas in our rules so we try to define as much as we can and spell it out. This is one of those things that falls in one of the gray areas so we are trying to come up with a solution now.

Ben – I have two questions. One of the gentlemen read the legal definition of an electric bike. Have we taken that into consideration and does that in any way tie our hands? If that falls into the definition of a bike then, are we now banning all bikes?

Blair – So this would essentially separate those two. Anything that had the electronic capabilities that E bikes do would be banned. A regular bicycle would not. That's where we were making the distinction. Then within the E bikes themselves there are different classes of E bikes that vary between speed and power.

Ben – My follow up question is, there is an electric wheelchair type thing that you see at the hunt expo each year that's on the tracks and they can stand up. Can someone use one of those out there?

Blair – Yeah, so we have accommodated those things specifically within our rule. Those devices are used for impaired mobility.

Josh – I had two people who asked me not to ban E-bikes on the dykes. I feel obligated to ask the question are E bikes currently allowed in wilderness study areas in Utah?

Blair – That's a good question. I don't know for sure.

Josh – It's tough because we see technology increasing in every other aspect of hunting and if guys are using these bikes it seems like defining a regulating mechanism like 20 miles per hour or so many watts or horse power seems like an approach to consider rather than a flat out ban. Because technology is only going to be increasing, it's not going away.

Kristofer – Anymore discussion?

Alan – I make a motion that we accept the divisions recommendations with the exception of banning the E bike.

Ken – I'll second that.

Kristofer – All in favor? Passed unanimously

VOTING

Motion was made by Alan, seconded by Ken to accept the Division's recommendations with the exception of banning electric bikes on WMAs.

In Favor: Ben, Ken, Josh, A.J., Mike, Alan, Brock, George

Opposed:

Motion passed/unanimously

Meeting adjourned: 11:53 pm

In attendance: 27 public plus 17 DWR employees

Next board meeting: November 29, 2018, 9:00 am, DNR boardroom, Salt Lake City

Next RAC meeting: December 4, 2018, 6:30 pm, Springville Civic Ctr multipurpose room



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 6, 2018

To: Utah Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members

From: Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife, Utah Bowmen's Assoc., UTFNAWS, Rocky Mtn. Elk Foundation, Mule Deer Foundation.

Subject: **2019 OIAL Archery Only Hunt Recommendation and Season Dates**

Recommendation:

We recommend adding (2) new Archery-Only Once-in-a-Lifetime hunts outlined below.

California Bighorn Sheep		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Newfoundland Mtn	Dec 11 – Dec 31	New Hunt, Archery Only

Desert Bighorn Sheep		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Zion	Nov 11 – Dec 1	New Hunt, Archery Only

Benefits:

- 1- Addresses point creep.
- 2- Provides new and additional opportunities.
- 3- The hunts have a high potential for a lower success rate.
- 4- Targets animals that are often passed over by rifle hunters.
- 5- Not the most opportune time to hunt some of these units. Best time still slated for the any weapon hunts.
- 6- These permits would be in addition to the current permit numbers

History:

- 1- This proposal has passed the RAC's twice 2017 & 2018
- 2- In 2018 it passed all of the RAC's with only 1 descending vote
- 3- Wildlife Board asked that it been ran through the Sheep Committee that happened this year. The Committee supported it.
- 4- The Wildlife Board asked for a hunter survey that was completed this year as well and the results show support for the concept.

Primitive Muzzleloader LE Deer		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Kaporowitz (Desert Sheep Boundary) San Juan (San Juan South Desert Sheep Boundary) Green River East	Nov 9 – Nov 16	No Scopes, 209 or Cap Ignition



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 6, 2018
 To: Utah Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members
 From: Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife,
 Subject: **2019 Recommendation and Season Dates**

Recommendation:

Barney Top LE Primitive Weapon Elk		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Barney Top	Sept 11 – 24	New Hunt, Archery Only
	Area Kaporowitz Sheep Unit, Cannan MTN, East of HWY 12 to Notom Road	Sept 26 – Oct 4	New Hunt Primitive Muzzleloader No Scope Cap or 209 Primer Ignition

Late Archery LE Elk		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	All LE Elk Units	Nov 23 – Dec 5	New Hunt, Archery Only

Benefits:

- 1- Addresses point creep.
- 2- Provides new and additional opportunities.
- 3- The hunts have a high potential for a lower success rate.
- 4- These permits would be in addition to the current permit numbers and age class would not be figured into Unit Plan Objectives

BUSTING 10 MYTHS ABOUT E-BIKES

October 30, 2017

Morgan Lommele, e-bike campaigns manager



Image: Leslie Kehmeier

In some circles, electric bicycles have an undeserved bad reputation. Like just about anything new, they require an open mind and a positive attitude. As their popularity skyrockets around the world, it's only a matter of time before e-bikes really take off in the U.S. Fact is stronger than fiction, so here are 10 e-bike myths and the truth behind them.

1. MYTH: They're too fast!

FACT: Most e-bikes travel at bike-like speeds. Class 1 e-bikes have a motor that cuts off after the rider reaches 20 mph. This is the top assisted speed, not the average speed. On flat and uphill surfaces, class 1 e-bikes travel on average two to three miles per hour faster than traditional bicycles. [Studies](#)

SHARE

x

<https://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/e-bikes>) show that in some instances, e-bikes are slower than regular bikes, depending on the terrain and power produced by the rider.

2. MYTH: E-bikes riders are reckless, and they will harm me, my children and everyone I know!

FACT: E-bike riders, like nearly all riders, are generally respectful of the road. We are not aware of studies or reports that show that e-bike use decreases public safety.

3. MYTH: They are too heavy!

FACT: E-bikes are slightly heavier than traditional bikes, but the greatest contributor to a heavy mass in bicycling is personal weight, not the weight of an e-bike. It's no different than riding a traditional bicycle with loaded panniers.

4. MYTH: E-bike access is a slippery slope and will lead the way to full motorized access on all non-motorized trails.

FACT: Pedal-assist e-bikes are fundamentally different from ATVs, off-road motorcycles and internal-combustion off-road vehicles. Motorized vehicle regulations were written before the invention of e-bikes and shouldn't be used to regulate e-bike use. E-bikes are emissions- and noise-free. PeopleForBikes works to distinguish e-bikes from motorcycles and bicycles so that e-bikes are understood and non-motorized trail access is preserved.

5. MYTH: Bike paths will become a zoo!

FACT: Most e-bike users are like most other path users -- they generally respect the law of the road and are kind to others with whom they share public resources. Riding an e-bike is like riding a regular bike. If you want to break the law, you don't need an e-bike to do it.

SHARE

SHARE



6. MYTH: We need more public process before we decide whether to allow e-bikes!

FACT: Many studies have already been performed that evaluated how e-bike and bike riders interact on trails. One [study \(http://b.3cdn.net/bikes/163d004fb8f1b7fcde_ywm6i6e4e.pdf\)](http://b.3cdn.net/bikes/163d004fb8f1b7fcde_ywm6i6e4e.pdf) demonstrated that trying out an e-bike increased a person's acceptance and reduced their uncertainty around e-bikes. In Colorado, the City of Boulder studied e-bike use on shared paths and found minimal "conflicts" between trail users, no observed crashes, no negative verbal interactions, and safe passing.

7. MYTH: E-bike riders will go further into remote areas and won't be able to pedal out if their batteries die.

FACT: There's risk in everything we do. This is a lesson that you learn the hard way. Climbers, hikers and cyclists are rescued from difficult situations every day. Self-reliance and proper preparation must be emphasized.

8. MYTH: Speeding e-bikers can't be slowed or ticketed.

FACT: Excessive speed—both on regular- and e-bikes—can be monitored and ticketed using radar guns. But this is a highly inefficient use of trail manager time. Furthermore, speeding on e-bikes has yet to be identified as a significant problem. Clear signage and public etiquette education are the best ways to encourage all trail users to travel at safe speeds.

9. MYTH: E-bike riders don't know trail etiquette!

FACT: Sure they do. Most have years of trail experience. The typical e-bike rider is 45-65 years old and generally uninterested in reaching maximum speeds or passing other trail users without proper warning or slowing down.

10. MYTH: E-bikes are cheating!

FACT: We like to think that e-bikes aren't cheating, they're empowering.

We need to embrace e-bikes because they get more people on bikes more often. From older riders, to those with longer commutes, to people dealing with health issues, e-bikes provide important bike riding opportunities. We're not saying they're for everyone, but we believe that more people riding is not only good for everyone who rides, but for the entire community.

Let's embrace the future and make the most of the many benefits that e-bikes offer.

Enter your information below to receive our e-bikes email newsletter. For more information and resources about electric bicycles, visit our [e-bikes page \(https://peopleforbikes.org/e-bikes\)](https://peopleforbikes.org/e-bikes).

SHARE

First Name*

Last Name*

Email Address*

Company*

Zip*

By clicking below you acknowledge the PeopleForBikes [Privacy Policy \(https://peopleforbikes.org/privacy-policy/\)](https://peopleforbikes.org/privacy-policy/) and agree to our [Terms of Use \(https://peopleforbikes.org/terms-of-use/\)](https://peopleforbikes.org/terms-of-use/).

I agree to receive the PeopleForBikes newsletter and related communications from the PeopleForBikes Foundation and the PeopleForBikes Coalition regarding PeopleForBikes' advocacy and other activities. You can unsubscribe at any time.

Electric Bicycle Law Basics

PeopleForBikes and the Bicycle Product Suppliers Association (BPSA) are working to update and clarify state laws governing the use of electric bicycles (e-bikes) across the United States. Our objective is to ensure that certain electric bicycles are regulated similarly to traditional, human-powered bicycles to provide the same access that riders of traditional bicycles enjoy.

In many states, electric bicycles lack a specific vehicle classification. In these states it is unclear how they are regulated, or they may be interpreted to fall within terms primarily aimed at combustion engine vehicles such as mopeds or scooters. These classifications that were never intended to apply e-bikes. This legal scheme creates significant confusion for consumers and retailers, and hinders the electric bicycle market. In order to clarify state law, and properly regulate electric bicycles like traditional bicycles, it is critical to understand the existing legal rules that govern electric bicycles.

Federal Law Governing Low-Speed Electric Bicycles:

Electric-assisted bicycles have been defined and regulated at the federal level since 2002. Public Law 107-319 established that electric bicycles are regulated as consumer products under the Consumer Product Safety Act, and more specifically, subject to the same regulations that govern traditional, human-powered bicycles. Thus, electric bicycles are regulated by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and must comply with the bicycle safety standards at 16 C.F.R. Part 1512. In addition, electric bicycles are explicitly not "motor vehicles" for the purposes of federal law, and are not subject to National Highway Traffic Safety Administration vehicle standards. As a practical matter, Public Law 107-319 ensures that electric bicycles are designed, manufactured, and tested like traditional bicycles for the purposes of consumer product safety law. The main provisions of Public Law 107-319 are codified at 15 U.S.C. § 2085.

Under federal law, an electric bicycle is referred to as a "low-speed electric bicycle," which is defined as "a two- or three-wheeled vehicle with fully operable pedals and an electric motor of less than 750 watts (1 h.p.), whose maximum speed on a paved level surface, when powered solely by such a motor while ridden by an operator who weighs 170 pounds, is less than 20 mph." Significantly, this definition provides a maximum assisted speed that an electric bicycle can travel when being powered only by the motor, but does not provide a maximum assisted speed for when an electric bicycle is being powered by a combination of human and motor power.

Federal law does not preempt any state traffic laws or vehicle codes. While there is a preemption provision in Public Law 107-319, that provision is limited in scope to product safety regulation. Therefore, Public Law 107-319 has no impact on state traffic laws or vehicle codes, which regulate the use of electric bicycles, and it is still necessary to update these laws to incorporate these devices.

State Traffic Laws:

Nearly 30 states have incorporated e-bikes into their traffic codes and regulated them similarly to traditional bicycles. However, approximately 20 states still have outdated laws that lack a specific classification for electric bicycles. In these states, electric bicycles are regulated under a

patchwork of laws aimed at mopeds or scooters, or in some cases it is not obvious how electric bicycles are classified at all. This creates significant confusion for consumers, retailers, and manufacturers, and it discourages the public from taking advantage of the benefits that electric bicycles offer.

The central problem in many states is that their statutes lack a term specifically aimed at electric bicycles. Under many state laws, "bicycles" are limited to devices moved solely by human-power. The only other definitions that exist under state law are aimed at combustion engine vehicles (commonly 50cc or less), and may inadvertently include electric bicycles simply because there are no other options. Common vehicle classifications that may include electric bicycles in different states are "moped," "motorized bicycle," and "motor-driven cycle." State laws governing these devices often include additional administrative requirements that are impractical or not necessary for electric bicycles, such as licensing, registration, or insurance.

BPSA Class System

In order to modernize electric bicycle law in the United States, the BPSA has devised a three-class system to categorize electric bicycles and properly regulate them based on their maximum assisted speed. The BPSA class system would create the following categories of electric bicycles:

- 1) A "class 1 electric bicycle" is a bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.
- 2) A "class 2 electric bicycle" is a bicycle equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bicycle, and that is not capable of providing assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 20 miles per hour.
- 3) A "class 3 electric bicycle" is a bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling, and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches the speed of 28 miles per hour, and is equipped with a speedometer.

For all classes, the maximum power output is 750 watts (1 h.p.), and manufacturers and distributors of electric bicycles would be required to apply a class identification label to each electric bicycle.

The BPSA system also creates rules governing the use of electric bicycles, with safety as the top priority. Class 1 and 2 electric bicycles would be permitted to travel anywhere traditional bikes are permitted, as the maximum assisted speed of these devices is closely aligned with speeds traveled by traditional bicycles. Class 3 electric bicycles could be ridden on streets and roadways where traditional bicycles are permitted, including bicycle lanes, but would be restricted from slower speed areas such as multi-use paths. Class 3 electric bicycles would also be subject to additional requirements, such as a minimum user age and helmet mandate. Electric bicycles would not be subject to any licensing, registration, or insurance requirements.

Legislation creating the class system has been passed in eight states: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington.

UTAH WATERFOWL ASSOCIATION



UTAH WATERFOWL
ASSOCIATION

Preserving Utah's Waterfowl, Waterfowl Habitat and Utah's Rich Waterfowling Heritage

The Utah Waterfowl Association fully supports the recommendation of the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources in their efforts to prohibit the use of Electric Bicycles on all Waterfowl Management Areas in the State. Recent advances in technology have allowed E-Bikes to become very powerful and capable of traveling extremely fast in off-road conditions. These E-Bikes now resemble a gas-powered motorcycle in many ways. The negative effects of motorized vehicles in wetlands is well documented and is recognized by the DWR as a damaging activity. Because the UWA is concerned about the sustainability of our state-owned wetlands, protection of sensitive habitats, and safety of the public, we offer our full support of this recommendation.

Thank you,

Utah Waterfowl Association

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/6/18

Name Ereg Bird Phone Number 801 310 4962

Address 740 E 400 N Springville

Who are you representing? self group UTAH WILDSHEEP FOUNDATION

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

Date Nov 6 18

Name John Bair 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 Statewide Goat 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

Date Nov 6-18

Name Troy Justensen Phone Number 801-557-3362

Address 2494 Remede 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.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/6/18

Name RANNY QUAYLE Phone Number 435-671-2189

Address 426150 CANTY AONES RD, HEBEN

Who are you representing? self group UTAH ARCHERY ASSO.

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

Date Nov - 8 - 18

Name Troy Justensen Phone Number 801-557-3362

Address 2494 Remuda Dr

Who are you representing? self group SFW

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 7

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 11-6-18

Name Michael Hansen Phone Number _____

Address 7th. Green Ut. Sanpete

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Big horn

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 11/6/18

Name Garrick Hall Phone Number 435-232-1117

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group Farm Bureau

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 7 Big horn sheep Plan

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 11/6/18

Name Wade Eliason Phone Number _____

Address P.O. Box 815 Moroni UT 84642

Who are you representing? self group Ut Wool Grower

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Bighorn

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 11/6/18

Name Greg Bird Phone Number 801 310 4962

Address 740 E 400 N Springville

Who are you representing? self group UTAH WILD SHEEP FOUNDATION

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? 7

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 11/6/18

Name RANDY QUAYLE Phone Number 435-671-2189

Address 4261 SW. CRAZY ACRES RD - HEBER

Who are you representing? self group UTAH ARCHERY ASSO.

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? #7

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-7-18

Name John Bair Phone Number _____

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Statewide SAEFP #7

COMMENTS Support Sheep 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

Date 11/6/18

Name RANDY QUAYLE Phone Number 435-671-2189

Address 4261 SO. CRAZY ACRES RD, HEBER

Who are you representing? self group UTAH ARCHERY ASSOC.

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.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date Nov 6-18

Name Troy Justensen Phone Number 861-8573362

Address 2494 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.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date _____

Name Tom Mower Phone Number 801 369-3791

Address _____

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? _____

COMMENTS Extended archery
Landowner Bull tag

**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 7 - 18

Name John Bar 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 SFWD position

PLEASE KEEP SPIKE ELK HUNT!!!

**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 11/6/18

Name Cody Medler Phone Number 801-592-2958

Address 107W 300S Lehi

Who are you representing? self group _____

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.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/6/18

Name Greg Bird Phone Number 801 310 4962

Address 740 E 400 N Springville

Who are you representing? self group UTAH WILD SHEEP FOUNDATION

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.

COMMENT FROM RAC MEETING

Date 11/6/18

Name BAMMY QUAYLE Phone Number 435-671-2189

Address 4261 So. CRAZY ACRES RD. HEBEN

Who are you representing? self group UTAH ARCHERY ASSOC.

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? BIG HORN SHEEP ARCHERY HUNT & BARNEY TOP ELK UNIT

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 11-6-2018

Name Paul Phillips Phone Number 435-671-1520

Address 1378 South 2950 East HOBBS Utah

Who are you representing? self group Double R Cwmn

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Cwmn Variance

COMMENTS REQUEST Season Date Variance
ON Double R Cwmn

**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 11/6/18

Name Duane Bush Phone Number 801-230-2030

Address 940 S 2200 E SLC, UT 84108

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? E-BIKE BAN WMA's

COMMENTS I oppose the proposed ban.

1. The bikes can be regulated because they now are classified into 3 750 watt max 20 mph speed categories
2. They are bicycles that must be pedaled to go, no throttle option
3. They allow older hunters and others to access more huntable areas easier.

**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 6 2018

Name Ridley Griggs Phone Number 801-809-7921

Address 1850 N University Ave. Apt 103

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Waterfowl recommendations

COMMENTS revised Swan boundaries could provide
a great opportunity for physically challenged
hunters

**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 11/6/18

Name Dustin Carlson Phone Number 801 597 0447

Address 351 E Golden Pheasant Dr. Draper, UT 84020

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Waterfowl Regulation Changes

COMMENTS I would like to express opposition
to banning electric assist bikes for use
in state waterfowl management areas.

**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 11/6/18

Name Brian Westover Phone Number 801 718 2678

Address 504 W 1100 N P.O., UT 84062

Who are you representing? self group _____

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no _____

Which agenda topic? Waterfowl

COMMENTS I think the proposal to restrict electric assisted

bikes on the WMA's is ill-advised. This is a great tool

for appropriate ^{and site} access to use the resource for hunting

opportunity. Would like to understand why this is even being considered

**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 11-6-2018

Name Matt Clark Phone Number 801-836-7063

Address 968 Fir Ave

Who are you representing? self group Utah Waterfowl Association

Would you like to address the RAC today? yes no

Which agenda topic? Waterfowl

COMMENTS Supporting DWR recommendations

**Note – You will have a maximum of three minutes per individual and five minutes per group to address the RAC.

Northern Regional Advisory Council
November 7, 2018
Brigham City Community Center
Brigham City, Utah

Draft Meeting Minutes

Meeting Begins: 6:01 p.m.

RAC Present

John Blazzard- Agric.
Paul Chase- Forest Service
David Earl- Agric
Christopher Hoagstrom- Noncon.
Randy Hutchison- At Large
Aaron Johnson-Sportsman
Matt Klar- At Large
Mike Laughter- Sportsman
Kevin McLeod- At Large
Justin Oliver- At Large
Kristin Purdy- Noncon.
Mellissa Wood- BLM

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Justin Dolling
Erica Savage
Dave Rich
Jim Christensen
Chad Wilson
Krystal Tucker
Jordan Hastings
Jace Taylor
Justin Shannon
Mike Wardle
Devan Christensen
Kent Hersey
Covy Jones
Scott Walker
Eric Anderson
Blair Stringham
Bryan Christensen
Lindy Varney
Chad Cranney
Rich Hansen

Wildlife Board

Byron Bateman

RAC Excused

Bryce Thurgood- Chair

RAC Unexcused

Chad Jensen- Elected
Darren Perry- Shoshone Nation

Agenda:

Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
Approval of Agenda and Sept 5, 2018 Minutes
Wildlife Board Update
Regional Update
Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation
Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan
Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan
Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments
CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019
R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments
Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019

Item 1. Approval of Agenda

Justin Oliver- Vice Chair

Agenda Approved

Item 2. Approval of Sept 5, 2018 Minutes

Justin Oliver- Vice Chair

Minutes approved as circulated.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Justin Dolling- Regional Supervisor

Fishing Guidebook and Rule- First motion on the fishing guidebook and rule was to have the division look into the possibility of designating fishing areas to artificial flies and lures only, to have increased license requirements and fees and to bring information back during the next recommendation cycle which passed 4 to 2. The second motion was to keep the artificial flies and lure restrictions on UM Creek, East Fork of the Sevier and Mammoth Creek and raise the limit on UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier to 4 fish which passed unanimous. The third motion was to approve the remainder of the 2019-2020 fishing guidebook and rule R657-13 as presented by the division which was passed unanimously. Central Region Deer Management Plans- Motion to accept the management plans as presented and that also passed unanimously.

Item 4. Regional Update

- Justin Dolling, Regional Supervisor

Law Enforcement- They reported a quieter hunt this year than normal during big game season. May be due to the way the general season hunt was split up. Swan patrol saturation scheduled for the middle of November. New officer to Weber/Davis district: Brock Thornley.

Habitat- Reseeding fire scars: Goose Creek and Coldwater WMA. Installed deep water habitat fish structures at Pineview to provide habitat for pan fish. Working with the Central Region on the I-80 wildlife over pass near Parley's Summit.

Great Salt Lake Project- Harold Crane rebuilt dikes. Swans are starting to arrive, primarily around Bear River bay area going south. Pheasant releases will continue through November, about 600 pheasants per week. Waterfowl management areas obtained Marsh Masters. Brine Shrimp companies have harvested over 15 million pound cysts which is down a little from previous years.

Aquatics- Gill netting Lost Creek, Bear Lake and Willard. The Lost Creek road from the mouth, up to the reservoir has been repaved. Hyrum is fishing well for rainbow, perch and largemouth bass.

Wildlife Section- Starting deer classifications soon. Urban turkey drop netting efforts up in Cache Valley. Hardware Range trapping elk for disease testing.

Outreach Section- Assisting with beginners pheasant hunt at Ogden Bay on November 10th which is a combination effort with the DWR and SFW. Conducting advance decoy seminar at Farmington Bay on November 27th.

Item 5. Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation

- Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

See RAC Packet

Item 6. Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan

- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Paul Chase- What is your definition of a population in regards to this augmentation?

Jace Taylor- For this list, we have places that we have large status populations. Since about the last 10 years, we have received those numbers. I don't think we have a defined population, there are just goats in that area that we are using it.

Kristin Purdy- What are the reasons behind the trend that hunters are taking nannies instead of Billy's?

Jace Taylor- Part of it could be that maybe it is more acceptable socially. The time we started seeing that come down, where there were fewer Billy's, was the same time we offered nanny permits. It is becoming harder and harder to get permits, people become more desperate and that this will be their only opportunity to hunt them.

Kristin Purdy- This is a OIAL hunt and couldn't there be a question on the survey asking why you took a nanny instead of a Billy? Is that a reasonable thing to dig in to?

Jace Taylor- It's not a bad idea.

Kristin Purdy- If we want to encourage hunters to take Billy's, wouldn't it be a good idea why they are not.

Jace Taylor- That's a great idea. In places we are concerned about being too many nannies taken, we could look into that. That would be helpful information.

Randy Hutchison- Does the desire to increase hunting permits also corresponds with the population dropping between 2,100?

Jace Taylor- If we can harvest the right animals is part of the concern with requiring the orientation course. There are places where we have populations decreasing and have no interest in increasing permits. It is not going to be a blanket for every unit in the state. It gives the biologist the opportunity to use it when they think it is appropriate.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- In support of this recommendation.

Greg Bird- Utah Wild Sheep- We support this recommendation.

Bret Selman- Utah Wool Growers- Support this recommendation.

Troy Forest- Utah Department of Agriculture- I think it is a good plan. In support of this recommendation.

RAC Comment

Paul Chase- Forest Service support this plan but would like to add a few things. First, putting definitions in there for introduction, augmentation and populations. When you get to the individual plans, we would like to make sure we are at the table to help develop those. We are only allowed to put native species into wilderness areas, we would like to say that goats are native and specifically to these wilderness areas.

Mellissa Wood- The BLM also supports the plan but like Paul mentioned, there are some things that could use clarification. I support those things Paul talked about. BLM also has requirements for native species and wilderness areas. Making sure the division has information and data on that and could be included in the plan, I think that would really help the federal agencies be better partners in any reintroductions.

John Blazzard- It raised my eyebrows when I heard the increase in the permits to 45% when we are at a low number now. It doesn't make a lot of sense to augment a population if you are going to kill the animals you spent money on bringing down. I think we need to be careful before we increase those permits just for the sake of opportunity. If we do this for goats, why not for moose also?

Motion

Motion- John Blazzard- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented with the consideration of the Forest Service and BLM. Define Mountain Goat is a native species, address their concerns. Define Augmentation and Introduction and also define the meaning of population.

Aaron Johnson- Are the changes they are talking about, would they require us to vote on them or are they minor enough that you could add those things to your plan?

Jace Taylor- Are you asking if these three changes are minor enough to go ahead and change them?

Aaron Johnson-Yes.

Jace Taylor- If you guys voted and approved to recommend to accept the plan as it is with those additions, that is one option you have. I think that the unit management plans have language that we would incorporate the federal land management. We do not have a definition about augmentation vs. introduction. We don't have that they are native to

wilderness areas. I think that is for you to decide if you want to approve the plan without requiring those or if you think it would only be approved with those. That is for you to decide.

Aaron Johnson- If we approve the plan as Mr. Blazzard has proposed, could we ask for consideration to develop these definitions we are looking for and add them. Would that be ok if they added it next year?

Mike Laughter- I think this is for a 10 year plan.

Aaron Johnson-Correct, but they can make changes in the 10 years.

Jace Taylor- Maybe you could give us a deadline and say if these are incorporated by the board meeting, that might be an option.

Justin Oliver- The easiest way is if John would re-state your motion that we accept the divisions proposal as presented with the consideration and the definition of augmentation vs. introduction and population of mountain goat.

John Blazzard- That would be fine. I want to make sure we are specific on what those are. I assume when this comes to the wildlife board, that could be presented.

Justin Oliver- Yes.

John Blazzard- I will add that to my motion. If you will name those 4 things again.

Justin Oliver- The motion would be to accept as presented and include that we address the Forest Service and BLM concerns defining augmentation and reintroduction and population.

Paul Chase- That is for the definition part. We just want identification of that native species, specifically in the wilderness areas identified for reintroduction.

Justin Oliver- Do I need to repeat it again?

Second: Christopher Hoagstrom

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Item 7. Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Mellissa Wood- There's only one citation in the background about habitat. Is there really only one scientific article about habitat of big horn sheep.

Jace Taylor- There are lots. We have a great relationship with the Universities and have done a lot of work for habitat that is most appropriate.

Justin Oliver- Has there been instances where they have had sheep get in with a ram or a wild sheep get in with domestic sheep where you feel like it would have saved a herd or saved a group.

Jace Taylor- It is hard to say but big horn sheep have come in contact with domestic sheep in the past. There have been times where we show up too late in order to get those animals. We will spend a lot of times looking for it and are sometimes successful and sometimes not.

Justin Oliver- It is worth taking the animal out than letting it get back in there.

Jace Taylor- Yes, it is worth it to us. The threat it poses to the herd can be huge. It takes one animal coming back and bringing bacteria which can spread quickly.

Justin Oliver- If that did take place, the animal would be taken by the division.

Jace Taylor- Yes, absolutely. There is strict protocol in place. That would be a whole other process. Just because we approve the plan today, it would most likely come back and you would see it again before anything happens.

Paul Chase- You had a list of possible introduction sites with Wellsville Mountains being one of them. Do you have concerns with domestic sheep on the north end of that?

Jace Taylor- Yes. If the sites are on the reintroduction list, it is because they are not 100% appropriate yet. If everything was good to go and we could put animals on their safely, they would already be on that augmentation list and there would be animals there already. All of those sites still have things that need to be worked through. It was different members of the committee or biologists that brought instances up.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- I am very pleased with this. It has brought Agriculture and Wildlife together. Urge you to support this plan.

Bret Selman- Utah Wool Growers- This is something I think the state can stand behind. The sheep producers in the state can gain some trust from this plan. Mold a better relationship between Agriculture and Wildlife even better than in the past. Urge you to vote in favor of this plan.

Wade Garrett- Utah Farm Bureau- Support this plan. Letter with concerns about location.

Greg Bird- Utah Wild Sheep Foundation- Unique opportunity to watch this come together. Wording gone through carefully to protect everyone's interest. I support this and hope you will also.

Troy Forest- Utah Department of Agriculture- It is a good plan and gives livestock and sportsman to manage these species. Support this plan.

RAC Comment

Kristin Purdy- In the sheep management plan, one of the concerns listed for the population was the possibility of poaching. Is there any evidence of poaching events?

Jace Taylor- Yes, we have had events that our law enforcement have handled. It is not common but it has happened.

Justin Oliver- I am impressed to sit here and have all these groups here and hear they are all on the same page. Commend everyone who put this management plan together.

Motion

Motion-Aaron Johnson-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented.

Second- Mike Laughter

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 8. Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Troy Justensen- In the current elk management plan, it is broken down in percentages as far as weapon types. 60% rifle, 25% archery and 15% muzzleloader. If we are to create a new hunt, say a late archery hunt, is there any way those tags can be an addition or is it automatically held to those percentages?

Covy Jones- There is some flexibility in the plan. We are able to adjust those to accomplish different management goals. As far as a blanket wide, it is probably something we would have to address.

Troy Justensen- As far as changing those percentages and the hunt calendar. Is that something that would need to go through the elk plan as it comes up or is that something that can be done in the meantime?

Covy Jones- There is a lot of flexibility in the plan. Whenever we make changes like that I feel more comfortable letting that go through the public process and getting input. I don't believe that specific dates are set like that in the plan.

Troy Justensen- Lindy provided a number last night of total applicants. Do you remember what that number was?

Covy Jones- Let's ask Lindy.

Lindy Varney- For 2018, we had 494,000 total applicants. It s an increase of 7% from last year.

Troy Justensen- What is the total number of permits increase?

Lindy Varney- That I would have to look up.

Covy Jones- It is a lot every year. It is about 7%.

Troy Justensen-We have created a product that is in high demand. It is important for us to figure out ways to give people opportunity.

Covy Jones- You are saying that we need to find creative ways by season structure to offer more opportunity and still maintain the quality of the resource.

Travis Hobbs- Curious if anyone can tell me why we allow non-residents to apply for all species and residents have to pick? I think a lot of people aren't even aware of this.

Covy Jones- The draws are so low for non-residents. It does not impact residents at all. Because the draws are so low for any one species, we saw them really fall off. They didn't want to apply anymore. As they fell off, we came up with innovative ways. For any one species, it actually decreases their own odds but what they are hoping is a cross species will increase an individual's odds.

Travis Hobbs- It would seem like it hurts the odds. I get a lot of heartburn from residents asking. I'm not sure how that works when someone moves out of Utah. If I build up and retain bonus points, I could just go through and draw. That is happening. People are literally doing that. I was just curious if there was a reason?

Covy Jones- That's the biggest reason. I think as residents, we don't want that because it will decrease our odds.

Travis Hobbs- I would be strongly opposed to that. Is \$10 to apply the same for non-residents as a resident?

Covy Jones- All application fees are \$10.

Travis Hobbs- Have we ever considered that we really ought to adjust that? Most of the states right now are double to triple that I apply for elsewhere. I am wondering why we are not taking advantage of non-residents? Wyoming increased their general season elk tag to \$800. Demand did not change so why don't we take advantage of some of that? Do you guys have any plans to reduce point creep?

Covy Jones- Going back to your question about non-residents, we do capture costs in their license fee. They do have to buy a license to apply. Maybe it should be more but I am the wrong guy to ask that. Maybe we need to look at that again. As far as point creep, we focus on how to address this and provide opportunity. This last year, for deer, we brought around a different draw system. The whole reason that was implemented was to address this very issue of point creep.

Travis Hobbs- I was curious if there would be interest from the division to get a few of the sportsman groups together and come up with some ways to address this over the next few years. I think it is a problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later. It is getting worse.

Covy Jones- I think that is a great idea. There are three ways to do it. One is to increase populations, another is to manage for less quality and the final one is to have lower success rates. Those are the three main ways to increase opportunity and address point creep. You can come up with a million different strategies to accomplish one of those three. I would love to sit down with sportsman and address this. It is a great idea.

Travis Hobbs-. Are you aware of the problem of applying multiple years on one license with non-residents? Does the council and everyone across the board know what is happening there?

Covy Jones- Yes, you have the ability to buy a license mid-year. When you hit the application period, you can buy another one. Lindy, do you want to address that. The 365 day license, you can buy a license in the middle of the application period.

Lindy Varney- That was done intentionally in 2008 when it was put into place. We starting requiring people to have a hunting or combination license to apply for permit. Non-residents don't come to Utah every year to hunt or fish. We still want them to contribute to habitat and grow these animals they want to come hunt in 5-10 years from now. One way we work with our legislators is to allow them to use it twice in one license for 2 years.

Covy Jones- It is not just non-residents that do it, it is residents too.

Travis Hobbs- It doesn't make financial sense.

RAC Questions

Aaron Johnson- I received a letter from a sportsman concerned about extended archery date. They are in favor of it but their concern is that it is becoming more of a trophy hunt than a depredation hunt. What thoughts have gone into that? Have you considered a doe hunt only if the purpose of extended archery is to depredate problem deer?

Covy Jones- We have thought about that and some areas that we were going to recommend extended archery, we went with antlerless rifle hunts. In some areas that does not work. I think the truth is that you're right. A lot of Salt Lake County where you don't have the opportunity to harvest a buck or bull with anything else but a bow, it has turned into a trophy hunt. One of the benefits is harvest and the other is having sportsman chasing those animals does push them away. We just don't have the conflict that we have in Utah County. We might not get as much harvest out of it but just pushing them back out of the cities is part of it.

Public Comment

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the divisions recommendations with the following exceptions: Reestablish Barney top elk unit but include Canaan Mountain and the Kaparowitz sheep unit. Our original plan was to propose this as a primitive weapon unit meaning we would have an archery hunt and a primitive muzzleloader hunt. It was brought to our attention that we could not do that with the current definition of a muzzleloader within the guidebook. Until we can get that change, we would like to create this Barney top unit and have it as an archery only unit. Elk

numbers are relatively low on this unit. We would like to start out with archery and muzzleloader. As elk numbers grow, we can look at adding rifle. We would like to ask the division to create a definition of traditional muzzleloader or primitive weapon. We would like to recommend a late season archery hunt to fall over the Thanksgiving weekend, an all limited entry bull units. Biologists feel the success rate this time of year would be under 10%. This would give opportunity to keep bulls higher on the mountain and provide opportunity without impacting the resource. We would also like the council to address Mount Dutton. It winters several different herds and we ask that we do away with the late rifle on that Boulder Mountain unit. We were going to recommend a late November muzzleloader deer hunt on the Kaparowitz sheep unit, South San Juan sheep unit and the Green River unit. But we can't address that until we get that rule changed.

Greg Bird- Utah Wild Sheep Foundation- Agree with the proposal from the division. We also agree with SFW's recommendations on the primitive weapon hunts and doing away with late season Boulder. We recommend that we add 2 new archery only sheep units. This has been brought through the RAC twice now and has been accepted. Was asked to be put on hold until it went through the sheep planning committee. There was a request for a survey from sportsman. Both have been done and the survey showed support for this concept. Big horn sheep committee also had support for this. We recommend adding an archery only Newfoundland Mountain California Big Horn sheep hunt and a Zion Dessert Big Horn sheep hunt. This would be in addition to the permit numbers already on these units. This would address point creep, give additional opportunity for a different type of hunt.

Kevin Norman- Support SFW and the sheep foundations recommendations. As far as point creep goes, Covy mentioned three things that can address it. For me, I would rather see lower success. I think the best way to lower success is to look at season dates and move rifle hunt out of the rut. People would appreciate the opportunity to be able to get out and hunt, even if they are unsuccessful. Urge the committee to have the wildlife board look into and recommend moving season dates.

Travis Hobbs- I would really like to see this council make a recommendation to the wildlife board to encourage a license purchase every year. Especially from residents. On the non-residents, I would like to see them purchase a combination hunting and fishing license. Colorado, Wyoming and Arizona all have a fishing license figured into the purchase of a non-resident hunting license. We should take full advantage of that. I would also like to see non-resident prices increase. We have the quality here, the price should be adjusted accordingly. On the application fees, lets lower resident application fees and raise non-residents. That is what all the other states do. I would also like to support the recommendation from the sheep foundation and SFW. I really think opportunity has got to increase. This point creep is out of hand and it concerns me. We ought to look at residents not being able to apply for OIAL and limited entry.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- Appreciate comments from sportsmen. There are a lot of good points brought up. The other states charge a lot more money to apply or hunt out of state. Considering an increase in costs would be something to look at. The archery hunts proposed, they were introduced last year and were voted down at the wildlife board. How many permits are we looking at?

Covy Jones- I can't answer that right now.

Troy Justensen-Can I ask them? Are you looking at 10 permits or 2-3, just so I have an idea? Or, do you want them to decide?

Aaron Johnson- We will leave it up to the division. We are not asking for a set number. Whatever the unit can handle. We put dates on there but would leave it up to the biologist. We want it to be a hunt, not a selection process.

Justin Oliver- It is pretty clear that the major concern is just trying to make sure everyone has opportunity. There is a fourth option and that is to blow the whole system up and no longer have points.

Travis Hobbs- In audible. (?)

Justin Oliver- In my opinion, that is another option that needs to be looked at. It is only going to get worse unless we do something. We are looking for opportunity and I think those waiting 20-30 years, when they draw, they are expecting something big. I like what everyone has said and I would encourage the division to look at these and involve the public. As far as OIAL archery hunts brought up, it was discouraging as a RAC member to watch it go through and pass and then didn't go through the wildlife board.

Kevin McLeod- These recommendations from these organizations, is this the first you have heard them tonight?

Covy Jones- No, we had a RAC meeting last night.

Kevin McLeod- There has got to be a reason that it has not been adopted to be made part of the plan.

Covy Jones- Last year, when we brought forward hunt dates and season structure, we brought forward quite a few big changes. One of them was multi-season elk and a few other big changes. I realize, at that point, it is one thing to be heavily involved and have a lot of change and be able to digest that and understand that. It is another thing to be our

average hunter and see all these changes coming at them and say "this is just too much". This year, the big change was adding quite a few extended archery units. Part of that is making sure we change at the rate our public can absorb. There are a lot of good ideas in front of you. Sometimes, at these meetings where the seed gets planted and the public has the time to digest and decide if it is a good idea. Maybe it is not a bad thing that we have heard the archery only hunts 3 times. Maybe that is the amount of time for our public to hear and digest and accept. I have heard this before and I worry about opportunity and point creep.

Kevin McLeod- On point creep and cost of out of state permits, I know you look at that. I am a 46 year recipient of a San Juan elk ridge permit and I didn't kill an elk. Took me 46 years to draw that. Did I expect to go and shoot a big bull, I did but I didn't find one so I didn't kill a bull and I'm fine with that. It is a challenge for you to manage point creep. Maybe doing away with it is the way to go.

Covy Jones- Not only are we managing point creep but also expectations. After you have waited that long, you have an expectation.

John Blazzard- We talked about boundary on the south slope bonanza. I know this has been discussed before but a lot of people who live in the Kamas area have hunted the soapstone area as part of the Kamas unit. There is a small finger of the south slope bonanza that comes down to the north fork of the Provo river. It is a narrow strip of ground. I would like you to look at that. Move the south slope bonanza diamond mountain unit which goes a way and move to the north fork of the Duchesne. We talk about opportunity but the opportunities presented are always for archery hunters. A lot of people cannot hunt archery who are left with regular hunts. Whenever we do the big game management plan, I think that would be the time to put these in. That would give you time to analyze. A comment was made tonight to not allow late hunts for elk because they shoot them too far away. There are a lot of people in Utah who cannot hunt with a bow.

Justin Oliver- You are still helping rifle hunters because these 5 guys to hunt the archery hunt are no longer in the pool for that rifle hunt. Or, they burn through their points, they are no longer competing against you. Their odds are so much less because one of those 5 guys will probably kill that bull or ram that the rifle hunters are going after. You are creating more permits but not taking as many animals. I see that it benefits everyone that way. I see what you are saying.

John Blazzard- Except when you talk about hunting elk into the first part of December. Those elk are migrating down. I am not trying to cause trouble. I just want you to think that sometimes there are other hunters out there besides archery hunters.

Aaron Johnson- I think the late season archery elk hunt on all units is a big pill to swallow. I think it is a great idea but probably needs to be discussed more. I respect the sportsman groups trying to conserve animals. I agree with Justin about the archery. If you took 10% out of the big horn sheep draw and put in for just this archery hunt, that helps the other 90% with point creep a little bit. I voted for it last year and I really like the addition of the hunt. There are some good ideas here and I hope Covy and whoever is on these boards make notes and talk about them all in the future.

Kevin McLeod- We talk about opportunity and when we have got equipment that are allowed to use that shoot an animal at 1,500 yards, to me that is not hunting. I could have probably killed a bull on the San Juan if I shot it at 1,500 yards. I agree with the opportunity and like a lot of these ideas. On this side of the spectrum, we are looking at killing animals that you should not even be trying to kill. I trust these biologists and they work through it all the time. I like these sportsman groups because I think they bring up a lot of good points and are passionate about it. I agree with what Covy said about being careful on overloading the system with all of this. We put pressure on these animals from August to January. Sometimes I wonder about going back to general hunts and do away with special times because we never leave those animals alone.

Motion

Motion- Kevin McLeod- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented.

Discussion on the Motion

Justin Oliver- I believe that is kind of what they are asking for.

Kevin McLeod- My motion is to accept as presented with the caveat that a committee be created in the future, before these RAC meetings, to discuss these issues with the sportsman groups and be more in agreement or ready to present that at the meetings as a total plan.

Aaron Johnson- I think this is exactly the time to do this. No one has asked us to change a management plan but every year they set tag numbers and make different hunts. That is all the sportsman groups are doing it talking about taking away a hunt here or there. They are not asking to change any management plans or strategies. They are asking for a different opportunity. I wish it was all done behind closed doors. I think there is a better way that the division and

sportsman groups can come up with to do in the future. But this is exactly what this RAC process is for. Some of these committees only meet every ten years. This is the time to discuss some of these hunts and get some input from the biologist and the other people and decide as a RAC whether we want to pursue it or not.

Justin Oliver- This is the appropriate place to present this. When they decide to create a sheep, deer and elk plan, if they wanted to put together a plan to explore these dates, what would that process be?

Covy Jones- Explore the dates? There is a couple different things. There has been a couple of things asked to do. One is to form a committee with sportsmen to address point creep and hunting opportunities. A lot of the SFW recommendation was to address some of those issues. We are willing to do that as an agency. In this process, when Troy comes with a different recommendation than the division, it is ok to put it through this process and see where it lands. It can be hard, as a biologist, to realize that we are not the decision makers. We make recommendations and put those through the public process and that allows others to also bring their perspectives and make recommendations as well. I caution how much change there is. There are things here worth discussing. I don't know that we need to form a committee before making recommendations. I don't know if that will help.

Melissa Wood- We are still discussing the motion.

Mike Laughter- I really appreciate the input from sportsman groups. To assume that this was done on the way here in the truck. This is the third year. If the biologist support this, I'm sure Troy has talked to the biologist. I don't have a problem coming through the RAC and having these discussions. Where else do you take it?

Randy Hutchison- Even if there is a 10 year plan, that doesn't preclude the division from setting new hunts right?

Covy Jones- No, the plan doesn't go into the detail of that. It is more how we will manage but not whether we can have a hunt. It encourages us to use different hunting strategies. It depends on the plan and the species.

Christopher Hoagstrom- I think we have seen this a couple of times and I have been on the board with these issues that keep coming up. I think it would help me and maybe others if you could tell us why it isn't in the plan? Maybe it is not the highest priority.

Covy Jones- We have to distinguish between annual recommendations and the plan. We make annual recommendations that vary and they are in accordance with the plan. A lot of this is an annual recommendation. It really has less to do with the plan and more to do with an annual recommendation. Some of the reasons why is because it is a lot of change. We decided the things we wanted to focus on this year as an agency. That does not mean there are things that we missed. The archery only OIAL hunts, that was not in the plan but we re-wrote the statewide sheep plan and the committee felt it was important to include that we could use different weapon types to improve opportunity. It actually is in the plan. We recommended it for mountain goats on the Nebo but that is as far as we went this year as an agency.

John Blazzard- In this plan that was presented, there was a OIAL archery hunt included for goats right? After reviewing this, if it is a viable thing that the division can support when they come to us this next year, why don't they have this in the plan so we can vote on it after they have reviewed it?

Melissa Wood- I think it is not in the plan because they don't support it right? There are things you disagree on?

Troy Justensen- Can I address this?

Melissa Wood- I'm confused.

Covy Jones- Troy discussed this with the biologists and they felt like it was something they could support and work through. But we did not make those recommendations. That is specifically for the OIAL sheep units on the Zion and Newfoundlands.

Second- John Blazzard

Justin Oliver- The motion is to accept as presented. There were so many things that were addressed as far as late seasons. I am still a little confused. We talked about dates, looking at changing some dates. Another one was the OIAL archery. I would like to see some of those things put into the motion.

Aaron Johnson- Any time we have these suggestions come up and there is different opinions, it would be smart as a RAC to look at them individually and vote yes or no and then vote on the remainder of the divisions plan. Instead of just trying to get it swept through. There are a lot of things that could stand to be voted on individually and see if we like that particular suggestion.

David Earl- We have a motion and a second, let's move on that motion.

Justin Oliver- We can comment on it but we are going to vote on it now.

Motion Passes- For: 7 Against: 4

Aaron Johnson- I think there was enough talk from sportsman groups that fits within the plan and should have voted on some of these individual items. I don't support all of them but would have liked to make a motion to support some of them. Some of these things probably should be implemented.

Mellissa Wood- I think the exact same thing. We voted for some of these last year and supported them so I am not sure why we are not supporting them again this year. There has been no new information provided that leads me to believe that our vote should be any different than it was.

Mike Laughter- This is where the public comes to be heard and give opinions. We need to consider that every time. The sportsmen spoke and had some valid issues and great ideas. It warranted some discussion and maybe asking the wildlife board to look at them again.

Paul Chase- I agree with the previous comments. We had enough information on sheep permits. I would like to see the state look at the balance and bring those recommendations back next year.

Justin Oliver- I can't vote but agree with Mellissa. I was disappointed last year when it did pass unanimously through all 5 RAC's. When I addressed it to our chairman and the wildlife board, I did not get the courtesy of having my email returned. I felt like we were not listened to.

Item 9. CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Comment

Larry Whitaker- I understand there is a specific policy for establishing a CWMU. Last year, I had a question on a unit that was created and posted. I had assurances from Mr. Jones and 3-4 officers that they would review this and would get back to me. They took my name and phone number but didn't hear anything from anyone. I spoke with Bryce Thurgood, he told me to write everything down. I have your proclamation and you are big on how many public private acres we have in CWMU's. But you failed to tell us how many acres in the CWMU's belong to the public, not the private landowner. Last year I asked about the acreage involved in the Twin Peaks and meadow creek. It doesn't meet the criteria of this new Meadow Creek that you are creating. In the proclamation, it is a new unit this year. I know and you know it was posted a year ago. Also, we questioned why 2 public permits were now going to be available to the public because they had created the unit. Now you are turning around and are cutting another one to the public out of the North Peak unit. I am wondering why we are wasting our time if I can't get these answers. I am angry. Mr. Jones, is there a specific reason you never followed up? How do you make rules for a CWMU and then immediately grandfather it in when it does not meet the criteria?

Justin Oliver- When you are talking Mr. Jones, are you talking the big game coordinator?

Larry Whitaker- I don't know if you remember me or not?

Justin Oliver- I apologize.

Larry Whitaker- You even guarantee you would.

Justin Oliver- I do not remember. I still question if that wasn't me?

Justin Dolling- I assure you that we will have someone follow up with you. I apologize that we did not get back to you sooner.

Gary Webb- North Peak Cooperative Unit- The landowners in the North Peak Cooperative unit made a late change to the size of the unit. They added another 4,500 private acres. We were not able to get to the division in time to ask for an additional bull elk permit. We are asking to increase the size by about 20% private acres.

Justin Oliver- Has that been brought up to you Mike?

Mike Wardle-Yes, we are supportive of that request. That is on top of what was in my power point.

Justin Oliver- That is one additional but does meet within everything.

Mike Wardle- Yes.

Gary Webb- Makes is approximately 40,000 private acres.

Todd Black- Mountain Meadow CWMU- We missed a deadline also. Mountain Meadow CWMU asking to accept the division recommendations and modify our COR. We would like to change the season dates. Right now, it is September 10-November 10. We want to move those back to the other option which is September 1-October 31. Based on some classification and data, we would like to reduce our overall number of permits from 18 and 2, to 9 and 1. Our biologists are accepting and supportive of those changes.

Mike Wardle- We have an August 1st deadline for CWMU change applications. These were ones that came in later and we felt it was better to have them come and request this here. We are supportive of these changes.

Justin Oliver-Both of those were in the presentation already?

Mike Wardle- No, these came to us after the RAC table had been submitted.

RAC Comment

Mellissa Wood- Support the two land managers that came up and talked. Deadlines are for a reason but if biologists are supporting these, I think we should as well.

Justin Oliver- They are going through the proper avenues. I would agree with that.

Motion-Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept 1 additional bull elk permit to North Peak CWMU

Second- Matt Klar

Motion Passes-Unanimous

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the late application from the Mountain Meadows CWMU. Change dates from 9-10 through 11-10 to 9-1 through 10-31 and reduction of permits from 18 private and 2 public to 9 private and 1 public.

Second- Kevin McLeod

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Motion-Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019 recommendations as presented.

Second- Matt Klar

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Item 10. R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator

See RAC Packet

RAC Questions

Mellissa Wood- Before they draw a permit, they have to have 8 hours of service?

Bryan Christensen- They draw a place in the program and then start doing service and then they can get their permit.

Now, they draw a place in the program and can get that first permit.

Mellissa Wood- Got it, thank you.

RAC Comment

Mellissa Wood- This makes a lot of sense.

Motion

Motion-Mike Laughter-Recommend the Wildlife Board accept R657-38 Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented.

Second- Mellissa Wood

Motion Passes- Unanimous

Item 11. Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019

- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

See RAC Packet

Public Questions

Duane Bush- Have you had any problems with electric bikes out at Farmington or at any of the WMA's?

Blair Stringham- No documented incidents with electric bikes to date, it has been more to align our rule with other forms of transportation. That is really the reason for the change.

Troy Justensen- What is the purpose for this? Just to align with other rules?

Blair Stringham- Yes, we have seen technology changing a bit over the last decade or so. A lot of different contraptions people are bringing out to WMA's. These are going to grow in popularity. We are trying to find ways to fit them in to the things we are doing on our WMA's on a day to day basis. We had not allowed motorized vehicles behind gates of WMA's.

Troy Justensen- If you put a restriction on it and requiring that they could not get off the dike, is that something you would consider. Are you more comfortable having an all together ban?

Blair Stringham- We figured it would be easiest to just draw the line in the sand with no e-bikes at all. Probably our biggest thing is to try and reduce damage off the roads. There are probably ways to look at accommodating e-bikes.

Troy Justensen- A lot of what happened tonight, happened last night. What are these RAC's for? My understanding was this was a place to come to hear input and also to give input and put forth ideas. What is the purpose of these RAC's?

Justin Shannon- From my perspective, we have a wildlife board that is a decision making body. In a lot of states, when recommendations are taken to those boards, they are taken directly to that board. In Utah, they have 5 RAC's that flush through ideas and work through the different pros and cons of proposals. When the information gets to the wildlife board, they know how everyone feels and they can have some more information. When we have an item on the agenda, as a season date or hunt boundary, it is to decide if that should be approved. The RAC's help the wildlife board make better decisions.

Troy Justensen- Are we doing it wrong? We come up with an idea and put it through the division and local biologists and bring it here. Should we be doing something different?

Justin Shannon- I don't know if I have all the answers because there are two sides to this. This is a chance to talk about the agenda items. We appreciate working with any group that wants to run ideas. If the division feels comfortable to include it in our own recommendation then it is easier for RAC members. If proposals are brought forward, sometimes it may be the first time RAC members are reading it. That is probably one of the weaknesses of the process we have. If items are brought up for the first time, there may be people who really care about that item but did not know it was going to be discussed. I don't know if I have a perfect answer. For the RAC members, I think they are doing a good job on wading through the recommendations to the extent they can. I don't know of any process that is perfect.

Troy Justensen- I appreciate you guys. I am frustrated in the process not in you all as individuals.

Ryan Wicknick- What was the original purpose in banning motorized vehicles from WMA's.

Blair Stringham- To improve the quality of hunting by providing access to our WMA's. Sometimes it moves birds of the property and quality goes down significantly. We are trying to maintain access in as many forms as possible without affecting wildlife.

Ryan Wicknick- In the WMA's, there is no airboats?

Blair Stringham- Right, we feel like there are some things that probably should be excluded from our properties.

Ryan Wicknick- Mountain bikes are ok?

Blair Stringham-Yes.

R. J. Guiney- Have you had complaints about air boats because don't they launch through the WMA to get to where they can hunt?

Blair Stringham- Not so much with airboats. A lot of these decisions were made prior to my time. I can't tell you exactly why a lot of them were established. We try to provide as much access as we can. We have some ATV trails to try and accommodate as many people as we can.

RAC Questions

Mellissa Wood- What forms of transportation are allowed on a WMA?

Blair Stringham- Depending on the area, most allow mud motor type boats with long shafts to access ponds. We do have some ponds closed off to basically any form of motor. Our closed gates a closed to any form of motorized transportation. Foot traffic is allowed almost everywhere.

Mellissa Wood- Are horses allowed?

Blair Stringham- I believe they are on most parts of our WMA's.

Mellissa Wood- You mentioned that there are some WMA's that have ATV trails. Can you talk a little bit more about how those were decided?

Blair Stringham- A lot of that came from input from the public that wanted areas that would be easy to access for people that wanted to use those. There were a couple of those designed on our WMA to allow people to drive their ATV's and hunt.

Mellissa Wood- Do you ever have people with disabilities that come in and want to use those ATV's to hunt because they cannot access it another way?

Blair Stringham- Not sure about those specific trails. We did set up some trails to accommodate those with challenges like that.

Mellissa Wood- Is there ever a case where you would not recommend the highest bag limit or day length allowed. Would there be any species of concern or conservation efforts that we may be trying where you would not want to allow that.

Blair Stringham- There may be some specific situations but nothing I can think of offhand. By the time we get to where we can select our highest bag limit, it has already gone through the process where everyone is comfortable with that harvest level. If species goes down, so does the bag limit.

Mellissa Wood- That is a collaborative process. Is there public input allowed in that process?

Blair Stringham- There is, a collection of all the states. Anywhere from Alaska, down to Arizona. All the states put together a recommendation and receive public input.

Kevin McLeod- Has there been any thought or consideration to an early goose hunt?

Blair Stringham- We have talked a little about that. One of the challenges is that most of the geese occur on private lands during the September time period. We see that most of our goose harvest is on opening weekend and not really again until mid-January. We feel like if we did go to that type of hunt, it would mostly be for private lands. It would reduce the days the average hunter could hunt geese.

Kevin McLeod- If you had an early goose hunt, it would have to be part of that 107 days.

Blair Stringham- Yes, those days would be taken up.

Mellissa Wood- Do you know if there is a way to turn off motors on e-bikes?

Blair Stringham- There is.

Public Comment

R. Jefre Hicks- Utah Waterfowl Association- We support the recommendations the DWR is making. E-bikes is something we have discussed at length and are mostly concerned with the protection of sensitive wetland habitats from wheeled motorized vehicles. Without certain rules and parameters, these bikes are not going to be capable of staying within a safe spot. Wheeled vehicles do damage and last for decades. They have increased 83% in sales in the last 12 months. 20 states regulate them as motorized vehicles, just like a car or motorcycle.

Duane Bush- (handout given) Last 4 years, I have been riding an e-bike. There are some myths about e-bikes. They have to be pedaled. They can be regulated. My average speed on my e-bike is about 15 MPH. Average e-bike rider is 45-65 years old. These are the furthest from a motorcycle or ATV. You get a little assist. It helps spread the pressure out. No impact environmentally. No difference between mountain bike and e-bike.

Justin Oliver for Dustin Carlson- Oppose the E -Bike ban.

Justin Oliver for Brian Westover- Oppose the E-bike ban. Form of access to the marsh by young and old. Nothing like an ATV or motorcycle.

R. J. Guiney- Have been using mountain bikes to hunt. It is really about access. Banning e-bikes will take away opportunity for people who can't get to places otherwise. I oppose the ban. I have never taken my e-bike off the dike. Maybe just ban e-bikes from leaving the dikes.

Micah Buzianis- Oppose ban of e-bikes. Hunt Utah as a non-resident. Hunt with an e-bike on WMA's and backcountry. They are being classified with motorized vehicles but are not like motorized vehicles. You have to pedal and the damage is same as what a mountain bike would be. Do more investigating before enforcing a ban.

Kevin Norman- Oppose ban on e-bikes. Want to ask Aaron to make a motion that would ask the wildlife board to require in the RAC process, if a group or individual requests something to be voted on, that the RAC is required to separate that and voted on that item.

Aaron Johnson- I spoke with Justin about this on the break and I think what needs to happen is a review of the Roberts Rules. A lot of these items should be voted on individually and then the remainder. I think Justin could follow up on that and then maybe a standard operating procedure if there is a ton of ideas shared, that the RAC chair or vice-chair directs us on a particular item.

Kevin Norman- I think this would help.

Aaron Johnson- I got in trouble by a biologist a few years ago and he told me that was not what this was for and he is wrong. This is exactly what this is for. This is the only time the public has a chance to come in and express it. I sit on some of the boards and a lot of stuff is done behind closed doors but not all of it.

Kevin Norman- If it went every time like it went tonight, no one would show up. This is what it is for.

Ryan Wicknick-I would like to oppose the ban on e-bikes. These guys have pretty much summed it up. It is a great way to spread people out.

David Andre- Back Country E bikes- CEO, started company 3 years ago. Designed for hunting. Donate bikes to Wishes for Warriors and Wounded Warriors. Helps people get around easier and access areas. Many clients in their 80's that have changed their lives. Hope we can oppose this law.

Travis Hobbs- Appreciate what Aaron said earlier. I drove 2 hours to come to this meeting. Not one of my concerns were brought up in your motion. If you are more interested in getting home and running motions through, maybe you ought to consider resignation. There is a whole pile of people who would love to serve on this board and listen to people.

Troy Justensen- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support the divisions recommendations but ask that the division reach out to the e-bike guys and see if there is a compromise. Important to provide access for all people. If there is no negative impact, we need to consider it.

RAC Comment

Aaron Johnson- These wildlife management areas bother me. There are so many rules the division puts on and I am not in favor in taking away someone's ability to hunt. Putting a ban on these bikes will eliminate some people from hunting. As far as the law enforcement aspect, that is their job. If they need to learn about specific bikes, that is what we pay them to do. They need to be trained on that. I would encourage the division to look into this more and come up with a better plan to control e-bikes versus banning all of them.

Mike Laughter- Is there increased maintenance on dikes due to e-bikes. Do you foresee an expense by allowing e-bikes on the dike?

Blair Stringham- I wouldn't say specific with e-bikes. It is such a small user group. We do see with other motor vehicles.

Mike Laughter- You say small today but everything you hear, this is coming.

Blair Stringham- Right, at some point, you would start to see impacts. It would probably be a lot less significant on an e-bike than an ATV.

Mike Laughter- I felt there was going to be a major impact or expense by the division to maintain bikes, I was going to recommend a permit like you need for an OHV lane. Something to help with repairs on the dikes. If that is not an issue, I got where I need to be.

Blair Stringham- I don't think damage to the dikes would be much of an issue. We would really like to have something to keep the e-bikes on the dike system. Something to regulate to keep it more like a bike than a motorized vehicle, like a class 1 type bike. That is something we could live with.

Mellissa Wood- Thank you for those who have brought up the discussions we have had and been able to address the things brought before the RAC. I think it would be helpful for the RAC to have some of these recommendations come in before the meeting. Sometimes I am not hearing it until I am sitting here and trying to understand it more. Especially, things that I am not an expert at. I would just ask and recommend that if you do have something and could get it into our hands before the meeting, that would help our discussions. Maybe that is a recommendation that we want to have as well to the board to make it easier for that to happen or to help facilitate that better. Hunting has decreased through the entire country. We are seeing a sharp decrease in hunters going out and that is our money for conservation. I like what Aaron said that our hunters are our conservationists. It is important to have tools that enable older or disabled people with some non-motorized means so they can access areas. We talk a lot about providing opportunity and I think e-bikes would enhance the opportunity. I agree that there needs to be a balance. I would really support only using e-bikes on the dikes or maybe capping at a certain MPH within the WMA's.

Aaron Johnson- I agree with everything that was said. Maybe that is something the division can look at next year. This year, there has been so many comments from the public and people who are for the ban. Mr. Hicks is for it and represents a large organization. There are so many comments against that I would be a fool to vote for it.

Justin Oliver- We have had more comments opposing the ban of e-bikes.

Aaron Johnson-Correct.

R. Jefre Hicks- (cannot hear comment)

Randy Hutchison- I believe you are talking about the ban in only gated areas right?

Blair Stringham- Yes, technically you could take an e-bike where you could take a car.

Randy Hutchison- I have friends and family who specifically look for places where things are banned so they can go there. Most people hunt within 300 yards, that is why they want to get away from ATV's and other things. I like giving different people different options and access. I like the thought.

John Blazzard- I have sat on a lot of boards and I think Troy or someone had the proper idea. Proposals that everyone is mad about, obviously were talked about last night. I know you have worked a long time on the proposals. I would like to see that get put onto the agenda so that we had time to be able to digest and study and also for other people who read the agendas. That might help them want to come and comment on some of these ideas. We were in the middle of the

discussion when we received these papers. If this is going to be a public forum, we need to make it so everyone has an opportunity to review these.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend not to accept the E -Bike ban as presented by the Division.

Second- Christopher Hoagstrom.

Discussion on the Motion

Mellissa Wood- I would like to recommend that the board directs the division to have a discussion with people who are for and against to better understand the issues on both sides.

Mike Laughter-With the flexibility and comments made earlier stating there was some flexibility. I don't think we should wait one year. I would like to see it relatively soon.

Kevin McLeod- My concern is if you are following Roberts Rules, I don't think we can vote on an item that is not on the agenda.

Mellissa Wood- Its part of the proposed plan.

John Blizzard- I hope the wildlife board reviews the minutes and listens to the discussion we have had and take it into account as they make their decisions. Everyone is upset because we are not agreeing, it still brings that issue to the wildlife board to get a feel for it. They are feeling 4 other RAC input also. We take the guff so the wildlife board doesn't have to. They are hearing a lot of stuff we are discussing. That is the good part of it.

Mellissa Wood- Help me with Roberts Rules. I would like to vote on this piece of making a recommendation to the board. It is not part of the current proposal. Is there a way to add that?

Aaron Johnson- I think they will review our comments and hopefully the waterfowl biologist is making a mental note of these. He can discuss them in the future in advisory groups. As far as making a motion telling each biologist what to think about, we would be here until tomorrow. Hopefully the wildlife board and DWR are doing their jobs in reviewing these notes and they will come back next year with a better proposal or one that has addressed some of these.

Motion Passes- For: 9 Against: 3

Randy Hutchison- I think it is ok to restrict access to some areas to walk in only.

Paul Chase- I would like to see more restrictions, whether it be MPH or by wattage. Having it open to e-bikes, not knowing where they are going to go down the road, it might open it to a place we don't want it to be.

John Blizzard- I think the division needs to review and figure out why it was they really wanted to ban these. I don't understand why but I kind of do.

Motion

Motion- Aaron Johnson- Recommend the Wildlife Board accept the remainder of the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments 2019

Second- John Blizzard

Motion Passes: Unanimous

Justin Oliver- I found that I would be doing this today. I appreciate public comments and things said. I don't believe it was anyone's intent to push this meeting as fast as possible. We were against a clock and informed by Brigham City that we had to be out by 10:00. I just want to apologize on my behalf that there were some things I could do as acting chairman and I wish I would have done things different on the bucks and bulls. I hope in the following RAC's that they will address this item. I know the wildlife board members will hear the discussion.

Motion to adjourn

Meeting Ends-10:19 p.m.

**SOUTHERN REGION RAC MEETING
Cedar Middle School, Cedar City, UT
2215 W. Royal Hunt Drive
November 13, 2018 5:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the minutes and agenda presented.
Nick Jorgensen seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous

2. STATEWIDE MOUNTAIN GOAT MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented. Nick Jorgensen seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. STATEWIDE BIGHORN SHEEP MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Program as presented. Nick Jorgensen seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous

4. BUCKS, BULLS, AND OIAL 2019 SEASON DATES, APPLICATION TIMELINE AND RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the SFW recommendation to make the Barney Top an archery only elk unit for 2019 and eliminate the late rifle elk hunt on the Mt. Dutton unit. Brayden Richmond seconded the motion.

VOTE: 9-4, motion passed. (Verland King, Craig Laub, Gene Boardman, Sean Stewart)

MOTION: Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the Bighorn Sheep as recommended. Riley Roberts seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous

MOTION: Rusty Aiken made the motion to reject the proposal for an early rifle deer hunt on the Panguitch Lake unit. Gene Boardman seconded the motion.

VOTE: 7-6, motion passed. (Brayden Richmond, Brian Johnson, Mike Worthen, Sean Stewart, Wade Heaton, Riley Roberts).

MOTION: Brayden Richmond made the motion to continue spike only elk hunts as they are currently outlined in the Elk Management Plan. Brian Johnson seconded the motion.

VOTE: 12-1, motion passed (Gene Boardman)

MOTION: Brian Johnson made the motion to allow general season muzzleloader elk hunters to harvest a bull or cow on units that are over objective. Rusty Aiken seconded the motion.

VOTE: 12-1, motion passes. (Sean Kelly)

MOTION: Riley Roberts made the motion to accept the balance of the proposal as presented. Motion was seconded by Wade Heaton.

VOTE: Unanimous

5. CWMU MANAGEMENT PLANS AND PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2019 AND LANDOWNER ASSOCIATION PERMIT NUMBERS FOR 2019

MOTION: Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the proposal as presented. Riley Roberts seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous, with one abstention (Wade Heaton).

6. R657-38- DEDICATED HUNTER RULE AMENDMENTS

MOTION: Gene Boardman made the motion to reject the ability to purchase service hours. His motion failed to receive a second. Motion failed.

MOTION: Wade Heaton made the motion to accept the proposal as presented. Tammy Pearson Seconded the motion.

VOTE: 10-2, motion passes. (Gene Boardman, Brayden Richmond)

7. WATERFOWL RECOMMENDATIONS AND RULE AMENDMENTS – 2019

MOTION: Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the proposal as presented with the exception of the recommendation to not allow E-Bikes on the WMA's. Wade Heaton seconded the motion.

VOTE: Unanimous

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Dave Black Nick Jorgensen Gene Boardman Rusty Aiken Craig Laub Wade Heaton Riley Roberts Verland King Brian Johnson Sean Kelly Mike Worthen Sean Stewart Brayden Richmond Tammy Pearson	Kevin Bunnell Phil Tuttle Teresa Griffin Johnny Neil Paul Washburn Cov;y Jones Mike Wardle Jace Taylor Justin Shannon Andrea Gifford Denise Gilgen Mindi Cox Heather Talley Blaine Cox Kyle Christensen Josh Pollock Josh Carver Kody Jones Vance Mumford Dave Smedley Jim Lamb Lynn Zubeck Ashley Green Bryan Christensen Blair Stringham	Donnie Hunter	

Dave Black called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. There were approximately 45 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Dave Black introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Dave Black explained RAC meeting procedures.

Dave Black: So, I'd like to welcome you out tonight to the Southern Region RAC meeting. My name is Dave Black; I'm from St. George, representing the public at large. I would like to also introduce the rest of the RAC members. We'll start down at my far right with Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: Thank you Dave. Rusty Aiken, at large, Cedar City, Utah.

Verland King: Verland King, agriculture, Bicknell, Utah.

Craig Laub: Craig Laub, agriculture from Iron County.

Sean Stewart: Sean Stewart, BLM out of Escalante, Utah.

Gene Boardman: Gene Boardman, Hinckley, representing the public.

Brayden Richmond: Brayden Richmond, representing sportsmen, Beaver, Utah.

Nick Jorgensen: Nick Jorgensen, representing the non-consumptive, St. George, Utah.

Kevin Bunnell: Kevin Bunnell, I'm the Regional Supervisor for the Southern Region of the Division of Wildlife.

Riley Roberts: Riley Roberts, representing sportsmen, Tropic, Utah.

Wade Heaton: Wade Heaton, at large, Alton, Utah.

Sean Kelly: Sean Kelly representing the Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest.

Mike Worthen: Mike Worthen, public at large.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson, Enoch, Utah, non-consumptives.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. I think we can take care of items one and two all at once. We need approval of the agenda and also the minutes. I assume that everybody had a copy of the minutes from the last RAC meeting. I'll entertain a motion.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Brian Johnson made the motion to accept the minutes and agenda. Nick Jorgensen seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Dave Black: Item #3, old business. In reality, that should be a Wildlife Board update. I think that the main thing from our last RAC meeting and Board meeting was, in the southern region, if you recall, it was the fishing guidebook items. There were some items in the southern region where they wanted to remove the fly fishing and artificial lure restrictions on three waters in our region. Our RAC made a motion and approved that they do not lift those restrictions, but we also approved that they increase the limit in those areas and the other recommendations in the Wildlife Board followed our recommendations and they approved that as we recommended unanimous. With that, we'll move on to agenda item #4 and get an update from Kevin.

Wildlife Board Update and Regional Update:

-Kevin Bunnell, Southern Regional Supervisor

Kevin Bunnell: Good evening everybody, I'm going to start a little bit different than I normally do tonight. I've been meeting with a group of sportsmen and agricultural producers, just talking about how we can build trust between those two groups, and RAC meetings are not the place to do that. It's often kind of a contentious relationship because it is perceived as being winners and losers and so that group asked me to take a minute and highlight some of the positive things that are happening between, in terms of cooperation, between sportsmen and agriculture producers. I wanted to talk about just one tonight.

One of the people that I have been working with is Mark Winch; he's actually the president of the Cattlemen's Association, has a ranch out in Wah Wah Valley, we work with him a lot. He's mentioned on several occasions, the relationship that he has with a group of dedicated hunters. Every year, they come out and help repair fences on his ranch, fence that has been damaged by wildlife, so there is a responsibility that we have to help do that. We are filling that need through dedicated hunters. He said that the same guys have come for several years now, and they've developed some trust between each other. So now when the guys are out there scouting pre-season and they see an issue with Mark's fence, or they see a waterline that's broken, they'll call him, and often times they'll just ask him "Where in the shed is the stuff and we'll go fix it for you." Over time, they've been able to work together and there is some trust that has been established and I hope that we can replicate that in lots of other places. More than anything, I just wanted to highlight the fact that the perception that we get of the relationship between sportsmen and the agriculture community just through the RAC meetings is probably warped in the wrong direction, there are some good things that are happening as well. I'm going to try to highlight some of those things at each one of our RAC meetings going forward. So, getting into the regional update from our wildlife section, the first thing is that our capture season, it will be starting soon, and we'll be doing a lot of captures in the southern region. There is an open invitation to members of the RAC and members of the public, if you want to participate, you are more than welcome to come join us. There are some standing around and then a flurry of activity as an animal comes in, and then there's some standing around, and that's kind of the way those work, but we do need a lot of people there for those times when we do have animals coming in. So, if anybody has an interest in that, you can coordinate that through Teresa. One of the things that we will be doing is adding the Zion Unit to our migration initiative, so just on the Zion Unit, we will be collaring 50 doe and 30 bucks, and so that will be a big effort in and of itself. We'll also be adding collars to pronghorn on the south west desert in the Pine Valley. Those will both be new units coming on. We are currently flying the Zion Unit, doing our survey for bighorn sheep. Many of you will remember that we had some concerns about the Zion Unit because we have detected some pneumonia in the Zion Unit. So far, we are holding on and doing okay. The survey, as of yesterday, the numbers were good, we still had lambs with ewes and at least, as of now, it does not appear that we have a real virulent strain of pneumonia working its way through that herd. That could change, if we get a stress condition situation, but we are keeping our fingers crossed on that. Lastly, we are currently releasing pheasants at 10 locations around the region. That is happening every Friday through the month of November, details on that are on our website. Please go out and take advantage of that, grab a kid, or someone that hasn't hunted, or that's interested, take them with you and let them experience pheasant hunting. From our habitat section, they're just in the process of getting all of their projects going, and let me just give you some numbers. Just in the southern region, we have about 42,000 acres of pinion juniper removal that will happen in the next couple of months, about 17,000 acres of fire rehab, 600 acres of aspen regeneration work, 500 acres of sagebrush work, about 450 acres of rabbitbrush work, and 3 guzzlers, and multiple other projects, and over 15 miles of fence. Those guys are going to be busy. Most of that work happens between now and about April. From our outreach section, I would like to just first introduce a new member of our outreach section. Johnny, do you want to stand up? So, Johnny is a new employee in our outreach section, he'll be dealing a lot with the dedicated hunter program. From our aquatic section, we mentioned at the last RAC meeting the issues that were going on up at Kolob Reservoir. We did treat Kolob Reservoir about 3 weeks ago. We had a successful treatment there; we have removed all the fish out of Kolob Reservoir as a result of some illegal introductions of non-native fish in there. It will be restocked this spring, but it's going to take a while to be back to what it was. It's unfortunate that we had to do that, but we really didn't have much choice once we discovered the issue that was going on. Then just lastly, I'll remind you of the procedures with the RAC. For the members of the RAC and the audience, let's stick to the process,

conversations up here at the table, let's keep them respectful and on the record, and not a bunch of whispering off the record and let's keep it respectful with the audience. That's all that I have, thanks, Dave.

Dave Black: Okay, before we move on to Item #5, I just want to recognize and introduce one of our Wildlife Board members who is here with us tonight, Donny Hunter, in the back, raise your hand. We appreciate his attendance. Normally, Steve Dalton is here, he asked to be excused this evening. So, with that, we will move on to Item #5. That will be Justin Shannon presenting.

Agricultural Contributions To Wildlife Conservation Presentation (Informational)
-Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

Justin Shannon: Thank you, my name is Justin Shannon and tonight I'm going to give an informational presentation that focuses on agriculture's contributions to wildlife. So, to give a little purpose and background on why we are presenting this tonight, over the last several months, we have been working with agriculture to identify and reduce conflicts where we have had some areas that we have needed to improve on. As we have talked about this, one thing that's come up a few different times is that the contributions that the agricultural community makes to wildlife are seldom discussed. This last spring, we presented an informational on the conservation permit program, and that was very well received through the public process and there was new information in the comments that we made, so tonight, we wanted to do the same thing, highlighting agricultures' many contributions to wildlife conservation. As a way of introduction, Aldo Leopold, who is considered by many to be the father of wildlife ecology, he said, "There are two things that interest me, the first is the relation of people to each other and the second is the relation of people to land." At the Division of Wildlife, we value our relationship with the agriculture community and the wildlife resource. Emphasizing private lands here for a few minutes, when Utah was first settled, the best lands were settled early, and these areas provide exceptional habitat for wildlife. When you think about it, the farming and ranching, they were the backbone of our pioneer settlement. Aldo Leopold, went on to say this, he said "There are two spiritual dangers to not owning a farm. The first danger is supposing that breakfast comes from the grocer and the second is that he comes from the furnace." I love that quote because it shows how connected we need to be to the resource that we have. We see it in the hunting community as well. I think that this is where hunters and farmers support the responsible use of the natural resource. The cultivated field and range lands that are provided on private lands, they provide a lot of open space and resources for wildlife. Deer and elk are often found on these properties, and because I'm a wildlife biologist, we have to quantify everything, and we did. We mapped it. Here's the state of Utah, and the blue is all the private lands held throughout the state. It's about 21% of our property. Through our migration initiative and other areas that we have been focusing on, we've radio collared over 1,000 deer and elk. So, this spring, we looked at all the data points and we said, "Where were deer and elk during the springtime?" and 27% of the deer were on private land and 35% of the elk, showing that these animals use private land. Water is also important. Most water rights in Utah are held in private ownership and wildlife needs that water to not only survive at a basic level, but also to thrive. You look at the contributions that landowners have made to water quality and quantity through the development of springs, ponds, wells, pipelines, troughs, etc. It's just been incredible and wildlife, they don't know. If there's water, they're going to use it whether it's on public land, private land, who developed it doesn't matter, and they use it. Also, landowners, in many parts of the state, have improved and created wetlands for waterfowl and other wildlife species, which has been really important. So, in the partnership efforts that private landowners have helped us with is allowing access for game and non-game surveys. This has helped us on basic things like getting buck/doe ratios in some

areas, but also preventing federal listings. The farmers and ranchers have left their gates open so that we can quantify species distribution and prevent listings at a federal level. That's been important to us. We have also partnered with many landowners to improve habitat, whether it's through the watershed restoration initiative, the grazing improvement program, etc. It's been a good partnership there. Many landowners allow public hunting access, which has been really important. Also, as the Division has made decisions, we've included landowners and producers to serve on committees, advisory boards, RAC's like tonight, etc. As we've made decisions, we've wanted to make sure that we have input from the private landowners. Finally, the division does not want to grow wildlife on the backs of private landowners, especially when these landowners have reached their social tolerance levels with some animals. Switching gears from private land and water to public land grazing for a minute, our landscapes in Utah, they evolved with herbivory. We had plant eating animals on our winter ranges, our summer ranges, etc. The proper grazing practice found on these lands, can reduce fire related fuel loads, increase vegetative diversity, improve range land health, etc. It's been shown time and time again. The permittees, one of their main responsibilities is to develop and maintain water systems, which benefit wildlife. Often times, they don't get enough credit for that. Another thing is, the permittees spend a lot of time on the ranges and they help identify range related issues. A good example was this summer with the drought conditions. We were seeing drought conditions. It was impacting the deer herds and other areas, and talking with ranchers and permittees, it was good to see what they were seeing on the mountain. That's important. I want to highlight a few success stories. The first is the Alton's, these are a bunch of landowners that fence an entire community to prevent depredation and to minimize that. They have conducted numerous habitat projects on their property, which has benefited wildlife greatly. Joe Ferry, he's a landowner up in Box Elder County, he just recently won an award for improving the waterfowl habitat on his private property and he didn't have to do that, he chooses to do that. These are landowners who are choosing to do this stuff on their property to benefit wildlife. He also provides walk-in access units for sharp tailed grouse. And you can say "That's neat that he allows some bird hunters in there." But, it's really important when you think that 99% of the sharp tailed distribution in Utah is on private lands. So without these contributions from these landowners, we don't get that type of hunting access. Another one is Brad Bowler, in Hamblin Valley. He's enhanced sage grouse, deer and elk habitat on private lands and allotments through chaining, water developments, etc. It's been really good. I want to stress too, that managing wildlife is truly a partnership effort. One thing that the wildlife community and the agricultural community have been working on is horse and burro related issues, focusing on some round-ups and on the Book Cliffs and some other areas. We've been working to lend our support where we can on that issue. Also, responding to drought concerns; a lot of our wildlife and waterfowl management areas are grazed, but not all of them. In years like this where we had a lot of fires and a lot of drought related conditions, we opened up many of our properties to increase grazing, which was a good thing for the livestock community. We also increased antlerless permits. If you go back to this August/September, we doubled the number of permits on the Henry Mountains where we had too many bison and increased 735 antlerless elk permits because the drought conditions were bad. It was a rough year. One thing we are working on is efforts to restore suspended AUM's. This is something that is really important to the agricultural community. The Division is committed to provide our support where we can in that regard. Another one is predator management efforts. The Division spends over 1.4 million annually on predator management control. That is something that benefits both parties. One thing that Kevin alluded to earlier was the agriculture and wildlife working group. Kevin has a group here in Southern Utah where he meets regularly with elected officials, agriculture representatives and wildlife representatives, and we are doing the same thing at the state-wide level, and it has been really good, meeting with the Farm Bureau and SFW and the Department of Agriculture and others. This new group, the idea there is to identify and address conflicts and really try to figure out how we can build

trust and have these communities start giving each other the benefit of the doubt. As I was putting this together, some feedback that I got from our friends at the Farm Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, they said “A lot of times, the Division have these programs in place and they do get things, but nobody knows about your program. You don’t do a good job of explaining and telling people about them.” So, I wanted to highlight these really quickly. The first is the Cooperative Wildlife Management Units. This is a program that is intended to promote tolerance for wildlife by having open spaces and active wildlife management. It allows public access to private lands and private landowners are able to financially benefit. The Landowner’s Association is fairly similar. We also have walk-in access, where landowners are compensated for allowing public access, and the farm bill, this is a program that the Division is a partner with and is supportive of and we help fund habitat projects, specifically on private lands. The dedicated hunter program, this is another one where many projects that we do are aimed at enhancing habitat. Kevin gave a good example earlier about Mark Winch and helping with fences and different things. Our grazing improvement program, this is something that is administered by the Department of Agriculture. We partnered with them on it, and it’s to range land improvement projects that benefit wildlife and livestock. Since 2006, 3.5 million acres have been impacted and it receives about 2.5 million annually. Another one is our depredation program. This is a long list and it can be pretty complex, but it’s a 30,000 foot view. We haze animals from cultivated crops, provide monetary reimbursement, provide antlerless permits and vouchers, have fencing options, depredation hunts, etc. There is a lot to that, but the idea is to build tolerance for wildlife. My last slide on partnership programs revolves around the watershed restoration initiative. Since 2005, we have spent \$304 million with our partners. Many of our federal partners have been heavily involved in that. We treated 1.9 million acres, and the thing that I really like is the WRI works at a landscape level. It doesn’t matter if it is public or private land, if we can do good things to have more forage on the landscape, then we’ll do it. We want healthy habitats. The one thing that I want to stress here is producers have been good contributors on these projects. A lot of time they’ll let us use equipment, they’ll help us draft projects from the get go and help fund them, financially benefiting them. We also have some other programs, private lands only antlerless elk permits, this is something that has been talked about for a few years now, but essentially, if you have elk on your private property, you can pick up permit at our division office or Wal-Mart and hunt those animals. Then we have general landowner buck deer permits, which is where you get one permit for every 640 acres of private range land. Also, our landowner appreciation buck deer permits where you have one permit for 100 acres or more of cultivated crop land. In summary, Aldo Leopold said “Conservation is ultimately going to boil down to rewarding the private landowner who serves the public interest.” I agree with that. We recognize that wildlife benefits from agriculture activities and with that said the Division and Ag are working very closely these days on identifying issues and trying to resolve some of them. We have programs in place to increase landowner tolerance, but that is not a substitute for dialog. We still want to talk through issues and see where we can improve, but at the end of the day, the purpose of this PowerPoint is to say “thank you” to the landowners and permittees for all the good things that they have done for wildlife and wildlife habitat. That’s all I have, thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Justin. We appreciate that information. It’s very appropriate, also the comments from Kevin. I think that we need to do that more to explain and let everybody know about all the efforts that are going on with these different groups. Thank you very much. Tammy, do you want to introduce yourself, please? If you come in late, we’re going to put you in the spotlight.

Tammy Pearson: Everybody already knows who I am! I’m just late! I’m Tammy Pearson, Beaver County.

Dave Black: Thank you. Before we start the next item I'd like to explain briefly the RAC procedures if you haven't been here before. If you want to comment tonight, please fill out a comment card. After you get that filled out, give it to a couple of the gentlemen in the back, they'll make sure we get it. So, after each presentation, then we'll follow the following procedures; first, there will be an opportunity for the RAC members to ask questions, and then there is an opportunity for the public to ask questions. This is not the comment section, it is just if you have a question for clarification, and it will give you an opportunity to do that. If you do have a question, or if you come with a comment, please come to this center microphone. Make sure you state your name so that we can have you in our minutes. Then after the questions, we will move into the comment section. I will go through the comment cards first, due to the length of our agenda tonight, each person that comes up will be allowed three minutes. Then, after we go through the comment cards, we will close that section and then we will hear comments from the RAC members and then we will have the RAC motion and a discussion and a vote. So, with that, we will move to our first actions item, which is #6 on the agenda, and that will be from Jace Taylor.

Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan (Action)
-Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Jace Taylor: Thank you. Like you said, my name is Jace Taylor; I'm the bighorn sheep and mountain goat biologist up in Salt Lake, coordinating the work that's done by the biologists throughout the state. What I'll be presenting today, the first thing I'll present is the statewide mountain goat management plan. To understand, to give us a little background on what the management plan is and what it does for us, for all our species this is where we outline our goals, our objectives for the state, and then also we list off how we intend to meet those goals and objectives. There's a process that we go through in order to make these plans, we basically go and we form an advisory committee with representatives from a bunch of different constituents and a bunch of different groups, a bunch of different interests for this plan. For example, from the BLM, PLPCO, Producers, SFW, Wool Growers Association, Department of Ag, DWR, Forest Service, and we get that committee put together and then we have meetings. We had five meetings throughout the summer where we sit down and we work through the issues that we have. We make sure that everyone's ideas are represented in the plan, and in the end, we would come to a consensus on what we thought should be in the plan. Going into this can be a difficult process. There are a lot of different opinions and needs that need to be met. It was really impressive to see the group of people that we had come together and come to a consensus. We are really happy with these two plans and this first one here is the mountain goat plan. What the plan lies out, it starts out with us giving out some natural history about mountain goats and how they have done here in the state. We will go over some of that today, some of the numbers, some of the history there, and then we get into some of the concerns and limitations that we have for mountain goats, and then what our goals are and how we are going to attain those goals, kind of the management tools that we and our biologists have to meet those goals. So, kind of to highlight some of that natural history, mountain goats, the records in the state going back as early as 1918 and surely before that, but we had records back then and then we have those records continuing to the 1950's, but the bulk of the mountain goats we have, the reason why we have as many as we do it because of the success of transplant efforts. Starting back in the 1960's, we have been transplanting goats within the state. Many of them have been successful in establishing populations in a number of places. You can see here on the map where we currently have mountain goats and they have really become a valuable part of our natural resources here in the state. It's something that we are really grateful to have, something that we have been fortunate enough to be successful with and we are happy that we are able to have that opportunity to increase our populations when appropriate. That's basically

the management goal that we have here in the state, that when appropriate, we want to increase populations of mountain goats, but then also, sustain the populations that we currently have. It's a pretty simple set of tools that we have with mountain goats. We have unit management plans that we use to set the population objectives for each area and identify the different concerns in specific areas. We will talk a little bit more in a minute about when you will see those unit measurement plans. Then, we also have surveys, we can harvest both nannies and billies, females and males, and then we can also use the transplants, as I mentioned earlier, that have been very successful. A big component of this is coordinating with our federal land management partners, you know, the BLM, the Forest Service and the habitat assessments and the habitat treatments that go along with that. Like I said, we have been pretty successful. Mountain goat populations have increased steadily. In the recent years, we have kind of leveled off at about 19,000 mountain goats. Some of it has to do with populations that have reached objectives, some that have struggled and others that are still growing, but overall we are happy with the way that we have been able to manage them. Like I mentioned earlier, part of this success comes down to having these unit management plans. This statewide plan, after it is approved by the RAC's and the Boards, whatever we come to and whatever versions that it gets approved, all of the specific unit management plans will be adjusted to adhere to this statewide plan, and then outside of that, the only time that you would see unit management come to the RAC's and the Boards, or anytime that we make significant changes, or if they have never come to the RAC's and the Boards, so this right here, this is also kind of the criteria that we will use to determine if those unit management plans will come to you. Basically, if there is a significant boundary change to a unit, if the population objective changes, if it is a new unit where we haven't had mountain goats before, or if it is a unit management plan that has not come and been approved by the Wildlife Board in the past, other than that, minor changes that happen in these unit management plans will be approved by the DWR director. That's the same thing that we will have for all of these species. As I mentioned earlier, these transplants that we have been so fortunate to execute and that have been successful here in the state, the statewide management plan outlines the places that we identify as appropriate places for transplants in the future. The augmentation list that we have in the plan, basically includes all units that currently have mountain goats, and it doesn't mean that we plan to augment every single population that is already out there. Some of them don't need it, but we would like to be able to reserve that right. There are some foreseeable events that might happen and we want to be sure that we have the ability, if they do need to be augmented, that we can do it. Then, the introduction areas, it is important to note that just because this statewide management plan becomes approved, just because these places are on that list, they will not automatically be places that we are going to go put mountain goats. If they require unit management plans that have not been to you guys before, new herds would obviously come and be presented, and there would be another process of working through that unit management plan and the committees to make sure that we are addressing the needs that are important to those specific areas. As I mentioned earlier, with mountain goats, it is important that we monitor habitat, just like all of our other animals, this is the most important thing that we can do to have healthy and growing populations is to have suitable health of the habitat that they use. So, it is important that we continue. We have been really successful with this and it has been a great partnership that we have with land management agencies and we want to make sure that we continue to assist them and to be supportive in monitoring the habitats that we have healthy populations in. One of the other objectives that we have in the statewide management plan is how we want to meet the need of recreationists, people that enjoy mountain goats in the state. Part of that is that we want to make sure that we provide high quality opportunities for hunting and viewing for mountain goats. Viewing mountain goats is a really unique opportunity. They are unique animals. They, in a lot of ways, symbolize wilderness, and we want to make sure that we improve the opportunity for people to view them. The other part of that, is that the hunting opportunity, we also want to make sure that we offer a good

opportunity for people to go out and enjoy that unique experience. Throughout the state and throughout the advisory committee, one of the big interests that we have is increasing the opportunity that people have to get out and get permits, so, increasing permits that we offer. In the past we've always recommended permits to you guys, to the RAC's and the Boards based on five to 15% of the animals that we count to run our surveys. We would like to have the opportunity to increase that to 5 to 25% of the adult population. The word adult was something that was not in the previous plan. We added that here, so basically, we've added adults- that has decreased the number of animals that we actually are using for the survey, but then we've increased the percentage. Basically what that does, is it increases our opportunity to offer permits by about 30 to 40% depending on the unit-depending on the structure of the adults versus the young of the year. So, it's awesome that we are we going to do it every single unit. There's some units were already offering is many permits as possible, but there are some places that, just because the nature of the surveys, it's difficult for us to offers as many permits as we would like to. A lot of this has to do with being able to get the biologists more flexibility in their management, but also there's a high demand for these hunting permits. This graph is interesting. Earlier I showed that increasing line where we got to 1,900 goats, that's the bottom line that we have here that, looks almost flat. The reason why it looks flat is because the scales changed. We have 20,000 or more people that are either buying points or applying for mountain goat permits here in the state. So, the demand is so high that we're trying to find opportunities like this so that we can address some of the key issues that we have. We also want to make sure that we can offer female-only permits when appropriate which we have done in the past. We want to look into having a variety of different hunt dates, season links, and weapon types. As we have surveyed the public for that, we have gotten a lot of support and a lot of interest in doing that, so we will pursue doing that in the future. One change that we do want to make is that we want to require an orientation course for everyone who receives a mountain goat permit. Currently, there are two types of permits. We have our female only permits, if you get one of those permits; you need to take this orientation course which helps you identify males from females. But, if you receive an either sex with a hunter's choice permit you don't take that orientation course. In some of our units we're seeing an increase in the number of nannies that are taken. This is showing a decrease in the proportion of the harvest that is males. So, for whatever reason, people with those either-sex hunter's choice permits are taking more females. Sometimes it's not a problem. We have nanny only hunts in some places, but in other places we think that that might be limiting the production of some of these units. So, that would require a rule change, and that was highlighted in the memos that you got. We want to be able to have that as an opportunity for our biologists to manage their herds successfully. With that, that's all that I have for you and I'd be happy to take any questions.

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Brian.

Brian Johnson: Who is the group or organization of the people that were reporting the mountain goats in the early 1900's?

Jace Taylor: Forest Service does have records of surveys where they saw bighorn sheep and mountain goats. At the time, it was called the Wasatch Mountains I think.

Brian Johnson: But it was the Forest Service that reported and documented it?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, it's the best documentation we have from 1980.

Dave Black: Any other questions? Gene.

Gene Boardman: You said there were 20,000 applicants for mountain goat tags? I think in your literature you said that it's about 1 in 70, that draw?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, the odds, the odds are tough. So the 20,000 is for everyone, non-resident and resident, both points, and those who are applying.

Gene Boardman: Okay, the next question you probably can't answer, but is it ever been looked at that this point system that we have is going to eventually implode or collapse?

Jace Taylor: So, I think that's a separate question. It is something that we are definitely aware of, the issues and the difficulties of people who are starting into the system or don't have a lot of points. It is definitely something that we are keenly interested in. We are trying to find ways to address that. Honestly, some of these strategies are hoping to help with that by being able to offer more permits, being able offer different season lengths and dates. Gene, I think that that is one way that we are addressing that.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Do we have any questions from the audience? Okay, we do have two comment cards, the first one is Troy Justensen and he will be followed by Greg Bird.

Comments from the Public:

Troy Justensen: Troy Justensen, sportsmen and fish wildlife. I had the opportunity to sit on the statewide goat management plan committee. They had a great committee; I think that we accomplished a lot of great things. Probably the most notable, as Jace pointed out, is how we changed things and are going to provide more people the opportunity to get out and chase these majestic animals. I would encourage the RAC to accept the Division's recommendation. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Greg Bird: Greg Bird, Utah wild sheep. I likewise like Troy, sat on this committee. There was a lot of diversity on this committee and we put a lot of work into it and we feel like it is a really solid plan. The Division did a great job with this and we highly recommend that you also accept this.

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay, I'll close the public comment, oh we have two more. Okay Troy Forrest followed by Bret Selman.

Troy Forrest: Uh, Troy Forrest from the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. I also served on the committee and I want to thank those that did. We want to just reiterate to the RAC that we support this. We took part in it and spent the time and we think that we came up with a good product that will serve everybody well. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Bret Selman: My name is Bret Selman; I served on this committee as well as a sheep producer from Northern Utah. I mirror what these other gentlemen have said. We all came together and we have a good product here to accept your approval. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thanks Brett. Okay, I believe that's it. Do we have any comments from the RAC? Tammy.

Comments from the RAC:

Tammy Pearson: I missed the question part of it. Jace is the same language in the goats as what is in the sheep plan that we discussed earlier today?

Jace Taylor: No, a lot of the language, the legal specific language that we have in the bighorn plan is not in this goat plan. A lot of that is specific to bighorns.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, so are there no cross contamination issues there?

Jace Taylor: No, we don't have the same level of concern with mountain goats like we do with bighorn sheep and pneumonia. There is language about disease and we continue to learn more about disease, but we don't have the same concerns.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, so my comment is that I appreciate what the DWR has done, bringing the extra partners to the table to negotiate and work on these plans together in a cooperative manner. That has what we have been asking for all along and I appreciate you guys doing that.

Dave Black: Okay, comments? Sean.

Sean Kelly: Mr. Chairman, both the Bighorn Sheep and the Rocky Mountain Goat Plan have become high interest items at the Forest Service. Most of the habitat of rocky mountain goats and some of the habitat of bighorn sheep are obviously following national forests. We would like to support the division. We think that they have done a great job in getting a lot of these players to come to the table and does their background work. Whenever we do have a lot of discussion, sometimes our forest supervisors will draft a letter. It becomes my job to read that letter at the RAC, so I would like to get this over with if that is okay with you.

Dave Black: Sure. Afterwards, we can give a copy at the desk for the minutes as well.

Sean Kelly: It says Dave Black, southern region RAC committee chair; Dear Mr. Black, this letter is in response to the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources proposal to revise the Utah mountain goat and Utah bighorn sheep management plans. The Forest Service appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on these statewide plans and looks forward to working more closely on individual unit plans as they become necessary to develop. The Dixie and Fish Lake National Forest generally support these statewide plans. We'd like to offer the following recommendations to these draft plans. The draft plan should specify the local Forest Service offices will be involved in the development of the specific population objectives in the individual herd units, plans should have a process spelled out to address how the livestock community will be involved in the process of developing individual herding plans and should avoid potential conflict in wild and domestic sheep. The Forest Service appreciates the opportunity to

comment on the management plans and looks forward to the next phase of the process, including development of the individual herd unit plans.

Sincerely signed, Michael T. Ellison, Forest Supervisor, Fish Lake and Dixie National Forest.

Again, I appreciate all the background that the division has done on this and a chance to come.

Dave Black: Jace, do you want to comment on any of those three items or do you see any conflict or problem with what they're requesting?

Jace Taylor: You know, I don't think so. I would have to go over it more closely, but we will definitely be working with the Forest Service and the BLM. They have been great partners in all of our processes so far and we want to continue with that, especially with unit management plans as well as with all interested invested stakeholders. It is definitely beneficial for us as well.

Dave Black: Thank you, any other comments? Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: I'm ready to make a motion.

Dave Black: I'm ready, unless we have another comment that needs to be heard. We're ready for a motion.

Brayden Richmond: Seems we've got a long night, and everybody is happy with this, including all different parties; sportsmen and agriculture and everybody. I make a motion that we accept as presented.

Dave Black: Okay, can we have a second?

RAC discussion and vote:

Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented. Nick Jorgensen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Dave Black: Thank you, unanimous. Okay, we will move on to our next action item, which is #7, the Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan. Jace Taylor will also be presenting.

Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan (Action)

-Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Jace Taylor: Thank you, I'm still Jace Taylor and this will be our statewide management plan for bighorn sheep. So, I mentioned earlier in the first presentation, we talked about this advisory committee. Here with the bighorn sheep, this is where this process and this committee were critical. I'm really impressed with the members of the committee. A number of them are here today; Troy, Forrest, and Bret Selman, who you've heard come up, Troy Justensen, Greg Bird, Donny's back there, Donny drove all the way up. We have had people driving all the way from the north end of the state to come for this meeting. People really gave a lot of their time to come, and a lot of their mental effort. Some of these meetings were really long, and we sat and sometimes debated individual words in this plan for hours. I'm not exaggerating there; we really put a lot of effort into this. It was a very unique plan, a unique

committee. Here is a little bit of a reason why. You all remember back in May of this year when we took the Mineral Mountains Unit Management Plan through the RAC's and the Boards. It really brought to head and highlighted to us the conflict, maybe the tension, between the wildlife community and the agriculture community was a lot worse than we had realized. It has to do with some of the weather we've had lately and a lot of things that have happened in other states; legal issues those producers and stockmen have had with bighorn sheep and domestic sheep. We haven't had the same issues here, but there are a lot of things that made the tensions high. We are really happy that it came to such a head of the time, because it really helped us with going into this management plan, which was already on the slate for this summer. It helped us really dive in there and put a great committee together. This is one of the unique plans to the west and to us. This is the first plan that we have had heavily influenced by PLPCO's lawyers. The strategy here was to make a product that would protect the livelihoods of Utahans, specifically those who are at risk here or those that deal with domestic sheep. We also wanted to make sure that we maintain state management of bighorn sheep. It is an important thing for us. We also wanted to make sure that we would attempt to meet the needs and expectations of Utah's public. If you remember back to the RAC and Board process, one of the things that were requested was that we would work on an MOU. This was a document that would hopefully provide some protection for those whose livelihoods are in domestic sheep and grazing in general. Going into this plan, we really wanted to develop something that would meet that need of all those different groups. Some of this, I'm going to have to read through a little bit, I know that this is going to be quite a bit of reading, but I think it's important. We really wanted to make sure that in this plan, a lot like Justin's presentation, that we show our support for the agriculture community and for grazing. It's something, like Justin mentioned, we probably don't always do the best job of verbalizing, so we wanted to get it here on paper. I'll read a couple of these statements from the plan that I think are important. "The DWR's objective is to expand bighorn sheep populations where feasible and to maintain bighorn sheep on a sustainable basis." I mean, that's what it comes down to. One of the DWR's charges is to protect and to propagate wildlife species. Part of that is to find opportunities where that is feasible. "The DWR does not support any form of involuntary reduction, limitation, termination, or conversion of permitted domestic sheep grazing for purposes of protecting bighorn sheep." This has been a big concern in other states and sometimes that domestic sheep grazing has gotten the short end of the stick in the name of bighorn sheep. "We want to also reassure that we recognize that a divide between the agriculture community and wildlife management is detrimental to bighorn sheep conservation and to wildlife in general." No matter which species, it is important that we understand each other and that we are communicating, and that we are working together as much as possible. "The DWR supports an active livestock industry that exercises responsible grazing practices." We're not going to have time to highlight all of the different things in the plan that are along this thread, but, you know, we go and we explain that there are ways that responsible grazing does provide better opportunities for our wildlife, whether it's water development, whether it's maintaining open space, suppressing fire, there are a number of ways that we can help each other. "The DWR will not manage bighorn sheep to the involuntary exclusion of domestic sheep. The two much both exist in Utah with a proper balance between the two entities." We're talking about domestic sheep grazing and wild bighorn sheep. I think that it is understandable, the apprehension or the anxiety that people have, and we want to make sure that we are making it clear that it is not our intention to negatively impact peoples' livelihoods. We are going to work together to make sure that that doesn't happen. Another part that we mentioned, another one of our goals, is to maintain state management. With bighorn sheep, it's important to understand that there is a very real risk of disease transmission. It is impossible to completely remove the risk of disease transmission. "The DWR fully understands and accepts the risk of disease in bighorn sheep populations and we will use a variety of strategies to manage around the risk to ensure sustainable statewide populations." This is a big part of the plan. We want to

make sure that we can defend our ability to successfully manage these animals. The disease is real. Bighorn sheep just simply do not handle some of the same pathogens that domestic sheep are able to handle. It's nobody's fault for that. It's just that they just don't do well. Maybe, to illustrate a little bit of this, we have here three different maps. On the far left we have a map from 1850. This is estimated bighorn sheep with distribution in the west. Then, by the 1960's, those numbers have dramatically declined. It is estimated that those numbers were less than 2% of what they were at the time of European settlement. We have made a lot of improvements and made a lot of efforts to get those numbers back up, which is done a lot to show that we are able to manage this species and that we can responsibly do that and maintain the state's ability to manage those animals. In this plan, we go through and we want to highlight a number of the tools that we have to defend our ability. I have a few listed here, but there are many more in the plan. I think that the one that might be the most important to highlight here is this one on the bottom left. It talks about lethal removal of wild bighorn sheep by livestock operators. Currently, if a bighorn sheep wanders down into someone's domestic animals, then only a DNR employee can lethally remove that animal. There are times when we don't get the phone call quick enough. A herder might not be able to get a hold of us for cell service reasons, or we can't get there fast enough. We recognize that there is the potential that that could have benefit for us to have livestock operators lethally remove that animal as well. Now, this was an interesting thing to have come up in our advisory committee. When it was first proposed, there were a lot of people that sat up and got hairs on the back of their necks stand up, but the more that we work on this and the more that we think about this, there really is the potential that it would be beneficial for bighorn sheep. There is no value in that wild bighorn when he comes down and makes contact. We don't have any value in him wandering around after that. All he can do is take any pathogens that he may or may not have picked up, and take them back to the herd. Just because this gets approved today or at the RAC, it doesn't mean that it's off and gone and you'll never hear about it again. There would be a whole other process of outlining the criteria and the protocol of how that would happen. We have it for other species; how contact needs to be attempted, that kind of stuff. All of that would need to be worked at and you would see that again before we'd ever implement it. We recognize that it could be something valuable for us in the future. In addition to the other tools that we have listed here, we also have a lot of valuable habitat here in the state. If you remember the first map of the distribution estimate, basically, more or less, the whole state was highlighted as being once inhabited by bighorn sheep. It may have been the most common ungulate at the time when European settlers came. It's a very valuable animal to Native American cultures. So, you can see on the far right, where we currently have bighorn sheep. This doesn't mean, in a minute I'm going to get to our transplant list and we'll talk a little bit more about some of those areas that don't have bighorns at the time, but bighorns have done fairly well. Currently our Rocky Mountain population, which is the red line on the bottom, we have the two different species. We have Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep in the northern part of the state and Desert Bighorn Sheep down here in the southern part of the state. The deserts are the yellow line and the Rocky Mountains are the red line. The deserts are continuing to do well, our Rockies have kind of fallen off in a couple places, and that has to do with some disease concerns in some of our bigger herds. But overall, the blue line shows the two species combined. They've been doing fairly well overall. But, it's a tough thing to meet the needs of the public. Like I said, there are a lot of cultures, a lot of different people that want bighorn sheep. It's important for us, in the plan how we outline, how we want to meet that. To coordinate with federal land management agencies, it is also important that we establish protectable nursery herds. This is a big picture type of thing that we really want to work on here in the state. Because bighorn sheep have issues with disease, and because it's imperative that we manage them heavily, we need to have healthy bighorn sheep in the state that we can use to augment or to restart populations when they have issues with disease. So, it's an important thing that we are going to be working the Department of Agriculture, private property owners,

The BLM, and the Forest Service to find places where we can have protectable nursery herds. Then, another important part of that is to have the transplants. Again, like the Mountain Goat Plan, we had the augmentation list which included where we currently have bighorn sheep; this is for both desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep. In addition to those, we have the reintroduction sites. Again, I want to emphasize that just because we have them on the reintroduction site here, doesn't mean that we are going to have animals out there next week. You'd see a unit management plan come through to you. Take a look at those lists, but recognize that if we don't have bighorn sheep there right now, it's probably because there's an issue that area and we recognize that issue. That's probably why they're on this reintroduction list, and we would need to work through those concerns before we got there. Like I said earlier, before animals went into one of these areas, we would go through this unit management plan with the same criteria that we had earlier; a significant boundary change, a change to a population objective, a new unit that is being proposed, or a unit where we have not taken a plan through to you guys or the or the Board in the past, and that is when you would see these unit management plans. Finally, we want to get to hunting bighorn sheep. Likewise with our mountain goats, there's a lot of interest in try to address some of the point creep issues that we talked about, giving more people opportunity. These are both really unique and special animals that people enjoy having the opportunity to go out and chase around the mountains. So, what we've done here is we've also increased the number of permits-we would like to increase the number of permits that biologists can offer or recommend. It used to be 12-15% of the counted rams, or 30-40% of the rams that are six years or older. We wanted to change that to 12-25% and then 30-60% of the older rams. Again, this wouldn't be every unit, there are certain units that we would not want to do this, maybe places where expectations are already set or where it doesn't make sense for our management. But, in some places, that would be a valuable tool for our biologists and for our public. We want to be able to use sub-units, multiple seasons to distribute people as we get more permits, we want to look at different types of permits, different types of seasons, different season lengths. We also want to be able to have yew hunts. There are places and times when it is not appropriate to transplant yews from an area, but the densities might be getting too high or reaching our population objective. That is an important part of this management as well as we manage in the face of disease. As I showed earlier, this blue line if you look on the top shows that bighorns have increased steadily. This is that same blue line on the bottom, just like with our mountain goats, but this is maybe even more dramatic. We have over 50,000 people that want to hunt bighorn sheep here in the state, so you can see some of what we're up against there. So, with all of this and with this statewide plan, I really feel good and I really want to thank the people again who are here and that have put the time into this advisory committee and the product that we have gotten. The plan, going forward, is that now, I feel, we've really done a good job of strengthening our partnership, you know, developing lines of communication, developing friendships, from here what we are going to do, is we have an MOU drafted and it's being reviewed right now by the state entities, the Department of Agriculture, PLPCO has looked at it, it's at the governor's office currently. After those parties are in agreement on it, we're going to take it out to our federal partners, the Forest Service and the BLM; they'll have a chance to look at it. Eventually, when the plan is approved by the Wildlife Board, the MOU will reference that plan. Basically, it will be all those parties, the Department of Agriculture, DWR, governor's office, Forest Service and BLM agreeing to manage bighorn sheep as outlined in this statewide management plan. We feel that it goes a long way to help protect producers and to meet those other needs. Then, after that we'll just continue to work collectively and keep those communications going so that we can find the best ways to have healthy and successful bighorn sheep here in our state. That's the plan going forward, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Dave Black: Thank you. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Might as well be first. So, like I said today when we had our other meeting, do you have a proposal for nursery herds?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, so we're working with our biologists, we're working with folks. There are basically three sub-categories that we have of bighorn sheep; there's the California Bighorn Sheep, The Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep, and the Desert Bighorn Sheep. We manage the California's and the Rockies very similarly; currently a lot of the research considers them to be the same thing, some of that is still disputed. We want to make sure we have at least all three right now. For our California Bighorn Sheep, we have a great nursery herd on Antelope Island. It's been incredibly successful. It has really one a lot for us to successfully manage bighorn sheep here in the state. We've moved hundreds of animals off of there, really with only putting less than 40 animals out there to start with, we've moved hundreds off, and it's come a long way. For our Deserts and Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep, we do not currently have nursery herds established. We are continuing to work to find those. It was really fun, like I said, in this advisory committee, to sit down with the Department of Agriculture and the Wool Growers Association, and it's going to be important that we work with them to find these places, because they're going to have some of the best insights for finding safe places.

Kevin Bunnell: Jace, explain what you mean by a nursery herd please.

Jace Taylor: Yeah, so a nursery herd, so think about Antelope Island. It's a place where we have very, very, very, minimal risk of contracting disease in our bighorn sheep. It's something that we can protect. Antelope Island, a lot of that has to do with the lake itself. It's a place where we don't expect bighorn sheep to come off, pick up disease, and come back. Or, we don't expect domestic sheep to make their way out to the herd. As that herd stays healthy, it grows and then it's a nursery that we can use to pull animals out of, to augment, or to start other populations that might be struggling.

Tammy Pearson: So kind of a follow-up on that question, are those kinds of herds already established in Nevada, or wherever else where you've got your transplants from before?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, we've been getting, a lot of our sheep are deserts that we've been getting from Nevada. But, even those populations like the Muddies or the River Mountains, the Jefferson's, they've been healthy so far, but Zion was healthy up until this year, too. I mean, there's no guarantee. If we have them in state, there are some complications that come with working with other states. Nevada has been fantastic to work with, don't get me wrong, but there is some value in having them here and work on our own timetables. It makes us more self-sufficient. It also looks good for our ability to manage them.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, one more. Was there a timeline that you have planned as far as establishing the nursery herd?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, as fast as we can get them. I mean, we want to make sure that we go through all of the proper steps. There's a lot that goes into it. In these nursery herds, it may involve fencing. Once we start looking to fence, it creates all kinds of different issues that we need to make sure that we work through. There are some places that we are talking about that we've looked at, that we might be able to have within a year or two. To be honest, there's no way to say for sure. It's a long process, just like what we saw with the Minerals, we want to make sure that we address all of those needs before we jump in, hopefully in a few years.

Dave Black: Sean.

Sean Kelly: Uh, Jace, I noticed on the control, that it was worded livestock operator not sheep operator. Is that going to be something that cattle operators are going to be able to do? Occasionally there are rams that get into herds of cows too.

Jace Taylor: Yeah, so we're not as concerned if they get into someone's cows. We are concerned if they're getting into domestic sheep or domestic goats. The specific strains that the bighorns struggle with right now, that's where the research shows that that's where our risk is at. I don't know if we need to dive into this, but right now what we have is language saying that we're going to pursue it. It's #2 on this list. We want to pursue this and find a protocol that works. There's going to be all kinds of stuff about documented contact, about efforts to contact the DWR about what happens to the animal afterwards. Right now it's just a concept.

Dave Black: Verland.

Verland King: Uh, in your deal, you talk about Utah code, that talks about your management authority on wildlife. I haven't read it real close. Do you have other wording in there that talks about other Utah code that would make a difference in this situation? Is that included? That Utah code 63-J-4401 has a lot to do about protecting livestock from transplanting wildlife in certain areas where suspended AUM's and different things are. So, do you have wording in this plan to that effect?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, I don't know about that Verland. I don't think that we have wording for that specific piece of code. I do know another piece of code that we have that talks about that the DWR is charged to manage, recognizing the impacts of wildlife on man and his activities. That's an example of another code that we have in there. We have statements talking about how we-I think in this one, we talked a little bit about how we don't support any involuntary restrictions or limitations of AUM's. We do also state that we are in support of, in situations where AUM's have been cut, that those AUM's are reinstated, the DWR supports that where the conditions that precipitated the decline have recovered. So, we do definitely clearly state that we support that, and in the code that states that we recognize wildlife's impact on man and his activities. I don't know, we don't have that specific one that you're talking about. I would have to look at it with you and see if we cover those same principles.

Verland King: But, if it's Utah code, then you are bound to it?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, oh yeah. It's not like we say "Hey just the codes that are in this plan are the ones that we follow." Yeah, all the codes still stand and we highlight certain ones in here. Marty, did you want to add some more to that?

Dave Black: Marty, will you introduce yourself to the audience?

Marty Bushman: Marty Bushman, assistant attorney general to the state of Utah. I work with the Division of Wildlife Resources. I was the one that drafted pretty much all of the legal language that is in that plan. It may not always look like legal language, but there was a strategy that we had in the plan. That is that the state of Utah has primary authority to manage bighorn sheep on the Forest Service and BLM lands. The Forest Service and BLM have authority over grazing. By involuntarily terminating

grazing, they are basically creating a divide between wildlife and agriculture that was not productive for wildlife. That's the story that we were trying to paint in this plan, because if it's ever challenged, that's what a court is going to read. We wanted to understand is that the Division of Wildlife Resources manages wildlife. It has code sections that tell us how to do that. We manage it on a sustainable basis. We manage it and try to balance those wildlife needs with economic activities of man. We really can't get involved in a game where domestic sheep grazing and wild sheep are pitted against each other and only one can win. That's not going to work. That is kind of the strategy behind the plan, so when you look at code sections that are in there, we didn't have any of those code sections that you were referring to. Those are directives to PLPCO and how they deal with federal land management actions and respond to them. It really didn't fit in well with the strategy that we were trying to put forward. In Utah, we manage wild sheep a little differently than in other states. All of our wild sheep populations are in relative proximity to domestic sheep. All have some element of risk and we assume that risk and we try to develop a plan that deals with it without the exclusion of domestic sheep grazing. That was kind of a long answer to the question of what other code sections did we have within the plan. They were primarily wildlife code sections because we felt that that was strategically where we wanted to make this argument layered in between the various parts of the plan.

Dave Black: Questions on the left? Gene.

Gene Boardman: Uh, here you recommend permit numbers of 12-25% of accounted rams or 30-60% of rams six plus years of age. Is this a more generous permit program than what you've run in the past?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, yeah it is. Basically, this may be a good time to hit this real quick, on here what you see is a graph and numbers showing what we have offered in the past and what this change will give us the ability to offer in the future. We have the last five years; 2014 to 2018. The far left column shows the actual number of permits that we offer, which is the bottom blue line. The top line shows that under the new guidelines, that is what we will be able to offer. So overall, basically it means that with- so this is looking at Desert Bighorn Sheep here, if you look at the second to last column- it creates the ability for us to offer 50-60% more permits. It doesn't mean that it's going to happen everywhere, so it definitely wouldn't be that high, but it is more generous.

Gene Boardman: Thank you.

Dave Black: Okay, any questions from the audience? Okay, we'll go to our comment cards. Oh, we have one more question.

Tammy Pearson: I'm full of questions. I didn't see it in the plan, but what is going on with the Zion herd? Are we going to be able to hunt in there now?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, oh you mean, inside the park? No, we are not going to be able to hunt inside the park.

Tammy Pearson: Oh, we should have a meeting with Zinke.

Jace Taylor: Some update about Zion itself though, you probably heard back in July, it was when we first started seeing pneumonia symptoms in some of the sheep there inside the park. But we are seeing it outside the park and hunters have been really helpful to help us get a handle on where we've seen it.

Fortunately, we haven't seen any animals that have died from the disease itself. We have quite a few collars down there. We are putting our more collars and none of those collard animals have died. We have had animals that were coughing back in July, specific animals that are not coughing now. So, like Kevin said earlier, we are hopeful that this might not be the worst strain in the world. But no, nothing inside the park, Tammy.

Kevin Bunnell: I like your optimism though. (off microphone)

Brian Johnson: Tammy, I agree with you (off microphone)

Dave Black: Okay, we'll go to the comment cards. Before I get to the ones on this particular item, I have two comment cards that don't match with any agenda item today. Luke Stewart had a comment card regarding the mountain lion quota. That's specifically addressed in the July RAC's, so I encourage you to come then. Also tonight, Dave Smedley, would you stand up real quick? Luke, can you maybe just meet with him in the back and you can discuss your concerns with him and we won't take the time up here to do that. Also, I have one from George Wincelle. If you could meet with Paul in the back, he can discuss your concerns as well. He's one of the law enforcement officers, so we appreciate that and we appreciate you coming tonight, but we won't address those concerns up here. So, let's go on then. The first comment card is Kevin Whicker, followed by Troy Forest.

Comments from the Public:

Kevin Whicker: I'm Kevin Whicker; I'm the natural resource specialist for Beaver County. I would like to comment the DWR for the work that they have done on this plan. I think that there was a lot of effort that went into this. They have taken great measures to try and protect our livestock producers. I think that they have come up with a very unique and a very workable plan here. We would like to commend them and give our support to this plan, thank you.

Dave Black: And Troy will be followed by Bret Selman.

Troy Forest: Troy Forest, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food. First of all, again, I served on this committee. We spent a lot of time on this. From an agriculture standpoint, we had real concerns, especially with what had happened in Idaho with the Payette decision with the loss of producers there. We knew going in that there had been success stories. Wyoming had successfully been to court and been able to defend their domestic livestock industry because of the way their sheep plan was written. A lot of what we did, we took that to try and incorporate it in Utah's language, in Utah's way, to be able to have both species coexist, both the bighorns and the domestic sheep. That's our end goal. We don't want anybody to go out of business, especially in the agriculture side of it, from my chair. We worked with this committee and I think that we came to a good place. Is this a perfect plan? Absolutely not, but we spent a lot of hours and blood, sweat, and tears and we got to know each other in that committee and spent the time working through the issues. I think that where we got is a great compromise and a great way to move things forward in the state of Utah. So, we from the Department of Agriculture strongly support this plan. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you Troy. Brett will be followed by Scott Stubbs.

Bret Selman: Uh, Brett Selman; I live in Tremonton. We ranch sheep up there. We also ranch up in

Wyoming, just this side of Jackson Hole if you're familiar with that town. We end up with one of our allotments right on the Jackson Unit boundary between that bighorn herd and our domestic sheep herd. We have three allotments there. We voluntarily abandoned the one allotment closest to that herd of bighorns to make a buffer zone between them and us. We also, where we used to take two herds in the summer, we just take one and rotate between the remaining two allotments, again, to minimize the risk of contact from the bighorns coming into our herd. To me, that is too much to ask of a producer, to voluntarily abandon a permit and basically another one every other year. I didn't want to see that happen to us in the state of Utah, and that's why I agreed to sit on this committee, to try and explain that problem. We locked horns on this right for a livestock or a sheep man to lethally remove a bighorn when it comes in contact with one of our herds. The guy with the bridle reins in his hand and the rifle under his knee has the best chance to keep that bighorn sheep from getting back to the other bighorns and infecting them with disease. So, in my opinion, that is the best chance that we have to keep them clean and to keep us clean, for that matter. So, I urge you, my cohorts from this end of the state, to agree with this plan. We spent a lot of time and effort; we worked hand-in-hand with the sportsmen on this. We came together; the sportsmen and the agriculture community are on the same page. We agree on this and I think that it's a great foundation for this plan and many others in the future. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Brett. Scott will be followed by Troy Justensen.

Scott Stubbs: Scott Stubbs, sheep producer. I went through this plan and had a lot of interest in it and I feel like it goes a long way to protect us as producers. I think that it is really good. Also, it's our state right to stay in charge of these animals. One thing, I think that it is a little late to ask for help. I'm from Parowan, and in the early 1900's that was the Rambouillet capital of the world. So therefore, we're the Parowan Rams. Somehow, during my lifetime, we went from being the Parowan Rambouillet Rams, to the Bighorn Rams, but I think that it is a little too late for help there. I agree with this proposal and support it, thank you.

Dave Black: And Troy will be followed by Garrick Hall.

Troy Justensen: Troy Justensen; Sportsmen, Fish and Wildlife. In 25 years of doing this, I've sat on more committees than I care to remember, but this one will always stand out in my mind. We all knew the tensions that were here the last time we met concerning the Minerals. This committee convened shortly after that, so you can imagine that those emotions and the intensity were pretty incredible. Like Bret stated, we came together and we talked about issues and ways to get around issues to where we could both co-exist. I personally wanted to thank Troy and Bret for coming down here; they didn't have to do that tonight. For those of you who don't know where Tremonton is, it's to hell and back. Thank you. I appreciate that. I think that we came up with a great plan. I think that as far as the state goes, we looked at every possible thing that we could put in there to protect the producer. Like Troy stated, is it perfect? No. We still know that. We deal with federal agencies; there are things that we are still vulnerable to. But, I'll give you this guarantee and this promise if that time comes; sportsmen and livestock will stand and fight together to make sure that domestic sheep stay on the ranges. We appreciate the willingness to work with us, to come through and to come up with a plan that benefits both. I would encourage this RAC to accept the Sheep Plan as presented. I want to give a shout out to Jace as well as the Division. They did a hell of a job in managing us, keeping us on track, and coming up with a great plan. Thank you.

Dave Black: Garrick will be followed by Greg Bird.

Garrick Hall: Garrick Hall here representing the Utah Farm Bureau. We want to first off, thank the Division for the effort that they put forth to develop this plan. I think that it is a testament to the process that they went through, all of you remember a few months ago when we were talking about bighorn sheep, it almost was a knock down drag out fight here in the RAC. Today, we came forward with a management plan and the sportsmen support it the agriculture supports it. Everybody seems to think that this is a good plan. That happened, I think, because there was a lot of time and effort put in by a lot of people to make sure that we have reached some compromises and address all of the issues. We think that this is a good plan. It goes a long way to protect domestic sheep, which is been our concern all along with the bighorns. There is specific language in there to address those issues. I think one of the key components of this whole plan is the MOU. It's not technically part of the plan, but we can put out a great plan, and if our Federal Land Management agencies don't buy into that plan, we don't have much. But, I understand the MOU's going forward and we view that as a key component to all of this. It's a good plan, not a perfect plan, we have a couple things that we have concerns with, but all in all, we think that it is a good plan and we encourage you to vote in favor of that. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you and Greg will be followed by Steven Yardley.

Greg Bird: Greg Bird, Utah Wild Sheep. Just for the sake of time, I just want to concur with a lot of these gentlemen that served on the committee who also stated that this is a really unique plan that is really unique to Utah and itself. We don't see a lot of these built in protections in the west with bighorn sheep and domestics. So, there is a lot of work going into this. We feel like it is a workable plan and we whole heartedly agree with this and hope that the RAC accepts it tonight. Thank you.

Dave Black: And Steven will be followed by Gibb and that's all the comment cards that we have.

Steven Yardley: My name is Steven Yardley again, and I would like to thank the people who went through this plan and prepared it. I would also like to thank Justin Shannon for his remarks regarding the work that the Division has done with agriculture and with guys in agriculture. I think that there are a lot of good things with the GIP and the WRI that are taking place. I know that you guys have heard it until you are blue in the face, a lot of you that are on the RAC, there still is a lot of apprehension on the Mineral Mountains from the permittees that are on there. When they talk about the sustainable basis and suspended AUM's, there are a lot of suspended AUM's. Really, I don't know that those AUM's should be, maybe some of those suspended AUM's should continue to be suspended, because really, it's about the ecosystem and managing the range resource. I feel like we are trying to put animals in a place that already has, if anything, needs to be cut back on. We need to take all things into consideration. There are a lot of antelope that they have increased out there, there is a lot of other wildlife that are increasing out there, and the range resource can only handle so many animals, along with the water resources, that's a very arid part of the state, and so I hope that the Division will take into consideration the apprehensions that are real from the permittees who feel like that this is an infringement and an encroachment on their permits and on the range resources that they are relying upon. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Gibb Yardley: I'm Gibb Yardley from Beaver. We're quite opposed to the DWR transplanting all of these species from one place where there are too many of them to another place and making it so there's too many of them in another place. It's impacting the range resource very seriously, and we are opposed

to that. We've got a lot of neighbors and I've got a ranch that borders this Mineral Mountain allotment and it's really going to have a bad impact on them if they put all of these bighorn sheep out there. There hardly used to be an antelope out there, now, Fish and Game tells us that they counted 600. Our people think that there are over 800 out there. I've spent thousands of dollars re-seeding this ranch that I've got next to that. It's been droughty and they didn't grow much this fall. We had those good ranges all greened up and I've got 80 head of antelope right in my ranch eating that grass. I want those roots to get invigorated and they're eating it up! We just can't have all of these game animals on our private property. These antelope- am I out of place to talk about these antelope for a minute?

Dave Black: You've got about a minute left, so you can talk about whatever you want in the next minute.

Gibb Yardley: Okay. On the Parker Mountain I've heard about too many antelope up there all my life and I'm 85 years old. They capture them out there and transplant them on the rest of us so that we've got too many. We need a lot bigger antelope hunts in a lot of areas, and this Mineral Mountain place is one that needs a big increase in numbers of antelope killed. I hope that you can do that because it's impacting our private property and we don't like it. It's costing us a lot of money. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Gibb. Make sure you're at the RAC meeting in April and we'll talk about numbers on tags. Okay, that's all the comment cards, so we'll close the comment section to the audience. Do we have any comments from the RAC? Brian.

Comments from RAC members:

Brian Johnson: Just wondering if we want to think about maybe inserting the word 'sheep man' or 'wool grower' or encourage them to insert that word when they are talking about a livestock man removing a bighorn sheep. It's just something that I maybe want to discuss. If we don't want to discuss it that's fine too, but it sounds like a really good plan. That was the only catch that I had while listening to it. I just want to know what you guy's opinions were on that.

Dave Black: Tammy were you part of that process? Were you on the committee?

Tammy Pearson: No.

Brian Johnson: And maybe I should just ask Troy, the livestock-

Dave Black: Bret

Brian Johnson: Foster. I mean, what is your guy's take on that? Should we have the word sheep, because I'm not too worried about it, but if a sheep gets in with cows...? I don't want to have some trigger happy guy start whacking bighorn sheep if they get in with cows. What's that?

Dave Black: Troy, please come up to the microphone.

Troy Forest: So the language in the plan just says the words 'pursue this' so the details of it haven't been- that's all we did was insert that. I think that that will be very well covered when they get into the

details, and it has to come through rule and it will come back to the RAC, so I think at that point, it will be very covered, so I think that what we have now is fine. I don't think that there is any reason to argue about it.

Brian Johnson: So, I was just wondering if we wanted to encourage the insertion of that word, is all I was wondering.

Dave Black: Okay, uh any other comments? Wade.

Wade Heaton: Okay, uh, I just want to make a couple of points. One is that I love the new approach—the direction that everyone is taking. Let's be honest, it's being led by the Division. I just want hats off to them. The direction that they are moving with getting the agricultural community and the wildlife community together to solve some of these problems, to me, is just awesome. I think that we have seen right here in these two committees and these two groups what can be done. For far too long, we have listened to the extremists from both communities. They have dragged the process down and made all of our lives a little harder. It's clear to me that there are really smart guys in both communities and they sat on these boards and in these groups and they came up with some really great plans. To me, I hope we use that as a model to continue on from here. We can accomplish a whole lot more together than we can while we're squabbling. So, thank you. Thank you to Justin and Jace and there are an awful lot of others that have been involved in that, but I think that we are on a good path.

Dave Black: Okay, Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: I just want to make a quick comment along Wade's lines too. In fact, I might be one of the extremists he's talking about. I have been very involved in this process, on this sheep one particularly and engaged in it. It is exciting to be here today and listen to the sportsmen's groups and guys representing the sheep and the agriculture and everybody in favor. It's pretty impressive. I would have bet money that that wouldn't have been able to happen a couple of months ago. I was in several meetings where it was definitely going the other direction. So, it is impressive and it's good and I apologize for one of those extremists, Wade.

Dave Black: I just wanted to see if we are ready for a motion or if somebody had a comment that they wanted to say. Gene and Tammy. So, two more comments.

Gene Boardman: Just an observation that these sheep are really high maintenance in the state compared to deer. It's like a high maintenance wife or girlfriend or a high maintenance husband or boyfriend. Compared to deer and other animals, they are high maintenance and in the past, herds have been established for quite a while and still only two or three permits per herd. Trophy hunting is a great thing, but sometimes trophy hunters get a little beyond. I think that what we really need is more opportunity. If we're going to have these high maintenance animals, and we are going to have them and I love them, let's have more opportunity.

Dave Black: Tammy.

Verland King: Yeah I have a comment. I sat on a similar committee to this and we hashed it out and it worked great on the bison committee in the Henry Mountains. So, yeah, we are all feeling good and it's really great that everybody came together. Now, it's up to the DWR to follow this plan if we pass it. The

concessions made to protect agriculture are great. I read them in there, that's my main concern. It looks like you have put them in there as strong as you can. So, it's good, but we need to not just forget about it and let it go. With this bison committee, we put in some language for drought and it was like pulling teeth to get extra tags. We're in a terrible drought on the Henry's and we are actually going to lose bison to starvation this winter if- I was going to say if things go well- but if we can get some snow it will help too. The MOU too, that's great. It's the same though, we need to make sure that it is followed and then on this, the rancher being able to kill these rams that come into their herds. I just encourage it. Don't over regulate it. Don't make it so that it can't be done without-just make it so hard that the ranchers can't do it because a lot of times, the one that will be able to do it will be a Peruvian herder that happens to be there. And, yeah, you don't want those rams going back into the wild herd. These livestock men, whether they're sheep men or cattle men, they are honorable. They'll do what they are required to do. The worst thing that could happen is for them to say "Well, dog that ram out of the herd, I don't want to go through the paperwork of being able to kill it." So, just when you get to writing that specific part of it or discussing it, don't over regulate it, because we see this time after time again at these RAC meetings where you've gone through and it seems to me that a certain part of a regulation makes it so that your officer can't right a ticket. So you try to change that to make it easier for them, but it bothers me, so I just encourage you not to do that. Thank you.

Tammy Pearson: Okay, so uh, I want to commend everybody coming to the table and working on this. This is something that we have been preaching about ever since I got here and heard about the resource management plans; we should all be on the same team, we ought to be working together and not against each other. There should be no negative impact of livestock, on agriculture, for the benefit of wildlife. Everything that we have done for years and years has always benefitted wildlife. Two things; I want to tell you that I do appreciate your-thank you to agriculture. It's about time. I think that we need to continue that because wildlife wouldn't be where they're at if it wasn't for agriculture. These permittees that are out there maintaining water and doing these rehab projects, but most of all, I do really appreciate everybody and especially the Division, Department of Agriculture, and PLPCO coming together and bringing everybody together and working through this. I think that it ultimately comes down to conversation. We can all do hard things. We're not going to solve these issues overnight. This is the first, best step that I have seen in the four years that I have been a commissioner of working together. Hopefully, like Wade said, hopefully this is just the first model. Let's work on the rest of the state management plans. Let's start getting these kinds of protections in and benefits to both sides of the issue, because I can guarantee you, it'll be a win-win if we do something to that effect. Counties, we're actually having our state association meetings tomorrow, so it will probably one of the very first times I ever walk into a meeting and say "Hey! We've got good things moving with the Wildlife Division" I appreciate being able to share some good news. Thank you.

Brayden Richmond: I was handed the microphone, so I'm assuming it's time to make a motion.

Tammy Pearson: Hey, I'm going to make that motion! I didn't know if all the comments were done yet. I would like to make a motion that we approve this Bighorn Sheep Statewide Management Plan.

Dave Black: Okay, so we have a motion from Tammy, and a second from Nick. Do we have any further discussion?

RAC discussion and vote:

Tammy Pearson made the motion to approve the Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan accept as presented. Nick Jorgensen seconded the Motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Dave Black: Unanimous. Okay, let's move on to #8, which is why everybody is here, I'm sure. That's going to be Covy Jones. You're up, big guy.

**Bucks, Bulls, and OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline (Action)
-Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator**

Covy Jones: We good? Alright with that, I'm Covy Jones; I'm the big game coordinator and I'll be presenting the 2019 big game season dates, boundary descriptions, and rule amendments. Starting with general season deer, again, it's pretty similar every year; a 28 day archery hunt there, starting mid August, a nine day muzzleloader hunt at the end of September to the 1st of October, and then the early any weapon hunt, five days on selected units, and then 9 days, and the general season hunt there at the end of October. Moving on to elk, the archery spike, there's a bull hunt there first, being 21 days and leaving those last 7 days to the limited entry hunters, archery any bull up to the 28 day hunt, the muzzleloader hunt there at the end of October beginning of November, 9 days in the any weapon hunt at the 1st of October. We'll move right into changes, and we'll do changes by region so at the top you'll see the region on the left hand side you'll first see the species that we're talking about the change for and then recommending the change underneath that, what the changes for that species are. Starting here in the southern region with deer, we are recommending discontinuing the late-season limited-entry muzzleloader hunts on the Monroe and Plateau Fish Lake units. If you remember, last year we brought around a recommendation to have this hunt on all units that were meeting their minimum buck to doe ratios across the state, and we've brought that around. What we heard was a resounding "Follow the plan." And that's what the public want to see, that's what the RAC's wanted to see, and that's ultimately what the board went with. Recommending discontinuing this on the Monroe and Plateau Fish Lake units is exactly that. Those units fell back down in. They're no longer exceeding, so it will follow the plan, we recommend discontinuing that hunt. We are recommending adding an early general season any weapon hunt on the Panguitch Lake, we're dealing with some crowding issues there, and add archery and muzzleloader, managing buck deer on the Paunsaugunt unit. This is something we already do on the Henry's. It allows us to spread some of that pressure out and provide some more opportunity on bucks that aren't quite the trophy that a limited entry hunter would get. Onto the southeastern region recommendations for changes for bison on the Henry Mountains, we are recommending to add a cow only archery hunt on that unit with the below dates there at first of October. We are also recommending adding a new hunters' choice hunt on the Henry Mountains unit. Other bison hunt dates on the unit will be adjusted to allow for these additional hunts. One of the things that realized this last year when we got into the drought situation that we did and are currently still in, is that we needed a place to add hunters if we needed to. So, some of the shortening hunts up and adding more hunts allowing us to move that pressure around, allows us to better manage that population. We're also recommending a boundary change on the Henry Mountains, this boundary change, if you are familiar with the area, there is a piece from the Notom Road over to the reef that before, the Notom Road was the boundary. There are times when bison cross the road and go up against the reef. And this just takes that from Notom Road out to the reefs, so it incorporates that little triangle of land. For pronghorn, we are recommending to add an archery hunt of San Juan hatch point in mid August to mid September and a boundary change on the Centerfield North unit where we have had a population cross Highway 10 and go to the other side there. In the northern region, starting with elk, we are recommending a boundary change on the Cache North

limited entry unit. What this boundary change will do, is it will remove the Wellsville Mountains. There aren't a lot of elk on the Wellsville, but there is a lot of conflict. So, having that in the limited entry sometimes it makes it more difficult to deal with the conflict for very few elk. So, the second line there is a boundary change to add the Wellsville Mountains to the any bull hunt. So, we're just removing that piece and adding it to any bull, also a boundary change to add the Box Elder Hansel Mountains to the any bull unit, the any bull hunt. This is an area that previously was not included in any elk hunts and we have a resource there. For deer, a boundary change to the Cache extended archery unit. This incorporates some more agricultural land in the valley there and allows us to deal with some issues using extended archery. For bighorn sheep, a recommendation to discontinue the Box Elder Pilot Mountain Rocky Mountain Bighorn and that's simply because we alternate that permit with Nevada and it's Nevada's year. In the northeastern region, starting with bison, as this population continues to approach the population objective, we're starting to try and get hunts in place to help us manage that. So we're not there yet, but in order to distribute hunters across the landscape and manage it better, we're recommending adding quite a few hunts to that. So first we're recommending adding two hunters' choice hunts to the Book Cliffs, there would be one in September and one in October. We're also recommending adding a hunt to the Book Cliffs Little Creek roadless unit. So in the roadless area it's, you could hunt that with a regular Book Cliffs bison permit, but you probably wouldn't want to. So, what this does is the hunters that would put in for his hunt would know that they would be putting in for a roadless hunt and have the equipment to be able to get a bison back out. We are also recommending adding a cow only hunt of the Book Cliffs, and that would be in November. Other bison hunt dates would be adjusted accordingly to accommodate these hunts if you look at the handout. On the deer, we're recommending a boundary change to the Uintah Basin extended archery unit and this incorporates some agricultural land on the north end, on the northeast side I guess, and also makes a change on the west side to, they used to bisect the WMA and this puts it all so it's all in one. On to elk, the boundaries change to the Uintah Basin extended archery unit; it's that same boundary change. It cleans it up on both ends. This creates a few other boundary changes, so it will create a boundary change to the 9 Mile/Anthro Limited Entry and Spike Bull units, adding the entire Cottonwood WMA and taking that out of the extended archery and any bull units. There would be a corresponding boundary change to the South Slope Bonanza/Vernal Yellowstone any bull units as well. For pronghorn, we're recommending to add a muzzleloader hunt on the 9 Mile and Anthro-Myton Bench and to add a muzzleloader hunt on the South Slope Bonanza Diamond Mountain unit. On to the central region starting with deer, the first addition is to add the South Wasatch extended archery unit. This goes from, for those of you familiar with the area, it goes from Timpanogos Highway up a ways, not all the way to the top, up a ways on the mountain and then down to Hobbler Creek Canyon. We are recommending adding the Herriman South Valley extended archery, and this is just right in and around Herriman on land that is hunt-able there. We are recommending adding the Utah Lake extended archery unit. This is on and around Utah Lake on the sovereign lands there, and then there's some Division property at the south end of the lake, and recommending adding the Sanpete Valley extended archery to help deal with some depredation issues there. We're also recommending a boundary change to the Wasatch Front extended archery unit. This would take that unit from, right now it's the Salt Lake County Utah County line, and this moves it over to Alpine, the canyon there. When we look at this, and some of the addition behind this, there are multiple reasons why we use extended archery. One is to provide opportunity; the other is to deal with urban conflict. Where we had these hunts in place and have had these hunts in place historically, frankly, there's not a lot of harvest. They've become almost a trophy hunt in some aspects, but the opportunity is there to harvest either a buck or a doe, for deer. The other thing that we notice is that we don't have the urban conflicts, so when you see these areas listed and these cities listed, a lot of these cities down in the valley have urban deer programs. They have enough deer inside city limits that the city is removing those deer, or paying to

transplant those deer in some cases, but a lot of times they're lethally removing those deer. We wanted to provide some that opportunity to sportsmen, that's another reason. Even if the harvest isn't high, one of the things we've noticed is every day when those deer get chased back up the mountain, they don't have those urban conflicts. They stay out. So, there's several reasons here, we're really excited about these hunts. Central region recommendations continued; for elk, we're recommending a boundary change to the Wasatch Front extended archery unit. This is to that with the deer; it just brings it down from Salt Lake County-Utah County down to SR 92. We're also recommending on Rocky Mountain sheep we're excited to be able to bring back the Oquirrh Stansbury hunt there for bighorn. On mountain goats, we're recommending a boundary change the Wasatch Mountains Timp unit. This picks up some mountain goat habitat on the back side that before was outside the unit inadvertently. Also, we're recommending adding an archery only hunt on the Central Mountains Nebo unit for mountain goats. With that we'll move onto some key dates. The application period starts January 31st to March 7th. If you just want to buy a point, that's extended to the 21st. Then Lindy has promised that the results be posted by May 30th at the very latest. Just as quick reminder, there is a season for the buying and selling of legally obtained heads and antlers. That is from February 1st to July 31st. Some of the key dates for hunters with qualifying disabilities are listed here. Then, switching gears from recommendations to rule amendments, we had a few rule amendments and we just wanted, because they were not significant, we just incorporated them into the recommendations presentation. The one is, if you'll remember last year, we had some individuals that brought around a presentation on the use of an air gun or air bolts. When they brought that around, they didn't meet with a lot of opposition. It seemed like there weren't a lot of concerns. One of the concerns was that the gun doesn't pay PR tax. We'll talk about that in a second. Overall, the weapon is deadly, and there weren't a lot of concerns as long as it was used as an illegal weapon. Nobody wanted to see it allowed as archery or something else, but it is an illegal weapon. Most of the public generally accepted it. With that, we decided to incorporate a recommendation to allow the air gun as an illegal weapon under the following circumstances. It must be a pre-charged pneumatic device from a separate charging device. So, it can't be a pump gun. Usually they charge these with scuba tanks. It must shoot a bolt or arrow no less than 16 inches, and this aligns it for what we currently do for crossbows, then, using a fixed blade or expandable broadhead at least 7/8 inches at its widest point and travel no less than 400 feet per second at the muzzle. Because there is some concern in the agency, the fact that this weapon doesn't pay PR, we feel like this is a good middle ground, that the bolt pays PR, the broadhead would, and the companies have assured other wildlife agencies that the AFWA and WAFWA, the association of fish and wildlife agencies and the western association of fish and wildlife agencies meetings, that they are working with congress to get this in place. What we would ask is that a review in December of 2020 to see what the Pittman Robertson status is on the weapon. Another rule change, and this one aligns us with what other states around us do, and that is just to allow hunters to fly into remote areas. There are a couple of conditions here. One is that scouting during the flight is prohibited. I promise you that hunters notice if they see a plane scouting, so I'm sure that one will be enforced pretty tightly. Secondly, you must land on an improved air strip. Three, you cannot hunt until the following day, and four, when you are done with your hunt; we recommend that the plane may transport back out hunters, their gear, and any legally harvested wildlife. With that, I'll take any questions. Just as a reminder, if you have a question that is statewide, I am here and if you have a question that is specific to a unit or a regional question, we've got the biologists and managers here as well.

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Covy I have one question on the Panguitch Lake early year hunt. I think I know the answer, but does that overlap with another hunt, does that overlap with the spike hunt?

Covy Jones: Yes it's that first part of October, so it does overlap. I'm trying to remember.

Dave Black: Is it the entire hunt or are they both going on during the entire hunt?

Covy Jones: Let's look at it really quick. So, the dates for that are the 9th- 13th and then it would overlap.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Do we have any other questions from the RAC? We've got a lot of them down here, let's start down at the far end with Rusty and work this way.

Rusty Aiken: Thanks Dave. On the Panguitch proposal, is that unit; is it a 20 buck per 100 does? Is that correct, the upper tier?

Covy Jones: It's the 18-20, yes.

Rusty Aiken: But it is over that objective?

Covy Jones: Josh, you can speak to that.

Josh Pollock: The three year average is right now, Rusty, is right at 19.

Rusty Aiken: So it's not over 20?

Josh Pollock: It's not over 20, no.

Dave Black: Okay, anybody else down this way? I saw lots of arms. Right here, Gene.

Sean Stewart: Yeah, I just have a quick question on the flights. Does improved air strip have a legal definition? Or does it just mean that it was improved at one time?

Covy Jones: There's a list of improved air strips. We don't make those.

Sean Stewart: All right.

Covy Jones: I would hope it was good enough to land on. It might only get used once.

Sean Stewart: That would depend on the kind of pilot you are. We do have a lot of old air strips around on BLM lands, so I just was curious what improved meant. Reggie's over there, maybe he's...

Covy Jones: I was looking for Marty.

Gene Boardman: Okay you want an early hunt on Panguitch Lake? Last year early hunts were started on a trial basis. Have you got any information from anybody this year that the trial worked or didn't

work?

Covy Jones: So as far as initial feedback, is that what you're looking for, Gene?

Gene Boardman: No. Initial feedback is what you're going to have at first.

Covy Jones: Hunters went out, they harvested animals, but we don't have it broken down by harvest yet to see exactly when they were harvested. I've had a few negative comments or frustrations that "Hey, somebody else got first crack at these." Usually, that has been on units that were, how do I say this, units that we knew were struggling a little bit anyway from the drought. Overall, the comments that we've gotten on these hunts have been positive. "It was a great thing, I saw fewer hunters on my general season hunt, I like it, and it's a compromise." That early hunt has some disadvantages, it overlaps the spike hunt. So, there are some disadvantages to it as well. It's shorter, whereas the regular hunt is longer, through weekends. I guess that the answer is overall, I've had a lot of positive feedback and a few complaints, mostly on units that were struggling, probably because of drought.

Gene Boardman: What percent, what percent of the any weapon tags go to the early hunt?

Covy Jones: This last year we put 20% of the permits in that early season. Not 20% of the total permits.

Gene Boardman: 20, what 20 percent of the total permits?

Covy Jones: Yes.

Gene Boardman: So that would be about 40% of the any weapon?

Covy Jones: So what it did was effectively lowered the any weapon from 60% of the permits to 40% of the total permits.

Gene Boardman: Uh.

Covy Jones: Still have more in the traditional general season hunt than we do in the early hunt.

Gene Boardman: This one you probably won't be able to answer, but does it affect the percentage of draw on the point system?

Covy Jones: Uh, okay Gene, so in areas where-it depends on the reason why the hunt was implemented, okay? So we had areas that were exceeding their buck to doe ratios, but yet, every time we proposed an increase, we would hear that "We can't handle the increase because of crowding." And the crowding was always in that regular rifle hunt. That's where everybody felt crowded and that's where the majority of the permits are. So, on several of these, we were able to propose an additional hunt and also increase permits and when you can do that, yes, you can help draw outs. If not, you are just spreading the pressure across.

Gene Boardman: Okay, thanks.

Dave Black: Go ahead.

Wade Heaton: Real quick, Covy, you mentioned the boundary change on the Henry Mountains. Does that just apply to the bison hunts or is that for elk as well?

Covy Jones: No it's just the bison.

Dave Black: Questions down this way?

Nick Jorgensen: I uh, just wonder a little bit about what the impact of the early hunt on Panguitch Lake would have on those that are coming in. It seems like they scare a lot of the animals away early. Opening weekend is always the best opportunity to get a kill, but if there have been people out there hunting and it overlaps, it seems like that is a disadvantage to those that come along in the second hunt.

Covy Jones: If this is a unit question, I think I always hunt the second weekend, I hate the first weekend. So, let them go bang guns and do whatever they're going to do and I'm going to come out the second weekend and kill a buck. If it's an opinion question, that's my opinion. So, I don't see it that way.

Nick Jorgensen: Okay

Covy Jones: Elk, yes, move large distances to escape pressure, deer move around and usually settle back in.

Dave Black: Okay I just have one more question. There are a number of advantages of an early hunt or a second hunt, but doesn't it create one more opportunity for dedicated hunters? Isn't that one of the advantages? Because they can hunt both hunts, right?

Covy Jones: Yeah, so-

Dave Black: So, they don't chose an early or a late hunt, a dedicated hunter gets both. Is that the same for the youth as well?

Covy Jones: Yes. We didn't limit the youth or dedicated hunters. With the rational for dedicated hunters, you can only harvest two deer in three years anyway.

Dave Black: Right, so okay. Okay, any further questions?

Wade Heaton: Sorry I know we were talking about this earlier with Panguitch a lot, but it was presented last year and passed the RAC's, but not the board. Is that true?

Covy Jones: Yes that's correct. If I remember right Josh, it passed this RAC too, correct? It passed all five RAC's.

Dave Black: Okay are there questions from the audience? Remember to state your name, you've been here before.

Questions from the Public:

Lee Tracey: Lee Tracy, I'm from Enoch. I have a couple questions. Number one is, you mentioned that there is an extended time limit for those have qualified disabilities. Do we have a definition for what those qualified disabilities are? My next question is do they have to be permanent or temporary? If I bust my shoulder a week before the archery season, can I use a crossbow?

Covy Jones: So yeah there's a rule written on that. I don't have it right here in front of me, we could bring it up, but there's a rule on what a qualifying disability is, and in the rule, I believe it's a permanent disability. In fact, the front office staff just verified, thank you.

Kevin Bunnell: It's a permanent disability and it's apparently very strictly defined.

Lee Tracey: Well, you know, I'm 77 years old and I don't get around like I used to. I've got heart problems as well.

Kevin Bunnell: Unfortunately age isn't one of the qualifying disabilities.

Lee Tracey: Well, unfortunately most federal government agencies don't worry about age anyway. In talking to Teresa, she mentioned one time that she had made some proposals to the Division that we expand those extended archery areas. There are several hunts down here in Southern Utah right close to Cedar City that wouldn't be served as well with an extended archery area with some does hunts and stuff out at Quitchipaw and Parowan Front. Has that been discussed? Is there a possibility of expanding it beyond the Wasatch front?

Covy Jones: Teresa.

Teresa Griffin: Yeah I had just mentioned that that is something that our staff can consider, that if there are areas that they feel, so each biologists can consider having those, but we haven't done it in the southern region yet. It's just something that all of our biologists can consider. It's another tool that we've got in our toolbox if we feel like fits.

Lee Tracey: Alright thanks.

Dave: Okay any other questions? We'll move to the comment section. Our first comment will be by Steven Yardley followed by Gibb Yardley.

Comments from the Public:

Steven Yardley: Steven Yardley from Beaver, Utah. We draw on the Panguitch Lake unit as well as have private land on the Panguitch Lake unit. I would just like to speak in favor of having an early season. Elk numbers have perennially been over the object on the Panguitch Lake, and we need to do everything we can to get them down in numbers where they're supposed to be, especially with the dry years we've been experiencing. There have been a lot of the pastures that we've run into that before we've even gotten our cattle there, the feed is already gone! They've talked about all of the range improvement projects that they've done on the Panguitch Lake unit, which they have done a lot, but it has all been in lower country down by Panguitch and ? and that area. In the high country, there hasn't

been a lot done. I would argue that your habitat is actually on the decrease because of all of the deadfall you have from the spruce beetle kill. You can't get through most of that country and neither can the deer or the elk, so they're forced down into the valley floors that they normally haven't been in because they were grazing up in the timber. Unfortunately, because of a lot of whacked out environmental groups that helped bring that to pass, we are faced with a horrific problem, the spruce beetle kill that has fallen all over and not only that, but also with fire, there is a lot of ground and a lot of habitat there that is going to take a few years to rejuvenate itself, and so we need to take that into account and take those numbers down to where they need to be in any way, shape, or form possible. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Steven, I just want to clarify for you and for everybody else, the early hunt is actually a deer hunt that they are proposing and there is currently a spike hunt open at that time as well.

Steven Yardley: The deer numbers are also over on the Panguitch Lake unit, though, if you review them on the objective.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Gibb Yardley: I'm Gibb Yardley from Beaver, but we have about the largest cattle permits up on the Cedar Mountain and my granddad got those permits in 1908, so my family has been involved on the Dixie National Forest forever. We are really concerned about too many elk up there. Those elk come up there to that high country, some of it at 10,000 feet, the minute the first blade of green grass, the minute the snow goes, those elk are getting that grass eaten up and it's really diminishing our permits and our feed. We're concerned; we think that we need to take quite a lot more elk off of Panguitch Lake. Also, we winter our cows on the west desert, and out there, we are only going to be able to take half of our cattle out there that we normally take this year because of the drought. Those elk are out there year round. Our cattle move out for half of the year and go on the mountain and we are really short of feed and we think that we need to take a lot more elk off the west desert and it seems to me that in these drought years, we really try to keep our numbers down. We were a month late putting our cattle on the mountain. In the past, the DWR has not given any consideration to these droughts with this wildlife. We've got to take more of them off and not just have it all on the cattle people. These droughts are serious. You all know, we've never had a worse drought than we had last summer, and we need to increase the numbers of these elk that are taken off. We've got a lot more deer on the Panguitch Lake unit, but we can live with them a lot more than we can with these overly high numbers of elk. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Gibb. Make sure you are here in April, that's when we'll talk about the actual number of permits and stuff like that, so you'll want to be here then. Thank you. Troy Justensen will be followed by Greg Bird.

Troy Justensen: Troy Justensen; sportsmen, fish and wildlife. I passed out a couple of different papers with some different proposals on them. One of which is dealing with an archery only once-in-a-lifetime bighorn hunt for both deserts and Rockies. The other is pertaining to elk. The first thing that I want to address is the elk. First, I would like to state that we support the Division's recommendations with the following exceptions. The first one that I would like to talk about is the Mount Dutton late rifle. We know that that is part of the mega unit, and a lot of bulls tend to summer on that coming from the Boulder, coming from the Panguitch Lake, coming from the Monroe, and due to the country they're real susceptible to a lot of pressure on the top. So, we'd ask that we discontinue the late rifle on the Dutton,

just to help protect that top end. On all of these proposals, we'd ask that the RAC go ahead and vote on. Gene, you're going to like this one. We understand that there needs to be more opportunity, so what we'd like to do is, those of you that have been around long enough remember that the Barney Top used to be a unit on its own and then they combined it with the Boulder. We'd like to carve back out the Barney Top unit and also include the Keenan, the Kaiparowits, and then east of Highway 12, and create a primitive weapon unit. Now, let me explain primitive weapon; what that would be, it would be t archery and then a primitive weapon muzzleloader, muzzleloader being iron sights, no scope, no sabots, percussion cap, 209 primer, there's some things as we proposed this earlier, the Division said that we'd have to address and define what primitive weapon is so this is something that would have to be implemented down the line, but we'd still like to go ahead and carve out that unit and for this year have it an archery only unit. The hopes of being able to provide more opportunity and see what kind of quality we can grow with taking a step back from technology to actually making it a hunt and not so much a selection process of being able to tip animals over at 7, 800, 900 thousand yards or whatever you're type of deal. Pertaining to the bighorn, this is the third time you've seen it. It's been passed by the RAC's twice and for whatever reason The Wildlife Board has not adopted it. Last year it was accepted by all RAC's unanimous except one descending vote. That vote came from the Uintah Basin and the individual voted for the new full on hunt, but not the Zion, so I don't know kind of what that was. When we presented it to the Wildlife Board, they came back and said "Well we're not going to accept it for the simple fact that we wanted it to go through a sheep committee and we want a public survey." Well, we're back again. It went through the sheep committee and we actually addressed it and it was in that portion that we talked about expanding the opportunity to hunt sheep, but also exploring and providing additional ways to harvest sheep through less effective weapon types. So, we did address it there and then as the Division will present you to the Wildlife Board, they did put a survey out, while we also have support of it from them there. Below, I kind of laid out the history to you and then some of the benefits to it. On the dates, we've actually put "to be determined." We want to get with the biologists, and once again, this is an opportunity. We want low success rates; we want to see when the toughest dates will be. The Division also asked if we'd be flexible on the units, because some things have changed obviously with design and we would be. We would like to see that in concepts of- once again, we'd ask that the RAC address these proposals here and vote on it individually. Thank you, I appreciate your time

Dave Black: Troy, a quick question before you sit down. On the archery, are you doing primitive archery as well? Are you going back to recurve?

Troy Justensen: No, we thought about loin cloth and that and it didn't work. (Laughter)

Wade Heaton: Can I ask a fast question too? Nobody wants to see Troy in a loin cloth, but for that Barney Top hunt, is the recommendation only archery this year and we'll address muzzleloader later?

Troy Justensen: Yeah, the Division said that they would have to define what a primitive muzzleloader would be. Right now, it's a scoped, we all know that muzzleloaders right now, effectively, are a 6 or 700 yard gun. It's a 3OA.

Brian Johnson: Troy I'm gonna pick on you one more time.

Troy Justensen: It's alright

Brian Johnson: What about just using the word ‘side lock’ on muzzleloader? That keeps it pretty primitive and I’ve talked to a lot of muzzleloader guys, I grew up playing muzzleloader dude. I mean the word ‘209 primer’ leaves it open for in lines. I’m just wondering what you think of the word ‘side lock.’

Troy Justensen: You know it really doesn’t matter to me. One thing that I didn’t add in there is that it would be a flintlock. I don’t care. What we’re after is providing opportunity to get out there know that if you put in for this hunt, the odds are against you. But at least you get to go out and try. We are getting too effective at killing things.

Brian Johnson: Yeah I just love the word ‘side lock’ so.

Troy Justensen: Yeah that can be addressed at a later date when we go through and it comes back and they define primitive weapon.

Dave Black: Okay don’t sit down yet, we’ve got another question down on the end.

Rusty Aiken: How many tags are you thinking? Just a ballpark.

Troy Justensen: That’s something-

Rusty Aiken: 20, 30, 100?

Troy Justensen: I have no idea. We just have to get with the biologists, and that’s another thing. We’ve talked to the individual biologists on these units and they are supportive of the concept. Even going back to the once-in-a-lifetime archery for the bighorns, the Division supports this.

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: If you’re going to call it primitive weapon, you’ve got to go to long bow. There is more technology in those bows than there is in a rifle. If you rely on the arms of the bow to cast your arrow, it would drop it to your feet.

Troy Justensen: I don’t know where you draw the line there, obviously, there are some people that have the ability to shoot 125 yards, but for most people, it’s got to be 60 or 100 yards. I don’t know if we would support going to that drastic measure.

Dave Black: Okay I think we understand your proposal. Thank you.

Troy Justensen: Thank you.

Dave Black: Greg will be followed by Ryan Houston.

Greg Bird: Greg Bird, Utah wild sheep. We agree with the recommendations of SSW with the Barney Top addition on the archery this year and a primitive weapon in the years to come as these details get worked out. Also we would support the no late Dutton elk hunt. As far as the sheep hunts on the archery only units, Troy addressed a lot of the issues and we just whole heartedly would hope that you’d vote on this. Again, as Troy mentioned, it has gone through twice already and has passed just with the exception

of the Wildlife Board. They asked us to do three things last year; one of them was to run through the sheep committee, which it was and it was heavily in favor of, the survey of the hunters' once-in-a-lifetime permits had also come back favorable, and then to be on the agenda. We propose and recommend that we had a desert sheep hunt and a bighorn, a Rocky, or a California hunt to this once-in-a-lifetime archery only. We do have the support from the biologists and we are open to suggestion on units and dates. At this, we feel that this hunt will address points; this will be a more desirable hunt for people that are just getting in the pool or have low points. It will possibly see that they can hunt a sheep earlier in their life, or if ever. It will also target animals that often get past over by rifle hunters because archery is just more of an opportunity type hunt. So we ask that you could vote on this again tonight and in favor, and we thank you for your time. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you Ryan will be followed by Kelly Houston.

Ryan Houston: My name is Ryan Houston, I'm from Panguitch. I'm basically here to represent myself; however, I am a sportsman through and through. I'm also a cattle rancher, and we have about 600 plus acres of land on the Panguitch Lake unit that is private. We're also a permittee in the Birch Spring/Rock Canyon/Pass Creek area. I'm kind of here for three reasons. I really enjoyed the Division guys in my home town and I was kind of a late comer on this. I wish that I would have been able to talk to them a little bit more. I'm actually here to address the Panguitch Lake early deer hunt. A couple of things, I guess I really have three main things—one, we're talking a lot about the pressure. I just want to make it stated, from August 1st to January 1st, I guess the reason that I brought up my cattle thing, is I'm on that mountain all summer, all fall long, not just during the hunt. On the hunt, I'm there as well. There's a lot pressure on that unit. With the fire, all of the roads are opened up. It really is, it's like a freeway. So when we come to that pressure, I think that there are some things to be considered about the early hunt that I would like to address and one of those is this—for example, when I mention the Pass Creek area, I have to be fast so I hope you understand because I only have so much time, but right now we are looking at developing a \$30,000 well project because we have a spring that runs right by the road. It's the only spring in the Pass Creek area. It also services four troughs in a 4-mile area. The Forest Service, when they widened the Pass Road, whatever happened, it killed a lot of our spring, so we've struggled. Even this year we hauled about \$4,000 worth of water into that area which we share with the wildlife and I'm glad to do it. The three things I love are cows, elk, and deer. You can make that work and like I say; the Division guys in my hometown are great. They always talk to me about what I like to do. With that being said though, I'm happy to do that. If there's something I've always understood was what I kind of thought was a sacred trust in a way. All of the permittees, we run about 360 cattle on our permit, we run with the Heap's here from Cedar City, and the Roundy's, when I say 360, that's cows and calves. And then you have all of the guys in the Little Valley unit, and we all come home right in the middle of October, so about the 14th. My point is, that early hunt is going to happen, and not only do we have an elk hunt going on, we have two. We have the spike rifle, but we also have all the guys and their horses, their kids, their dogs. Everybody's going to be out moving cows. Not to mention, it's kind of hard. So, we've always kind of had this sacred, I thought, kind of agreement. We end that hunt, all of the cows are off the mountain, and the hunters go enjoy the mountains. We too, go hunting, we go to the mountains, and we take our families. I guess maybe I'm a visionary or a romantic. I feel like that's going to ruin a lot of that. And furthermore, I think that that hunt is going to be a wash because we're all going to be out there on our horses moving cows up and down the highways. I mean we're talking a lot of permittees and so there is going to be an extreme amount of pressure with two elk hunts, cattlemen, all the gates open. So, with that being said, like I said, I'm the first one to try and work with the Division. They're really good to work with me. Like I said, I don't mind sharing the water that I hauled and whatever but I would like the

RAC to even consider that so we don't have all of that going on at the same time, hunts and moving cattle up and down the mountains.

Dave Black: Were going to have to cut you off, Ryan. I'm sorry.

Ryan Houston: Okay, thank you for your time.

Dave Black: Kelly will be followed by Jason Aiken.

Kelly Houston: Thanks for the opportunity to speak, my name is Kelly Houston. I'm his brother; I can't talk that fast though. So, this last hunt, two years ago, I talked to the wildlife biologist. I'm not sure if he is here, but I had a big bull tag on Panguitch Lake and then right after that the spike and cow tags came in. Those areas were hit extremely hard with hunters. I've talked to people from Montana, who have moved to Cedar City, and have never seen so many hunters in their whole lives. The biologist, I'm sorry, I can't remember his name, but he said that we had too many cow elk. But the reason I bring this up is I felt like I was hunting doves in a field, if you will. We had a person every 200 yards or less on that whole mountain, and if you know Panguitch Lake, you probably can't get over two miles from any road. With the forest fire last year, the Forest Service came in and cleaned up roads; they used those roads to fight the fire last year and did a wonderful job. There were people in canyons I've never seen before this year, I counted 17 people just on the archery hunt, and of course the cow elk hunt starts on August 1st on Panguitch Lake. As my brother said, there is a hunt that goes on every day they're on into January. Those elk and deer are getting pushed like crazy. I've seen the fewest number of buck deer ever, except maybe in the 70's, on that unit. We saw spikes that were barely legal being taken. I saw three mature bucks that might be over three years old, and I hunted them from August to October. I like to get out, when I say hunted, I don't shoot much, I just like to get out and have an opportunity. I would strongly recommend you do not put an additional hunt or additional pressure on those deer and elk. They go together, but that's too many people to have a cow elk hunt, a spike hunt, and an early deer hunt. I have to disagree with the presenter from the Wildlife Division. My friends that have hunted the Pine Valley unit told me that it ruined their hunt. There are too many hunters during that early hunt. I'm a dedicated hunter for the first time my year, the first time this year. There are too many hunters, those dedicated hunters, and youth hunters. We won't see the decrease in the numbers of hunters, which I think that the Wildlife Division is trying to do, and I am too. There are too many hunters on these units. Anyway, I want you to vote against that. Thank you.

Dave Black: Okay thank you. Jason will be followed by Austin Aikensen.

Jason Aiken: Jason Aiken representing myself. I'm here from Cedar. I wanted to thank the Division for putting together a great presentation and for all of the hard work you guys put into this. I think that you guys have done a great job. What I want to talk about isn't really something that needs to be changed now, but I think it's something that needs to be addressed. There have been quite a few questions that have come up that are important to understand what is going on when they're making recommendations for changes. Things like the early hunt, Gene Boardman asked about the feedback on the early hunt and do we really want to be recommending putting that on other hunts. Rusty was asking about the late season muzzleloader hunt on the Beaver. He was asking about the ratios, where the buck/doe ratios were. We don't have that information from this year, but we have it from last year. Then also, just from an applicant's standpoint, when we are going in to put in for hunts, we are looking into. I mean, a lot of people want to know how many tags are available and obviously, we don't have that number until May.

So, what I want to mention, is there any way we can get the Division and the third party vendor that does our draw system to come to the table and talk about maybe changing this timeframe of when we're having these discussions. I think that it is important that when we're having these conversations that we know what the tag allocation numbers are kind of going to look like and things like that. I think that that is a good thing for us to be able to talk about when we are doing this kind of stuff. I can understand one of the reasons why we do it in December and November back in the day when we had to apply by paper and everything needed to be entered by hand and all that kind of stuff, but in the electronic day and age, we should be able to turn around a draw system a lot quicker than we did back in the early 90's. So, I want to, I'm not sure how the Division has to bring them to the RAC meeting or is the Wildlife Board member or the Big Game board has to get something started, but I really would like to see that kind of come up as a conversation piece to see if we can get this conversation happening more in May when we're doing the tag allocations at the same time instead of having two different meetings. It's just a thought. I would just like to see if we can talk about it. The other thing that I want to mention, there has been some talk about maybe reducing the spike units or reducing the amount of spike hunting that is going on. I don't know how much drive it's got, but I have heard that that has been talked about. I think that it's something that we shouldn't not consider. The spike hunts have been a great opportunity hunt for a lot of people. I've hunted them for years and shoot, I still haven't taken one, but it's been fun so. Okay thank you.

Dave Black: Thanks Jason. Good luck in April when we talk about spike tag numbers. Austin will be followed by Jason Houston.

Austin Aikensen: Hi, my name is Austin Aikensen, I am not a pilot, nor an attorney who interprets the law, but I would like to speak to the aircraft rule a little bit. I do have extensive experience hunting in Alaska where aircraft is used extensively. I would like to say that I disagree with the definition, partly on an improved airstrip as it is written. It says "any landing area with a graded or mechanically improved surface, free of barriers or other hazards, which is traditionally used by pilots." I disagree with that where it includes helicopters. From my own experience, I would suggest the change to define aircraft as a fixed wing aircraft. That changes the game a little bit. It would be pretty hard to carve in an improved airstrip in the back country. I realize that this is probably not a big issue in Utah yet, but I don't want to see it be, especially with a helicopter landing on a small, say Forest Service or firefighting, improved airstrip in the back country. Also, in there it says that the aircraft can legally transport harvested game if it is harvested legally, providing they take off from one of these airstrips, but it does not define the act of a helicopter dropping a rope and picking up an animal. I know that it seems like a hypothetical, but it does happen, if he lands back at an improved airstrip, he could pick up illegally harvested game and extract it. I disagree with that. That's all my comments. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Jason will be followed by Grant Houston.

Jason Houston: Hi, I'm Jason Houston; I'm actually a college student here at SUU. Those are my uncle and my dad. I grew up in Panguitch. I lived on my ranch on the mountain that you guys are trying to put an early hunt on. Right off the bat, I'm opposed to that. I would like to explain a little bit why. I remember riding my horse on our range and being able to see a big buck in the summertime. By the time you go through your archery hunt, your muzzleloader hunt, and your spike elk hunts, your other elk hunts, you finally make it to your rifle hunt and you barely see a spike or a two-point. It's pretty discouraging. Luckily, I have a love for hunting, I don't like to just shoot, I like to hunt. I remember watching my little brother sometimes get discouraged when going hunting and not seeing anything that

he really wanted to go after. I have heard a lot of talk about the youth hunts. We want the youth to continue hunting; we want them to see what it's like. Adding another hunt in there is just going to discourage them more. A couple of years back, there was hundreds of more tags added to this unit and you see a decrease and the lack of it. You don't see as many big bucks and it's not as fun. As well, at this time of year, the early hunt, you just barely end your muzzleloader hunt. I used to hunt that as a youth all the time. You jump right in to your spike elk hunt if you're at an early hunt, and then you go right into your general season rifle hunt. The presentation of that that says it spreads out the pressure, I disagree with that. It just gives no time for the deer to not feel pressure. They're gone. I've talked to many people as well, being here in Cedar that hunts in the Pine Valley with the early hunt. They said that it was the worst thing to happen to their unit. I don't want to see that happen to the place that I love either, and I know of many people who hunt in that area that will feel the same way. Also, up there with our cattle ranch, being out there all the time, you see people going nonstop up and down the highway. You have lines of cars waiting. You see people in the mountains with the fire life they mentioned, and now having another hunt put in, another 100 tags put in there, or however many there will be, I think that it will just make the hunt worse. It won't be as good. I am opposed to this for a couple more reasons, but I think that in the long run, it may be one good hunt, where you see big bucks fall, but in the long run you'll ruin the unit. I'm opposed to this, and I urge you guys to vote negative on it. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Grant will be followed by Lee Tracey.

Grant Houston: I'm Grant Houston from Panguitch. My topic has been pretty well covered by my two sons. I just have one more thing to say, that I am opposed to having this deer hunt early, because of what the boys have said. Thank you.

Dave: Thank you.

Lee Tracey: Lee Tracey; Enoch. I would like to say that I, too, appreciate the Division and the sportsmen and the groups that have gotten together. I have been in some meetings where it hasn't been that friendly or that productive. I spent some time talking to a couple of the ranchers east of here at several meetings and they're pleased as well, at least they seem to be. Alright, I'm speaking for myself, and I support the Division's plans for these big game hunts. I've already mentioned my concern, or at least my proposal for extended archery units outside of the Wasatch Front. There are a lot of times when people purchase those leftover tags simply to hunt the extended hunts. They won't hunt Box Elder during the time when the archery season happens, but they are more than willing to hunt some of the extended areas. I don't want to have to travel 260 miles to do that when there are doe hunts here that are 15 minutes from my home. I think that the Quitchipaw is one that I would consider and the Parowan Front where we've had to transplant deer to reduce the population there. Since the archery hunt, the archery elk hunt, the archery deer hunt, and the archery pronghorn hunt, are all in the same season, I have to travel east or west or south or north or whatever if I happen to get two of those tags. I would like to be able to hunt one of those animals after the regular archery hunt. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you. So, that's the end of the comment cards, we'll close the public portion.

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Now, I would like to open with a comment, myself. My report is a little bit different on the Pine Valley unit. I have talked to some hunters that participated in the early hunt, and they were very

grateful for that hunt. In Washington County, the schools are out during that week. They have Thursday and Friday off, so that makes a four day weekend to be able to get out with your families, to get out and enjoy that hunt. That was a good opportunity for them. There were a lot of big bucks that came off during the early hunt. There was a lot of success; I'm not sure how that affected the later hunt. Every unit is not created equal. As you know, I'm very passionate about the Panguitch Lake unit. I grew up there, I have hunted there my whole life, and I've seen things change. We all like to keep things the way they were, we like to remember the hunts of the past and the amounts of deer that we saw. Over in Panguitch, they let school out during the general season hunt, you get the Friday off for UEA and they give the following Monday off as the opening of the deer hunt. That is when families and school teachers have the opportunity to be out and hunt with their families, not during the early hunt. If we approve an early hunt on the Panguitch Lake unit, again, you have the spike hunt, you can hunt cows during that time, you'd have an early deer hunt, and you would have all the permittees bringing their cows all during that same time period. That's a lot of pressure, a lot of things going on, and a lot of conflicts going on. I am opposed to that. I think that we put a lot of pressure on that unit. It's a great unit, it provides a lot of opportunity in a lot of different ways, but I don't know that we need to keep stacking during the same time period. So, I would suggest and hope that we cannot approve this again this year as an early hunt. I'll turn the time over to the rest of the RAC members for comment, and let's start that on my left this time. Do you guys have any comments down here this way? Brian.

Brian Johnson: Since we are talking about the Panguitch and early rifle, I get that there's a contingent of people here that are against it, and I understand that when you are unhappy, you come and voice your opinion. I get that. I have also talked to a lot of guys that drew Panguitch tags. I had people come up to me and ask "Is there an early hunt on the Panguitch this year, I'm a dedicated hunter." I'm like "Nope there isn't," and they were just disappointed. I just think that this pressure, it's such an arbitrary word. I just get so sick of hearing it, because if one guy sees one pumpkin out there, there's pressure. If another guy doesn't- everybody wants the mountain for themselves and I get it. I want the mountain for myself to, but its public land. I had that Pine Valley tag, and I know that not all units are created equally, my daughter had that Pine Valley Mountain tag, excuse me, and it was awesome. It was warm, she had a rifle in her hand that didn't kick, and it wasn't a muzzleloader. She weighs 110 pounds soaking wet. It was fantastic. We went out there and we had a great time. We found a decent buck, she put it down, and it was great. If you want to put in for that late hunt and have that day off that Panguitch gives out, put in for the regular season. Colorado has four rifle hunts. Four of them! We are talking about two. Well three, if you count the muzzleloader, because it's pretty much a 3308. We are talking about two here. It's funny when people wanted the smaller deer unit; it was, "Let's do what Colorado does!" I just don't understand it. I think that either way it's a good thing. It's not the unit I hunt, so I'm less passionate about it than some of the people in this room, but I don't think that the early rifle is going to be the Armageddon of the Panguitch unit. I understand that cows are coming off the mountain, and I also understand that people can pull off the side of the road and they can be inconvenienced by that. It's a choice they make when they put in for that early season. Those are choices they make. Let's let them make it. Anyways, I'm sure I'll have more comments later, so I'll just wait.

Dave Black: Comments to my right? Gene will be followed by Brayden.

Gene Boardman: Now we've got a whole bunch of stuff to consider here. It's going to be hard to break this down into a motion or motions that will work. There isn't anything more permanent than a trial hunt. You get a trial hunt in one year, it's permanent, and it's there. I'm not really for this early rifle hunt. Concerning the proposal of no late hunt on Mount Dutton because the bulls are too big-- that's

what the hell we're after! You're going to have some of your SFW's, people screaming like a gut-shot panther if you put all of those tags on the rut. So, that one's a hard one to go for. Those are the two things, but we've got so many things mixed in here. I do appreciate more hunting, and I'll say it again, if you want to call it a primitive weapon, it's a long bow or a recurve.

Wade Heaton: Thanks Brayden. So, I guess let's start off with the Panguitch early hunt. I think we need to keep in mind the purpose of the hunt--the reason why this hunt was even thought of. We blame extra pressure and we blame more permits and all this kind of stuff, lower buck quality on this pressure and increased permits on the unit. The thing we've got to remember is the buck/doe ratio is going to determine permits on the unit. It doesn't matter how many hunts we have. We're going to have 11 hunts. There'll be the same amount of permits scattered between those 11 hunts. Permit numbers were going up anyway on the Panguitch because the buck/doe ratio said it was, not because we added a hunt or wanted to add a hunt last year. I guess my biggest concern is, let's just keep in mind why we're doing it and what we're doing it for. The people I talked with that were a part of the any weapon hunts—early and regular—on other units for this year, I had probably 80 percent more positive comments. There was a marked decrease in pressure; well I shouldn't say pressure---total crowding—on the regular rifle hunt, on the units where there was an early hunt. That is 100 percent of the reason why we tried to do this early hunt on these units. It's crowding. It's not pressure. I get it that yes, we're extending our pressure, but it's the same amount of guys on the mountain, the same amount of permits on the mountain. Yes, we're extending our pressure over a longer period of time, but it is not going to change the quality of the bucks. Let's be real. What's going to change the quality of the bucks is total number of bucks harvested which equates to how we're hunting them, when we're hunting them, and how many permits we issue. But at the end of the day, these are general season units. If you want giant bucks on the Panguitch Lake, let's make it a limited entry hunt. It's not. Let's live within the framework and the plan that we have and its total permits and the permits aren't going to change because we have an early season hunt. The reason we did it, is because of hunter crowding on that regular rifle hunt. That hunt is still available everyone, but we're also giving another option with another 20 percent of the permits earlier. To me, I struggle seeing that that doesn't make sense and doesn't accomplish our goal of spreading out the hunter crowding.

Brayden Richmond: So first let me say “amen” to Wade. I agree 100 percent with what you said. There are four things I wanted to hit real quick. 1) This was kind of brought up a little bit, but it's been discussed in the other RACS and we haven't discussed it here. There is some movement towards limiting or getting rid of spike elk hunts and I would like to see this RAC jump in with a couple of the other RACS and support not doing that. If we need some more discussion on that, I'd encourage it, but I plan on making a motion in that direction in a minute, that we support our spike hunts in Utah. It's the last family hunt we've got where you can just walk into Wal-Mart and buy a tag and be guaranteed to go hunt with your kids. So, I would like us to make a motion on that. (2) Next comment I would make as far as archery being a primitive weapon. Gene, I love a lot of your comments, but I'm going to argue with you on this one. The Wasatch Front is the best example you've got. Archery is a primitive weapon unit. The Wasatch Front has an extended unit now, for I think, we're going on 35 years. It hunts from the middle of August to December on limited tags, and they're killing monsters on it every year and the deer are doing great. Archery is a primitive unit. It provides a ton of opportunity and you kill big stuff on those units and have long seasons on limited opportunity. And that's with the modern day compound. So, I think it's a great idea to have some primitive weapon units to increase opportunity and have quality. 3) The other one is...this is probably more of a question, but this one with the air strips and airplanes; I guess I'm wondering why the Division is bringing that one up? What's causing that rule

amendment? I guess I almost have the attitude on that; can't we just let sleeping dogs lie? What's been the issue? I have yet to have an airplane land on me and kill the animal I'm hunting. Maybe I'm the anomaly, but I wonder where that rule change is coming from?

Covy Jones: So that portion of the rule was very difficult to interpret and impossible to enforce. Basically, you couldn't fly in an airplane from the first hunt in August until they ended in January as a hunter. So, it just didn't work. When we looked around, we thought how do we line this with some more of our surrounding states, Idaho, and other states do have specific language for helicopters. We didn't have that concern, but maybe we need to tighten it up a little more. Anyway, that's why we addressed it. We addressed it because what we had was unenforceable and we couldn't make sense of it.

Brayden Richmond: And I appreciate that answer. I guess, going back to my comment, man, if it's unenforceable, then I say let sleeping dogs lie! (Crowd laughs) Let's not kick that sucker! The last comment I have is (4) I would just like to encourage, and I don't know that it's time to make a motion on this one, but maybe start greasing that wheel. I love that we're increasing some management hump opportunities on the Paunchegaunt. I would like to see us start spreading that to some more of our limited entry units.

Gene Boardman: Since I've been called out, I have no objection to archery hunting. I have no objection to compound bows in archery hunting. I have an objection to calling it a primitive weapon hunt, and then allowing compound bows because they are NOT PRIMITIVE!

Brian Johnson: Let's change it to archery only and primitive rifles. (Crowd laughs)

Dave Black: Further comments, anybody on the left?

Wade Heaton: Mind if I go again? Just real fast...Brayden reminded me that from the Friends of the Paunsaugaunt, whose discussed this idea of spreading the management permits throughout the seasons. Again, permit numbers there are determined by buck/doe ratios and the thought was just that people that wanted to apply may just want some different options, as opposed to the one _____ weapon hunt we do now. The thought was just to spread it through the other hunts, the second half of the muzzleloader and the archery seasons. Anyway, the Friends of the Paunsaugant supported that idea and it seems to make sense.

Dave Black: Okay, further comments on my right.

Brian Johnson: Do we have some numbers on this? This should have been in the question part of things. Do we know how many people opted for the multi season elk tag on the spikes and the open bull? Because there are 15,000 spike tags and 15,000 to any bull tags, correct?

Covy Jones: Yeah, I'll get that information for you right now.

Dave Black: Riley?

Riley Roberts: First, kudos to all of you who participated in presenting the plan, the season dates. There's been a lot of good stuff. A reminder to the RAC that some of the information that was

presented, we passed this last year already. I would also like to put my two cents in. It seems like the more of these meetings that I attend, the more of our personal agenda that we push because of “the right now” society that we live in. It’s “I want it now, and I want it because of how it’s going to affect me next year,” not necessarily, a five year plan or what’s best for the wildlife, or what’s best for the Division, or the state of Utah, in general, but what’s best for me and for those that are around me? How’s it going to affect my sons? How is it going to affect my dad who has a disability, or? I think that we have to look at the bigger picture, and I think that the plan presented has been presented very well. I think that the time and the research and the sciences behind it, I’m in favor for the majority of this plan. I really like the idea of adding the sheep hunts. I am different than Gene. I think that the late hunt on the Dutton is the worst hunt as far as what is good for that herd and that animal. I was really excited to see that as presented. That’s something that I’ve fought against for a long time. I love the idea of additional archery hunts and opportunities on the Barney Top. In some of these things, we’re thinking outside the box and I don’t disagree that some of these trial things become permanent, but we’ve also got to start making momentum or we’re not going to change anything. Nothing is going to happen. We’re going to be sitting around talking about pressure and too many elk on this unit and not enough deer on this unit. We’ve got to make some of these changes, and I think the Division has done a really good job on these things, and I support that recommendation.

Dave Black: Okay. Covy.

Covy Jones: Just to answer Brian’s question. Again, I don’t have it broken out by spike and any bull, but 37 percent of the 30,000 quota, those together.

Brian Johnson: 37 percent?

Covy Jones: 37 percent were multi-season.

Brian Johnson: That’s a lot of millions of dollars that could go on about 1.2 million, rough numbers (inaudible) If that’s 37 percent, 30 percent would be 1.2 million dollars—extra dollars. I would hate to see spike hunting go away. Just throwing that out there. Just saying. One more thing I want to talk about elk hunting and Tammy will even agree with me on this, but we have this muzzleloader hunt, general season muzzleloader hunt, and we have these units that are chronically over objective. And what I mean by chronically over objective, I mean we offer cow tags on them every year. I would love to see where general season muzzleloader hunters on the elk, could shoot a cow or a bull on these chronically over objective units. It would be another opportunity to take another elk, and they’re hard to kill anyway. Even Gibb likes it, even Gibb and his boy over there like it, they’re both grinning. Guys come on. We’ve passed this as a RAC down here before. I’d like to see this, and just make it be an option. Anyways, just a thought.

Dave Black: Okay. I think we’re getting ready for a motion. We’ve talked about a lot of things. There are some proposals from SFW and some of the other groups here, so what I’d like to do is break those out first before we talk about the plan in general. What I’m thinking is we’ll talk about the first memorandum. What I have here which is the Barney Top and the Dutton. Let’s address those both together in a motion and see what the group thinks about that. Following that, we’ll do the next sheep, which is the bighorn sheep, and see what we think about that. I think there’s been enough discussion on the Panguitch Lake that we can break that out separate from the general, and there’s also been a discussion about supporting spike elk hunts in the future, so we’ll see what that motion is, and then we’ll

look at the rest of the proposals presented, I think. So let's talk about Barney Top and the Mt. Dutton proposal. So I'd entertain a motion concerning that.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to accept the SFW recommendation to make the Barney Top an archery only elk (limited entry only) unit and for the Mt. Dutton late rifle to be discontinued for 2019. Brayden Richmond seconded the motion. The vote was 9-4, motion passed.

Wade Heaton: I swear we have the worst mic. Just a couple of thoughts. That's a pretty radical change. When I first read through it, I was like, man, I don't know. This one's going to be a tough sale. But, it does make a little bit of sense. With these boundaries that they've got drawn out, I do think there's a possibility that we can increase opportunity and let some guys get in there and do some things. This one kind of falls into that trial thing, Gene. I don't know how I feel about it either. I do think that this make sense. One thing I do want to go on the record and state. I kind of hate the idea that was withdrawn. The muzzleloader idea, going back to primitive. I think we've got to have some consistency. We've been making muzzleloaders bigger and better and faster and putting scopes on them and doing all these different things. Now, all of a sudden, we're turning back around saying, No, we want to do something different with this hunt. To me, I've got to have a little more consistency than that. So, that would be a deal breaker for me, but where we're talking archery only for 2019, I can support this Barney Top idea. The guys I talked to that spent time on late Dutton hunt, say this is a big issue. I mean that is part of the mega unit. There's a lot of elk that come onto there that late season timeframe and I can see their concerns on this and they know a lot more about the unit than I do. I'd probably support that one as well.

Dave Black: Okay. Gene?

Gene Boardman: Now, we used to have 100 bull permits on Mt. Dutton. We raised the age objective and we cut the bull permits to about 50, which was a big mistake, but that's what happened. Hopefully, we'll get it back up because the elk are there. And now, what I'm afraid of here is that if you cut out that late hunt, they're going to be talking about how there's too many hunters on the rut hunt. We can't have that. That's too crowded for a rut hunt. It's not far to the elk to shoot them while there in the rut and everything else, and they'll want to cut tags again. I hope that you in the SFW have considered this when you said, "Let's cancel the late hunt." What are you going to do to the rut hunt? Maybe you could just address that for a minute?

Dave Black: Okay, can we have a motion to second? One more comment.

Kevin Bunnell: Well, I don't have a comment. I just want to make sure we've got the motion right. Mindi, how do you have the motion written? Let's make sure that that sits.

Mindi Cox: I've got half way (inaudible)

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, let me tell you what I have. To accept the SFW recommendations to make the Barney Top a primitive weapon elk unit and to eliminate the late rifle elk hunt on Mt. Dutton? Does that capture the motion?

Mindi Cox: Yes.

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, I will give that language to you guys then.

Covy Jones: In rule, we don't have the definition of primitive weapons, so?

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, an archery only unit for 2019. Okay, so it now reads to accept the SFW recommendations to make the Barney Top an archery only unit for 2019 and eliminate the late rifle elk hunt on Mt. Dutton. I'll send that to you.

Dave Black: Okay. All those in favor? Hold 'em high so we can count. We got a number? 9. All those opposed? 4. Okay, the vote is 9-4. The motion carries. The chairman doesn't vote. If it's a tie I can. Haha. Okay, we're ready to entertain a motion on the Sheep Proposal.

Wade Heaton: What's the motion?

Brayden Richmond: I'll make a motion that we support the memorandum as presented on the archery sheep units with a note that this was also supported last year.

Dave Black: Okay, do we have a second. Okay, a second by Riley. Discussion?

Wade Heaton: Just curious from Jace. What's your knee-jerk reaction to this idea?

Jace Taylor: Supportive. So, in the state wide plan, we specifically made sure that we got in there the option to have these archery hunts. I'm supportive. The biologists we have for these two regions we've talked to are supportive. The details need to be worked out with the dates and the numbers but we support.

Dave Black: Okay. Discussion? Comments? The motion is seconded. Okay, thank you, it's unanimous.

Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept the Bighorn Sheep Proposal as presented. Riley Roberts seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Dave Black: Okay, let's talk about the Panguitch Lake unit. We have a motion one way or the other. Okay Rusty?

Rusty Aiken: I'll make a motion to not do the extra hunt, the 5-day early rifle hunt on the Panguitch.

Dave Black: Okay. Do we have a second?

Gene Boardman: I'll second.

Dave Black: Okay, we've got a second by Gene. Any further discussion? Wade?

Wade Heaton: What's the motion? To vote not having it?

Kevin Bunnell: The motion is to reject the proposal for an early rifle hunt on the Panguitch Lake Unit? Is that correct?

Muffled anonymous answer: Yes.

Dave Black: Okay, so we have a motion to second. All those in favor? 7. All those opposed. 6. The motion carries.

Rusty Aiken made the motion to reject the proposal for an early rifle deer hunt on the Panguitch Lake unit. Gene Boardman seconded the motion. Motion passes 7-6.

Dave Black: Okay, Brayden has a motion regarding spike hunts.

Brayden Richmond: Kevin, help me word this if I need to because this is not part of the presentation, but the motion would be that the Southern RAC would continue to support the spike hunts as currently outlined in the plan.

Dave Black: Okay, does everybody understand the motion? Do we have a second for the motion? Brian? Brayden? All those in favor? 12-1. Motion carries. Now, does anybody see any other items that we've discussed? I don't know if we need to summarize anything that we need to add to the plan as presented.

Brian Johnson: I would like to make a motion that on elk units that are chronically over objective that we allow general season muzzleloader hunters to shoot a bull or a cow.

Dave Black: Do we have a second? Okay.

Kevin Bunnell: Okay, the motion is to allow general season muzzleloader hunters to harvest a bull or a cow on units that are over objective.

Dave Black: All those in favor? All those that are opposed? (inaudible). Let's move on. I'm ready to entertain a motion on the remainder of the proposal presented by the DWR.

Riley Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to accept the remainder of the plan as presented by the Division. Okay, anybody second?

Wade Heaton: Second.

Dave Black: Motion is seconded. All those in favor? Unanimous. We're going to take a five minute break and then we'll come back and start on Item #9.

Brayden Richmond made the motion to continue the spike only elk hunts as they are currently outlined. Brian Johnson seconded the motion. Motion passed 12-1 (Gene Boardman).

Brian Johnson made the motion to allow general season muzzleloader elk hunters to harvest a bull or cow on units that are over objective: Motion was seconded by Rusty Aiken. Motion passed 12-1 (Sean Kelly)

Riley Roberts made the motion to accept the balance of the proposal as presented. Wade Heaton

seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Dave Black: So our next agenda item is item #9, CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers. That will be by Mike Wardle, we'll have him get started. Also, I would like to excuse Craig Laub; he had to drive up to Salt Lake tonight, so we'll excuse him from the RAC board.

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner association Permit Numbers for 2019 (Action)

- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Mike Wardle: Thank you Mr. Chairman. My name is Mike Wardle; I'm the Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator. I will be presenting our recommendations for CWMU and Landowner Associations. So, in 2019, we have a total of 30 CWMU applications. Two of those were new applications and 16 renewals and 12 change applications. So, there are two mistakes in your memo for the CWMU's that I need to talk about. With CWMU season dates, we recognize that the start date is a Sunday for next year, September 1st typically, all of our CWMU's start on September 1st. We just realize that that is a Sunday, and under code we can't start a hunt on Sunday's, so that is going to be bumped to August 31st to October 30th. The other error in your CWMU/LOA memo is that your memo only shows one Landowner's Association change application, but we also have one renewal application, and you'll see that here in the presentation, but that was not included in your memo. So with that, I'm going to get into our recommendations for Cooperative Wildlife Management Units. Just to give you a brief overview of what the program is if people are not familiar, a CWMU is essentially a large chunk of private land that is enrolled in a program, and the objective is to help us reach our population and recreation objectives and ultimately to preserve that land for open space for wildlife. There are acreage requirements to participate in the program. They have to have a minimum of 5,000 acres for deer and pronghorn, and 10,000 acres for elk and moose. The basis of the program is the permits are split between the landowners and the public. An example of what this looks like, if you look at the Weber Florence Creek CWMU, we have seven permits for Bull Moose on that CWMU, four of those go to the landowners and then three of those go to the public. Whoever the public hunter is that draws that permit is given access to the private land. So, this slideshow is an overview of how many CWMU's we have. Currently, we have 126 statewide and over 2.6 million acres of private land enrolled in the program. In this table, if you look at the left column, shows the species and the middle column shows the number of permits that we are recommending for the landowners, those are private permits, and the right column shows the number of public permits. In total, we have 505 permits that will be issued through the public draw where hunters will be given access to hunt on private land. As I go through the recommendations, you're going to see three different types of applications; you'll see new applications, this is a chunk of ground that they are requesting a new CWMU, they're requesting a three year certificate of registration, you'll see renewals, this is somebody that has been in the program and is renewing their three year seal, and then you'll also see change applications, changes are when somebody is within their three year seal. We are recommending changes to either permit numbers or season dates. There is a fair amount of them, so as I go through them, I'm just going to touch on the highlights, I'm going to talk about where we are increasing or decreasing permits, or where we are recommending adding a new species to a CWMU. Just to give you a little justification behind what we look at when we talk about changing permits on CWMU's, the big thing that we look at is wildlife distribution. As we all know, wildlife doesn't distribute themselves equally across a unit. As Justin mentioned in his presentation, some of the best lands and habitats that we have here in the state are privately owned, so some of these private lands have a higher distribution of wildlife on them. Acreage changes, it may add land, it may take away land, we

recommend permits change accordingly. Also, quality, for our public hunters that draw a CWMU tag, this is a limited entry opportunity and we want to have a certain level of quality there and also to help us reach our unit management objectives. With that, I will get into the recommendations by region. So, as I go through these, like I said, I'm going to move through them fairly quickly, but as you can see, the CWMU name is on the left column, the species that we are recommending changes to from their previous COR's and the next, number of permits and also any changes in acreage on the right column. If there are questions on a specific CWMU, we can come back to these at the end too. The major changes, on Junction Valley, we are recommending increasing deer and elk permits as well as adding moose to that CWMU, and then we are recommending decreasing pronghorn on the Rabbit Creek CWMU. These are renewal applications for the northern region. This is the other renewals in the northern region; there are no significant changes to permit numbers. We did have some change applications in the northern region. You can see that we are recommending decreasing deer permits and increasing pronghorn permits on the Desert CWMU. We are recommending increasing elk and deer permits on East Fork Chalk Creek, increase elk permits on Ensign Ranch, and we're recommending decreasing turkey permits on Folley Ridge, which will take them down to zero permits, so we will not have turkey as an available species on Folley Ridge anymore. We are recommending adding deer to the Jacob's Creek CWMU and recommend decreasing deer and elk permits on Lone Tree Tunnel Hollow, which used to be called Lone Tree-Taylor Hollow. Then, we also recommend increasing elk permits on Mountain Top CWMU. We recommend increasing elk permits on North Peaks and then decreasing deer on Weber Florence Creek. Here in the southern region, we had three CWMU renewals. There were no major changes to the permit numbers. There were some acreage changes, but that was it. We did have one change application here in the southern region, which was for the Pahvant Ensign unit up near Kanosh. We are recommending decreasing turkey by six there. We also had a new application here in the southern region, and this is for a new CWMU out near Enterprise, it would be called Heist CWMU, we recommend five pronghorn permits, and it will be about 9,520 acres. In the northeastern region, we had one renewal application; we recommend increasing deer permits and adding elk to the West Willow Creek Ranch CWMU. In the central region, it came to our attention that we had made an error with the Wallsburg CWMU last year when they renewed, they get one moose permit per year, and the way that the split works, it ends up basically being 50/50. So, what happens is, in their previous COR, it went public, private, and public. Does that make sense to everybody? Then when they renewed, the mistake was made that it went on public, private, public again, and it should have been on private, public, private. We are making the recommendation that the next two years of their COR permit goes as a private voucher for the, because last year it went for a public when it should have been private. We also had one new application in the central region; this is up Spanish Fork Canyon. It would be called Mountain Sky Ranch, we are recommending ten deer permits and seven elk permits, and the CWMU would be over 10,000 acres. In the southeastern region, we had two renewal applications, and we are recommending decreasing deer on the JV Ranch. We also had two change applications in the southeastern region. We are recommending increasing elk permits on both Scofield Canyons and Spring Creek Dodge. That is all for CWMU's. Now I'll cover Landowner's Associations. So to give a brief overview of what the Landowner's Association program is for anybody that is not familiar, the objective of the program is to build tolerance for wildlife on private lands that are located within a limited entry unit. The way this works, is an association is formed that represents at least 50% of the private land within that unit, and then that association receives buck or bull permits based on how many acres they have involved that is considered wildlife habitat and the number of available permits for that unit. So to give you an example, if you look at the Indian Peaks LOA, which is on the southwest desert, they currently have over 24,000 acres enrolled, which is above that 50% mark. We have over 900,000 acres of total elk habitat, which means that they represent 3% of the habitat on that unit, so they qualify for 3% of the available permits which

comes out to be four. So, we did have the one renewal application, this is not on you memo. This is for the Oak Creek Landowner's Association. They are qualified for seven permits and we are recommending seven deer permits there. Then we had one change application for the Indian Peaks LOA. We increased their acreage to over 24,000, which qualifies them for one more elk permit, and we are making that recommendation. That's all I have, thank you.

Dave Black: Okay, Any questions?

Gibb Yardley: How come (inaudible)

Mike Wardle: For Landowner's Associations? So, they renewed just last year, so they're currently within their three year certificate of registration. So whatever permit numbers were approved last year is the same they'll get this year.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you.

Questions from the RAC:

Dave Black: Any questions from the RAC? Are there any additional questions from the audience? Okay, we'll move to the comment cards. Gibb, Steven, we had a comment card from you, are you okay?

Steven Yardley: We're alright, yep.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Thank you for coming tonight, it's good to see you. Okay, we have no comment cards.

Questions from the Public:

No questions

Comments from the Public:

No comment cards

RAC discussion and vote:

Dave Black: Do we have any comments from the RAC? Okay, Wade.

Wade Heaton: Mr. Chairman, I need to recuse myself from the vote as I am involved in a CWMA and LOA.

Dave Black: Okay, noted. Do we have any other comments? Gene.

Gene Boardman: My comment is that it is hard to figure out how many total permits there is on a unit and where they go to. The landowner permits aren't listed anywhere where you can regularly see them and I would like to ask the Division to account to the public when they draw up these things, to account for every permit.

Kevin Bunnell: Gene, if you're asking, the numbers that are presented up there are the total number of

tags, not just the number of tags that are going to either private or public.

Gene Boardman: What I'm saying is (inaudible)

Kevin Bunnell: So you'd like that total number-

Gene Boardman: (inaudible)

Kevin Bunnell: What does that have to do with CWMU's?

Gene Boardman: (inaudible)

Kevin Bunnell: So that is relevant for the landowner's association. Okay. That makes sense. Mike, do you understand that? Okay. Thank you.

Dave Black: Any other comments? I'll entertain a motion. Rusty.

Rusty Aiken: (inaudible)

Tammy Pearson: He twisted my arm. Yes, I'll make a motion that we approve the recommendations from the Division on the CWMU's.

Dave Black: Do we have a second? We have a second from Riley. Tammy, do we want that to include the whole agenda item? So it's CWMU and LOA. Okay. As presented. Is that okay with your second? Are we clear?

Tammy Pearson made the motion to accept the proposed plan as presented. Riley Roberts seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with one abstention.

Dave Black: We'll move to Item #10, which is the dedicated hunter rule amendments.

**R657-38- Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments 2019 (Action)
- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator**

Bryan Christensen: Okay, thank you. My name is Bryan Christensen; I am the Division's state volunteer coordinator. I also oversee the Dedicated Hunter Program. I have got a pretty easy one for you today. Most of what we have, what I'll be presenting, is basic little changes we've had. We changed the rule a few years back. Since then, we've identified a few things that just needed to be adjusted. Most of it is wording, but I'll get into a couple of the more substantial changes here in a second. A quick background on the program. It's a general season deer hunting program where somebody will apply to be in. If they are able to draw a spot in that program, we'll allow them to hunt for up to three years in that unit that they draw. The participants get archery, muzzleloader, and rifle seasons and they have it again for that full three years. They are limited to two general deer harvests during that time frame. That's in exchange for 32 hours worth of service. Right now, we have just over 9000 participants doing this program. The revisions I mentioned have basically to simplify this rule, make some minor corrections, and some administrative improvements as well. It's also in response to anytime the public comes to us and has suggestions about the program, we consider them heavily and then if we can make

changes, we do when it's favorable. So, the main administrative change here is basically to establish a deadline. Right now, if a dedicated hunter draws a limited entry buck deer tag from the big game drawing, we allow them a one year extension so they can take full opportunity of the three years of the Dedicated Hunter Program and not be penalized for a year that they had that special tag. The rule currently just doesn't have a deadline for when they need to request that extension, so that's what we're asking for now in this proposal. The other change is a little more substantial. Currently, dedicated hunters join the program and they have just their ethics training course online to do to get their first permit. In the second year, we have them do at least 16 hours and then in the third year, they have to do another 16 to be able to get that third permit. Our recommendation now is to go back to the way we used to do it for many, many years, and that's to join the program, have the ethics and training course as well, that first year, but also do the 8 hours. Again, this was done for many, many years. Eight hours before they can get their first permit, 16 for that second permit, and then just 8 for the third permit. What this does for us is a number of things. Foremost, it resolves a situation that we've found increasing over the past few years that we didn't anticipate. Basically, what it is, is by allowing the dedicated hunter to join and get a permit without having any service hours, it creates some complications for those trying to get out of the program. Typically, these are medical situations, job changes, school, and a number of life events that can occur to where a dedicated hunter needs to leave the program early, but when they don't have enough hours, we can't let them out and it creates a number of problems for those that are in these tough life situations, as well as us administering the program. What this rule change would do, would basically allow anybody at anytime in the program to be eligible to withdraw, unless they're at two harvests, and at that point, they're in for the long haul. So if you join, and you don't have any permits, it means you don't need to have any service hours to withdraw. If you had one permit, we would know up front that you already had 8 hours just to get the tag, so we would be satisfied at that point and somebody would draw informally. And then, if it was two permits, but not two harvests, we would know that they already had 24 hours done. That's satisfactory to be able to withdraw from the program. It creates a situation where all the dedicated hunters, at any given moment, would be eligible to withdraw without having to come up with additional hours just to be eligible. We feel like these small changes here will not only help us with these withdrawal situations, but it will also create fewer holds, what we call administrative holds, at the end of a three year period. If a dedicated hunter owes a certain amount of hours, they can't apply again. This rule change eliminates a lot of those unnecessary situations and also we believe wholeheartedly that these 8 hours up front will help dedicated hunters become more engaged at the beginning of their program, rather than a year and a half in when they're trying to get their second permit. We feel like this will be a benefit to the program. So that's what I have for you. Thank you.

Dave Black: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the RAC? Okay, Brayden?

Brayden Richmond: If I remember right and understand, the reason we got rid of the required hours the first year is because of the difficulty in getting those hours prior to the start of the archery season from the time you draw out to the start of the archery season. So with this change, I guess I'm wondering how you're addressing the concern that caused the initial change to begin with?

Bryan Christensen: Right, that's a very good question. This was a change that we collectively came up with, regionally. So I've met with each of our regional coordinators that provide all those projects and we talked about this particular question at length, because I was the one that also brought this out to change it a few years ago. And so what we did is, we talked about the amount of projects that we have provided in the past and how many we could provide, and they were confident that they would be able to provide more than enough, so the dedicated hunters would have opportunities, should they go online and

pick the projects to go do them. So, they're very confident regionally that the project numbers will be there, without any question. And then, just to give it a little more emphasis, I went to our databases, and I've got some graphs we could go into if there are additional questions. But what we've found is that we did shift hours away from that first year and that relieved some of that pressure, but it just transferred it into the second and third year. The number of dedicated hunters waiting until late July and early August didn't change much. And so, we're still having that same pressure during that time period. There was enough change in the first year that it seemed like it was helping on paper, but in the graphs it ends up showing almost the opposite, so we think it's going to be okay.

Dave Black: Gene.

Gene Boardman: Believe it or not, I read through the whole packet that you sent me.

Bryan Christensen: Oh good.

Gene Boardman: I want to know about purchase.

Bryan Christensen: Okay. Give me a question to go from. I could talk all night about purchasing.

Gene Boardman: Okay, if you're able to purchase your hours, you don't have to work for them, right?

Bryan Christensen: That is correct.

Gene Boardman: You pay money for it?

Bryan Christensen: Uh huh. Yep.

Gene Boardman: If that isn't buying privilege, what the hell is it?

Bryan Christensen: Well, do you want me to answer that on an equity level or do you want to just let that comment stand as it is.

Gene Boardman: No. I would like you to tell me. Is it buying privilege or isn't it buying privilege?

Bryan Christensen: I would say that it's not necessarily buying privilege and here's the reason why. Everybody has the opportunity to do that if they choose it, but everybody also has the same opportunity to pick project work instead. So, if you don't have the privilege to be able to purchase hours directly, you can go and pick from hundreds and hundreds of service projects and do it that way, basically for free. So everybody has the same access to the same permits, the same hunting privileges, just in different means. In some ways it could cost you or some ways it couldn't, but everybody has the option to do either one, free or to pay.

Gene Boardman: How many do you have that purchase?

Bryan Christensen: The number of dedicated hunters that purchase, I don't know that number offhand, but I can tell you roughly how many hours get purchased annually. So last year, we were just over 21,000 hours that were purchased.

Gene Boardman: That's quite a bit of purchase.

Bryan Christensen: It is. We also had over 75,000 service hours completed too.

Gene Boardman: It also says that they have to work on approved projects.

Bryan Christensen: That is correct.

Gene Boardman: What's the percent of approved projects that has to do with deer?

Bryan Christensen: In one way, I could say all of them, indirectly. Directly, I don't have an answer to that. We could probably find out how many exactly benefit, you know, the habitat the deer live in or the guzzlers, or whatever the deer use. We could probably identify that, but it won't be a complete picture, because we also do projects in the dedicated hunter program for sage grouse and they live in the same exact place that deer do, so when we improve habitat for grouse or for turkeys, or for elk, we are also generally working on the same habitat the deer work on, so we'd have to include all of those. The ones that are easy to separate are for fish. If we do projects for fish or events, maybe not a direct impact on deer, but it is an impact on the agency, so any dedicated hunter that does service for the Division of Wildlife frees up opportunities for staff or other volunteers to work on other big game projects as well. So, indirectly, I'd say all of them, directly, not as many.

Gene Boardman: You won't have a percent of hours that are for deer either?

Bryan Christensen: With me today, I don't have that, but if you would like to contact me after, I would be happy to dig up some more accurate numbers that are specifically deer projects. I can say though that this region hosts maybe the most number of projects that are directly affecting deer habitat. The southern region does a fantastic job of that.

Gene Boardman: How many more days of opportunity in the field does a dedicated hunter have over a regular hunter?

Bryan Christensen: Depends on which hunt you're looking at. If it's an archery permit then-

Gene Boardman: Well let's keep it to deer.

Bryan Christensen: Okay.

Gene Boardman: In a year, they have 48 hours of opportunity. The deer hunter, if he draws, has nine. He's only going to draw once every two years now, and it's getting to in some units, that he is only drawing once every three years. I'm getting past questions. We'll talk about it in comments.

Bryan Christensen: Okay.

Riley: Bryan, I think that you answered most of these in the presentation. The one was on penalty if they didn't finish and you said that they're not able to get that permit the next year, apply. Is that indefinitely? As long as it's in the system?

Bryan Christensen: It is.

Riley: And this one you don't have to answer if you don't know it, but the question was would you think that they don't finish those hours or they buy those hours out because of procrastination and not finishing, if they're like me, it comes down to the hour like most anything in life anyway.

Bryan Christensen: Yeah, I'm a dedicated hunter as well, there's a fair number in this room that are. Sometimes life happens and it gets to be August before you realize that you haven't done it yet. With others, it's the way that they chose the projects. We have a lot of folks on the Wasatch Front in this program. Conveniently, we like things that are close.

Riley: It would be interesting to me, just because of that just to see when those were, what point in the year that they were purchased. And I know you don't have that, but.

Bryan Christensen: I can show you that. Yeah.

Riley: You can just send it to me.

Bryan Christensen: It's attached in your PowerPoint for the RAC packet. It's in one of those slides. I would be happy to go over that with you after.

Dave Black: Okay, we do have two comment cards. Kelsey Madsen will be followed by Rylan Orton.

Comments from the Public:

Kelsey Madsen: Hello, my name is Kelsey Madsen; I've been part of dedicated hunters since its inception. With the history of doing the service hours on the first year, it is extremely difficult to get them done by the time the draws come out at the end of May and by the time the tags are mailed out at the first of August. To find a project, get the project done, and it takes the Division several weeks to get your hours recorded with the Division saying that you have fulfilled your hours, and then it makes extra leg work if you don't have them completed by the first of August, when they mail out the tags, you have to go to the Division and if they still don't have them recorded, it just delays the process of you getting your dedicated hunter tag to allow you to go out on the first part of the bow hunt. So, I'm opposed to that. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you.

Rylan Orton: Hello, I'm Rylan Orton, I'm from Beaver Utah. I have been in the dedicated hunter program for I guess two cycles now. I think that this is a great proponent. One thing that I wanted to talk about was, I'd heard a rumor earlier this year that there was 90 something deer killed out of fields. I wasn't sure. I confirmed that number and it wasn't quite 90. We had gotten up to 35 that were killed out of fields down in Beaver. It's kind of disheartening to hear that the Division is going out and killing the deer that they are supposed to be managing. You know, 20 deer in a night out of one field is just a little bit too much for me. One thing that I wanted to propose is that we as dedicated hunters have a separate thing that we can specify. I want to put money, and the guys that can't get out to do projects, if their jobs

are keeping them from doing that, but the money, they can specify that “I want it to go to fencing projects so that we can put high fences up to prevent deer getting in these fields so we’re not having to kill them.” Then also, the deer that get killed in town, there’s quite a few deer that get killed in town. Whether we could transplant them, or, there are deer that grew up in town and that’s all they know, and I understand that the easier way to get rid of those is with a bullet, but I want to see if there is anything that we can do other than killing the deer. I don’t know what the exact number is on it, but I know it’s quite high. Thanks.

Dave Black: Thank you. So, do you have a comment card? It just barely slipped in. You have three minutes.

Jason Aiken: Jason Aiken. I want to say that I appreciate the dedicated hunter program. I love the dedicated hunter program. I think that it is a great program; I encourage anybody to get involved in it. I can appreciate how much work you guys put in to making sure that it works well. One thing that I want to mention, if we are going to go back to where we have to do eight hours that first year, is there a way that we can set it up to where we can bank hours? Just to help make it a little bit easier to help get those hours in before that season starts at the front end. Again, thanks for everything; it’s a great program, let’s keep it going.

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay, comments from the RAC?

Comments from the RAC:

Dave Black: Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: It does really concern me this first year, based on personal experience, it’s difficult, or at least historically, it’s difficult to get the projects. A couple of years ago, my dad enrolled for the first time. As soon as he drew out, he made a call that day to ask what projects they had going on. They can never give him a project. He ended up doing his project the opening day of the bow hunt, and it was a project that he came up with, and he had actually proposed it about five or six times. “Could I do this, could I do this?” Finally, he got to the right guy that said “Yeah, go do that, we’ll give you your hours.” He could start bow hunting a week and a half later. So it does concern me because the projects haven’t been available as readily as they could have been. It’s a concern that I hear from a lot of people too, that the projects are hard to get. I wouldn’t be opposed to it if we could bank them, I understand the problems with banking the hours, but I can’t support this as is because I have seen the problems.

Dave Black: Yes.

Wade Heaton: I definitely understand the concerns. I’ve been in the dedicated hunter program for 15 years now. The concerns of getting your hours that first year, I remember when we changed it and it made a lot of sense when we did. I think that the program has evolved considerably since then. I do think that there are more projects that are readily available. It’s easier to find out where they are. I think that it has streamlined to the point that a good portion of that concern should be gone. I think that bigger problem lies in guys like me that don’t get nervous until the 5th of August and then I try to get it crammed in. I think that that is where the bigger problem lies. That’s one me. That’s on each of us who decided to procrastinate. Just as it’s proposed, I would probably support it, but I do think that the idea

that Mr. Aiken had has some merit, of banking hours. Or, what if we even allowed ours to start January 1st, so if you know you're going to apply, bank hours from that calendar year. At the beginning of that calendar year, start banking and then, in anticipation you draw. If you don't draw, they roll over to the next year. Anyways, just a thought.

Dave Black: Okay, Gene.

Gene Boardman: I haven't really checked the draw results, I probably won't get to see them until just before May, but I understand that on the Pine Valley unit, some who have had one preference point, which means that they have put in for two years without drawing didn't draw. It took two. Now, if you take that out to 48 days of opportunity for dedicated hunters, compared to this fellow that is drawing once every three years, it gives you about 136 days of opportunity for the dedicated hunter to the one that didn't draw. If you are getting to where you are only drawing once in three years, then from one you draw, you skip two years and you draw again and you skip two years, that's one tag in five years, one tag in five years. You've got 9 hours of opportunity. It would take dedicated hunters over 200 days of opportunity. This thing has got to change a little bit. I have never killed a deer that was there because of the dedicated hunter program and I don't know if I have ever seen a deer that was there because of the dedicated hunter program. All these hours and all of this purchasing and so forth, we ought to have deer running out our ears because of increasing the deer herd. If you are going to give deer tags to this work, it ought to be concerning deer. Of course there will be benefits to the other animals, but if it's a deer tag it ought to be centered on deer. The way that this situation is going, I think that you need to start looking at some other ways to get volunteer work besides giving deer tags for it. I think that it is getting to be serious. What if we go to drawing only once in four years? Where is it going to change? I think that purchasing is paying money for privilege. Thanks.

Brian Johnson: I love you Gene, but I got to call you out on this one, buddy. This is just out- you're absolutely false. That guy that draws one every four years or every five, can put in for dedicated hunter. It's his choice. He makes that decision. Now, I let you ramble for a minute, so let me ramble for just a minute. You're dead wrong when it comes to habitat improvement, it does increase deer. It absolutely increases deer. You can't quantify what you've seen or not seen. So that dedicated hunter program is a great program and it increases deer numbers. Now, we could probably start tagging and collaring and call them dedicated deer if that's what you'd like, but you're absolutely wrong on this one. Anybody can apply, anybody can do the hours, and anybody can buy the hours. It's not privilege, and if it is privilege, who gives a rip, because it's okay to pay for something.

Gene Boardman: It's not okay to pay for something and some just aren't that ethically challenged.

Dave Black: Okay, let's move on. Let's keep it specific to the proposal. We appreciate everybody's comments. Any further comments on the proposal as presented? Tammy.

Tammy Pearson: Very short, our working group or whatever we are calling it right now, I think that Wade needs to make a proposal on some of the projects that we talked about, and it may not need to be tonight, but there are a lot of issues concerning different projects that dedicated hunter hours would be very beneficial on the Ag and the wildlife, on the interaction there. I think that that is something that we need to get a list of those projects that you were talking about, Wade. We need to get those submitted.

Dave Black: That's, I don't know if that would be through a motion, but I think that's definitely- get

that information out, get it to the right people at the Division and they'd probably look at a lot of those that may qualify.

Kevin Bunnell: Now, Tammy if you would've been here on time, you would have heard my regional update, and I talked about Mark's experience with dedicated hunters and put a plug in for that.

Tammy Pearson: I've already heard it once.

Kevin Bunnell: Yeah, but you didn't hear it tonight. (Crowd laughs)

Dave Black: I don't know what the process is for submitting projects, but I would assume if Tammy has a number of ?, you guys would be more than willing to look at them and see if they qualify and get them on the list.

Bryan Christensen: Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, can I address one of the comments that were made? There was concern, and I share the concern as well in some ways, about the quantity of projects provided in that short period of time. I spoke with Blaine for a second here and I spoke with some of the other coordinators as well. We want to mention that we are confident that we can provide the number of projects needed. There was a shift in our program in the past few years, and we have tried to provide as many unlimited opportunity projects as possible now. There are projects that we create, and some of them go year round, or near year round, it depends on which part of the state you're in, to where the project will be online and if you're willing to drive a couple hours, which most folks in this part of the region are, any quantity of dedicated hunters can go do it and it doesn't have to be done on a specific date. So, we give directions, we give a geographical area and what needs to be done, and that's the dedicated hunters' time, so that could mean a weekend, it would mean a weekday, it could be much more opportunistic and easy for a dedicated hunter to pick a project like that. The caveat is if they're going to be willing to drive to wherever the location is. In our northern areas, our central areas, distance seems to be more of a factor than it is in the southeast and southern region areas. I think that you're just more used to driving distances to do things, and that is very helpful. Those kinds of projects, we've really promoted more, and we're going to focus on even more now to give those opportunities. We also have had quite a number of projects, on average here in this region, it's about 30 at any given time they're available. The comment about doing projects to help with depredation and some of those other issues; we do work with landowners specifically. The process is just to contact our volunteer services coordinator here in the region. They usually get in contact with a biologist, and then they'll talk about the benefits of that project. They want to make sure that it's not solely benefiting a landowner, per say, as it would be benefiting public wildlife depredation issues and things like that. So, they kind of go through those issues and make sure it looks good, and then we do quite a bit with dedicated hunters and private landowners to support wildlife. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Okay, are we ready for a motion? Gene.

RAC discussion and vote:

Gene Boardman made the motion to reject the purchasing of hours in the dedicated hunter program. Motion received no second, motion failed.

Wade Heaton made the motion to accept the dedicated hunter proposal as presented. Tammy Pearson seconded the motion. Motion passed, 10-2.

Brayden Richmond: I just wanted to make a quick comment to it. I am going to vote opposed, I want to just state that I love the dedicated hunter program, I like the service hours, I just don't like the rule change to the program.

Dave Black: Okay, we'll move to Item #11, this is going to be Blair. Please explain to us e-bikes. Here in Southern Utah, most of us don't know the pros the cons, or what the concern is, and what they are. We saw quite a few e-mails, but it went right over the top.

Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019 (Action)
-Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

Blair Stringham: Okay would you like me to now or at the end, what would be your preference? Okay, so as far as e-bikes, they are basically electronically assisted bikes. As you pedal, the bike essentially creates power to help you move along. If you were to go up a hill, it would be like you were pedaling on flat ground. So, it's not completely assisted electronically, you basically have to start pedaling to get that push or assistance from the bike. So, we've talked about those in our WMA's, I'll talk about them a bit more here in a second, but on to my presentation and then we can discuss that a little bit more. Tonight I will be presenting waterfowl recommendations for the next three years. Before we get to that, I wanted to just briefly talk about waterfowl populations across North America. As far as our ducks are concerned, we are really kind of still going across this long time high we've had over the last five years. We've been doing surveys since about 1955 and we're still kind of at the peak of where we've been with our duck populations. If you look at it compared to last year, we have gone down slightly from where we were, but for the most part, most of our duck species are all above their long-term average and doing quite well across North America. When you look at our other waterfowl species such as swans, Canada geese, and light geese, they also are doing quite well. We are still seeing gradual to extreme increases in all of these populations. So what I'll be presenting tonight is to move our waterfowl recommendations from a one year cycle to a three year cycle. This isn't something new that we're just creating, we've done it for up and game for some time now, and it really worked quite well for a number of reasons. The reason why it worked so well with waterfowl is that most of our changes are out of our control. We are given what we can have as a bag and season limit each year by the Fish and Wildlife Service. These are based upon flyaway and Fish and Wildlife Service harvest management strategies, and so there is really not a lot of flexibility in what we do for waterfowl guidelines, and so it really makes a lot of sense to move it to a three year process and approve this process of doing permits rather than doing this each year. It also makes a lot of sense from a biological and administrative perspective. We heavily monitor these populations, and so if something was to go awry over those three years, we could always make adjustments as needed. It is also going to result in a lot fewer meetings and just more consistency with regulations over time. So what we'll be asking tonight, is not necessarily to approve specific bag and season limits and things like that each year, we would essentially be asking for you guys to approve the process of taking whatever the Fish and Wildlife Service gives us and going with the most liberal option that is presented to us. So, essentially what we would be asking you guys to approve would be this right here for ducks. We are given essentially four different options for waterfowl reasons; anything from a closed season to a liberal season of 107 days and a bag limit of zero all the way up to seven. It would also have species specific harvest strategies for pintail, canvasback and scaup; they would have similar seasons from closed up to 107. So, we would be going with ever the most liberal packages given to us by

the Fish and Wildlife Service. Here in the southern part of the state, if we did have a season that was shorter than 107 days, we'd essentially go the last period of time on the season, so if the season was only 86 days, we'd do the last 86 days of the waterfowl season for any of those three species; pintail, canvasback, or scaup. So for our season dates, the youth day would be the Saturday two weeks before the opening of the waterfowl hunt in the northern/southern part of the state. Our waterfowl seasons will start on the first Saturday in October in the north part of the state and the second or third Saturday in October in the southern part of the state. For ducks, we would be recommending for coot, snipe, merganser, and falconry a maximum bag or possession limit with the exception of wood ducks, we've had a two bird bag for them for some time now just to try to maximize some conservation practices we're doing to try to bolster those populations around the state. For geese, we are not recommending any changes from what we've had in previous years as far as zones are concerned, or season dates. They should all be the same as they were last year, the maximum bag and possession for geese, that would be given to us. For light geese, these dates would be similar to what we have done in the past as well. We would be breaking the season into essentially two different periods. The first would start in October and run through December and then from January to March. This is trying to capitalize on when we have the most number of light geese here in our state. We would recommend a close in the season in Millard County from February 15th to the 28th to accommodate the light goose festival. There is also another caveat with this, there are a couple of days here such as October 25th in 2020, that falls on a Sunday, so we'd be recommending starting that season the day after that. There's also a leap year in there, so we'd have to start that season a day later as well, so we wouldn't be going over the 107 day season allotted to us to hunt migratory game birds. For swans, we're recommending season dates that would start on the first Saturday in October and run through the second Sunday in September. The permits would be allocated through the Fish and Wildlife Service and the flyaway. We would be recommending allowing swan harvest during the youth hunt, which we haven't done in the past, and also a slight boundary change. This is the map here where we're changing that boundary. We're essentially including a little bit more area, most of it is public land, there's a waterfowl management area in that area as well as some duck clubs. It makes the boundary more definable, it's a major highway going through essentially from I-15 out through Corrine, out towards Thiokol. It gives us a more clear defined boundary and just gives us a little bit more area to hunt. As far as rule changes, we are recommending not allowing electric bikes on our waterfowl management areas. This is just to be consistent with what we do with all of our waterfowl areas. We don't allow any sort of motorized vehicles beyond our closed gates. So, as we've discussed electric bikes, we feel like they were probably closer to something like a motorcycle than an actual bike, so our recommendation would be to not allow electric bikes and also to define a hunt boundary around Antelope Island. This has been something that we've had in the guidebook for some time now. We work with state parks to create this boundary and we just want to incorporate it into rule. That's all I have. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Do we have any questions from the RAC? Do we have any questions from the audience? We do have one comment card from Troy Justensen.

Questions from the RAC:

No questions

Questions from the Public:

No questions

Comments from the Public:

Troy Justensen: Troy Justensen; Sportsmen, Fish and Wildlife. Do I have an e-bike? My e-bike has 500 horse power and a prop on the back, so. I'm actually representing two groups here, the Utah Waterfowl Association has formed an opinion on this and they support the Division's recommendations. As far as SFW goes, in talking with Blair and attending the other RAC's, we would support the Division's recommendation but ask that they reach out to these proponents of the electric bike to allow it to where if it's not biologically causing a problem to allow them to use it on the dikes and just put some regulations there. There is a benefit to provide more access for people to get out a little further and to spread hunters out, so if there's not a real reason and we're not doing any damage, I don't know if any of you have ever tried riding a bike in a swamp before, it doesn't work real well, you can't go very far. So, if we are just doing it to outlaw them, I think that we really need to reconsider and see if it is a benefit to sportsmen. Thank you.

Dave Black: Thank you. Comments from the RAC? Riley.

Comments from the RAC:

Riley Roberts: I actually have a question, it's similar to what Troy was commenting on, what is the reason other than, is there any ecological effect? Obviously, the RAC members have gotten a lot of different e-mails in support of the e-bikes. I was just telling Wade, there's a friend that just did a paper on this; state law says anything 750 watt or less is not considered an e-bike. Did you take any of that into consideration when doing this?

Blair Stringham: Yes, we did a bit of research on this. I guess that our main concern is that these are growing in popularity, and so as more and more people start using them, there could be the potential for damage to people going off the trails. There are several classes of these that you can actually function and barely pedal on these and go 60 mph. We figured that where they are closer to a motorized vehicle, that's kind of the way we leaned. We felt like that would be easy for us to regulate. We don't have to try and go out there and check what category each one of these e-bikes is and just for a safety concern. We feel like as we get more and more people out there using e-bikes, there is a potential for people to get hit and things like that.

Brian Johnson: Are we to comments or are we doing questions, I forget. I thought we were doing comments.

Dave Black: Oh I'm sorry, comments.

Brian Johnson: If you guys have ever hunted up there on those dikes, I could see an advantage on a dike to one of these silly little e-bikes. I don't know. I don't necessarily like to hunt up there. The only two wildlife violations that I have ever received are up at Bear River Refuge because there's a cop around every corner, but that's a story for another day. I'll tell you all about it one day. I definitely take no responsibility for this whatsoever. I was young, it was an accident. I just don't see a problem with them on the dike. I just think that if it gets people out hunting, I think that we should promote that. That's what I am all about is the opportunity and promoting people spreading out a little bit. Those dikes, those first 150 yards are a disaster up there. If we could spread it out, I think that it would be

worth looking at, so, whatever.

Blair Stringham: Mr. Chair, if I could make a comment. So we have received quite a bit of feedback on this. We weren't able to really ask for feedback from a lot of the e-bikers because we didn't know who they were until we started this process, but after getting this feedback, I think that we are open to being able to get these guys together and come up for something that would work for both of us. I think that there is definitely some room for compromise there; especially based off of the support we're finding that people have for these e-bikes.

Brayden Richmond: I think your comment was real key and a key to how we vote on this, because if there is room for compromise, then we can't vote to support because then we are no longer compromising. My general comment on this would be a comment that I have made before too, anytime we can not regulate, I prefer not regulating. There are enough restrictions in this life. I think we've got to be careful.

Dave Black: Okay. Wade, do you have a comment?

Wade Heaton: Please, just really fast. My microphone wasn't on, but I said amen to Brayden's comment. This has a feel of "Let's regulate just to regulate." I just think that there are enough advantages to allowing e-bikes. Dispersed hunters, level the playing field just a little bit. To me, this makes sense, and if there's room for compromise, I'm not in love with this.

Dave Black: Okay so let's break out the e-bike thing first, so we can flush that out so we can address everything else. My question is what's the best way to present a motion if we still want to work on a compromise? Is the motion to not accept it, to accept it, or to recommend that they table this ruling and that they get together and come up with another proposal? I'm just asking, if our consensus is that we want them to work on it a little bit more and come up with a compromise, what's the best way to do that? Maybe we don't want them to.

Brian Johnson: I think that the Board's going to rule on it either way, so I think that we should- and the reason I say that is because there's going to be four other RAC's that are going to come up with something-I think that if we were to say "Come up with a compromise" saying to stay on the dikes and then work toward a compromise then we've already kind of segwayed into that. But, I don't know.

Dave Black: Brayden.

Brayden Richmond: My comment would be that we aren't making the rules, we're just giving recommendations to the Board, so I', going to throw out a motion and see if it works. Can I do that?

RAC discussion and vote:

Brayden Richmond made the motion to accept as presented with the exception of the recommendation to not allow E-Bikes on the WMA's. Wade Heaton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Other Business
-Dave Black, Chairman

Dave Black: One more item that we need to talk about, next month's meeting. Do you want to do that, Kevin?

Kevin Bunnell: I'm afraid I've just totally confused the whole where are we meeting issue. I need to make sure that you help me remember at our next meeting that we set all of 2019 and we don't have any confusion. Traditionally, we've had the December meeting in Cedar City. Right now on the schedule, it says Beaver. I think that we have a location for Beaver already- so we don't have a location secured in any place. Do the members of the RAC have a preference between Beaver or Cedar City for the December meeting? Okay, who wants to be in Beaver? Who wants to be in Cedar City? Who doesn't care? That's not until May. Okay, I saw more hands for Cedar City than I saw for Beaver, is that what everybody else saw? Okay, assuming that we can secure this location, we will be back here for the December RAC meeting. Okay, thank you.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.



MEMORANDUM

Date: November 6, 2018
To: Utah Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Council Members
From: Sportsmen for Fish & Wildlife, Utah Bowmen's Assoc., UTFNAWS, Rocky Mtn. Elk Foundation, Mule Deer Foundation.
Subject: **2019 OIAL Archery Only Hunt Recommendation and Season Dates**

Recommendation:

We recommend adding (2) new Archery-Only Once-in-a-Lifetime hunts outlined below.

California Bighorn Sheep		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Newfoundland Mtn	TBD	New Hunt, Archery Only

Desert Bighorn Sheep		2019	
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Season Dates	Notes
	Zion	TBD	New Hunt, Archery Only

Benefits:

- 1- Addresses point creep.
- 2- Provides new and additional opportunities.
- 3- The hunts have a high potential for a lower success rate.
- 4- Targets animals that are often passed over by rifle hunters.
- 5- Not the most opportune time to hunt some of these units. Best time still slated for the any weapon hunts.
- 6- These permits would be in addition to the current permit numbers

History:

- 1- This proposal has passed the RAC's twice 2017 & 2018
- 2- In 2018 it passed all of the RAC's with only 1 descending vote
- 3- Wildlife Board asked that it been ran through the Sheep Committee that happened this year. The Committee supported it.
- 4- The Wildlife Board asked for a hunter survey that was completed this year as well and the results show support for the concept.

Southeast Regional Advisory Council

**John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah**

Nov. 14, 2018

Motion Summary

Approval of agenda and minutes

**MOTION: To accept the agenda as written
Passed 10-0 (1 abstention)**

**MOTION: To accept the minutes as written
Passed 10-0 (1 abstention)**

Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan

**MOTION: To accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented
Passed 9-2**

Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

**MOTION: To accept the Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented
Passed unanimously**

Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

**MOTION: To ask the Division to add verbiage to all hunting proclamations informing hunters of the negative impacts of putting salt baits near water sources
Passed unanimously**

**MOTION: To make the Barney Top area an archery-only elk hunting unit
Passed unanimously**

**MOTION: To ask the Wildlife Board to approve the Division to create archery-only hunts for desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in units the Division deems appropriate
Passed unanimously**

**MOTION: To not allow the use of airguns until those weapons become subject to the Pittman Robertson Tax
Passed 10-1**

MOTION: To do away with the late elk hunt on the Mt. Dutton unit

Failed 2-9

MOTION: To remove multi-season elk hunts on any units that are under age objective

Passed 6-4 (1 abstention)

MOTION: To accept the remaining Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented

Passed unanimously

CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

MOTION: To accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019 as presented

Passed 10-0 (1 abstention)

R657-38 - Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

MOTION: To accept the Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented

Passed unanimously

Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019

MOTION: To accept the Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019 as presented

Passed 10-1

Southeast Regional Advisory Council

**John Wesley Powell River History Museum
1765 E. Main
Green River, Utah**

Nov. 14, 2018 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

Trisha Hedin, Chairwoman · Sportsmen
Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman · Public at large
Sue Bellagamba · Non-consumptive

Lynn Sitterud · Elected official

Jeff Christensen · Agriculture
Jace Guymon · Public at large
Eric Luke · Sportsmen

Darrel Mecham · Sportsmen

Darren Olsen · USFS
Kirk Player · Public at large
Helene Taylor · Agriculture
Todd Thorne · Public at large
Dana Truman · BLM
Gerrish Willis · Non-consumptive
Chris Wood, DWR Regional Supervisor

Total public attendance

9

Others in attendance

Kevin Albrecht, Wildlife Board member
DWR personnel: 16

1) **Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure**

- Trisha Hedin, RAC chairwoman

We are going to get started. Welcome, thank you for coming. If you would like to make a comment, there are comment cards in the back. Please fill out one and give it to Morgan or Chris.

2) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes**

Trisha Hedin: So the first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Do I have a motion on that?

Dana Truman: I can make a motion to approve.

Trisha Hedin: So we have a motion by Dana and seconded by Kent. All in favor. Any opposed? So I have no opposition. And Gerrish is abstaining.

Kent Johnson: Motion to approve the minutes.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Kent Johnson to approve. Do I have a second? I have a second by Eric Luke. All in favor. And Gerrish, you're abstaining, correct?

VOTING

Dana Truman made a motion to approve the agenda as written

Seconded by Kent Johnson

Motion passed 10-0 (abstaining: Gerrish Willis)

Kent Johnson made a motion to approve the minutes as written

Seconded by Eric Luke

Motion passed 10-0 (abstaining: Gerrish Willis)

3) Old Business

- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

I represented the RAC at the Wildlife Board meeting. If you remember our last RAC was about fishing. We had a quick RAC meeting, it was only 75 minutes long. I don't think that's going to happen tonight.

The Wildlife Board had a few motions I'll mention. I don't understand the background behind this specific motion but maybe Kevin can answer any questions. There was a motion that passed 4 to 2 that has the Division looking into the possibility of designating premium fishing areas that allow artificial lures and flies only and to have an increase license requirements and fees. The motion was to look into the idea and bring it back through the RAC and Board on the next recommendation cycle. It was called an action log item. Periodically the Board and the RACs make those motions and give the assignment to the Division to look into those ideas and we explore them and come back and explain what we found. That was one motion.

The other motion was passed unanimously. It looked at keeping the artificial flies and lure restrictions on UM Creek, the East Fork of the Sevier and Mammoth Creek and to raise the limit on UM Creek and East Fork of the Sevier to four fish. I think that motion is pretty similar to the motion that we passed here at our RAC. The rest of the fishing recommendations passed unanimously.

The Central Region deer unit management plans were proposed and they passed unanimously by our RAC and the Board.

The Board also looked at the conservation permit annual report and passed that.

That's all I have.

4) **Regional Update**

- Chris Wood, Regional Supervisor

Thank you for coming. It's a busy time of year. I'm going to go over some of the things that our region has been doing. We've had a busy fall doing some great things.

I'll start off with our Aquatics Section. They have been helping our Habitat Section with the stream restoration project at Miller Creek which is in Carbon County. They have also finished up the Ferron Creek treatment. We did two rotenone treatments in that drainage. To finish that up, we stocked 49,000 native cutthroat trout back into the system. That was exciting.

This time of year, we're working with our federal and state agency partners and nonprofit conservation groups to implement habitat restoration projects on private, state and federal lands. We do river restoration, riparian restoration and uplands and high elevation projects as well. We're currently, as I mentioned, doing a project with our Aquatics Section at Miller Creek. We're installing these BDA's, they are beaver dam analogs. They basically act as beaver dams would. They catch sediment, increase the water table to allow better willow and riparian vegetation growth. They help reduce the erosion. We're doing a lot of work in Miller Creek for potentially introducing cutthroat trout to that system as well. There are projects going on throughout the region and throughout the state. It's an exciting time. We're flying a lot of seed. Specifically, the Trail Mountain Fire. At our warehouse in Price we have pallets and pallets full of seed that's going to be flown onto the project. We fly seed on to most of our habitat projects but that's one of the big ones we have going on. The Habitat Section manages our WMAs, which are Wildlife Management Areas. This time of year, a popular activity on our WMAs are the pheasant hunts that I'll mention here in detail in a second.

Our Saw Enforcement officers have been busy too. Chuck Lawrence is our new officer. He lives in Castle Dale and covers the south part of the Manti. They are investigating over 20 deer cases. The bobcat trapping season starts today and they are also working hunts that go throughout the fall. Upland game, cow elk, bison, they'll be busy for months to come.

Morgan is our outreach manager. He and Walt do a great job in our region doing different events, writing up media releases, writing blogs, producing videos and pictures. They are also in charge of our Walk-in Access program. We have several WIA properties in this region. They are renewing those contracts. We have a big event this Saturday. It's our Mule deer watch at Nash Wash, which is in the South Book Cliffs. This time of year, the deer in that area are very active. We've held this event for several years. If you are interested in attending that, talk to Morgan or I and we can get you more details on that. It is kind of booked but we might be able to squeeze you in if you are really interested. It's a great event. Hunters and wildlife viewers both really come together and admire and appreciate the great mule deer that we have. Morgan has also been busy doing other media projects on the Miller Creek restoration project and we also have a great project that we're collaborating with the Nature Conservancy on The Matheson Wetlands Preserve in Moab. We're doing a razorback sucker project. It's a wetland enhancement project that brings in water and helps this native fish and its habitat.

Finally, our wildlife section. I mentioned pheasants earlier. This time of year, we team up with some of the sportsmen groups and we purchase and release over 10,000 pheasants statewide. I would say about 2,000 of those pheasants come to our region to various properties. They come to Gordon Creek, Desert Lake, the Huntington Game Farm, Fuller Bottom and some of our WIA areas. On our website you can see where we release those pheasants. It's a very popular activity this time of year. It's become a very popular activity for families to go out together and live like it was back in the olden days when the pheasant hunt was really popular and there were pheasants everywhere. We don't quite have those conditions now so we create that artificial put-and-take type of hunt. It's popular and families are really taking advantage of that opportunity. We have our bighorn sheep classifications going on right now. I just talked to Wade. He's flying the North San Rafael. He said in the last two days they've counted about 90 sheep. Last year, in three days they counted 101 sheep so the sheep are looking good on the North San Rafael. We'll be doing those classifications in the next few weeks in other units as well then, we'll be heading into the deer classifications. With that, I'll take any questions.

5) **Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation**

- Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

Thank You. My name is Justin Shannon, I'm the Wildlife Section Chief for the DWR. Tonight, I'm going to give a presentation on agriculture's contributions to wildlife.

The purpose and background of this presentation is we have been meeting with agriculture pretty intentionally over the last several months. The idea is to identify and reduce conflicts. In part of our discussions with the agriculture community, one thing that has come up time and time again is that the contributions of agriculture to wildlife are seldom discussed. Last spring, we brought forth an informational item on the benefits of the conservation permit program. It was well received. There was a lot of feedback and people said they learned things that they didn't know before about that. Tonight, this presentation is going to do something similar. Highlighting agriculture's many contributions to wildlife conservation.

Aldo Leopold is considered by many to be the father of wildlife ecology. He said, "There are two things that interest me, the first is the relation of people to each other and the second is the relation of people to the land." I really like that because the Division of Wildlife, we value our relationship with the agricultural community. We also value our relationship with the wildlife resource that's on the landscape.

I'm going to talk about private lands really quick. The best lands in Utah were settled early and they provided exceptional habitat for wildlife. That's still true today. When you look back, farming and ranching were the backbone of our pioneer settlement. Aldo Leopold went on to say, "There are two spiritual dangers to not owning a farm. The first is, supposing that breakfast comes from the grocer and the second is that heat comes from the furnace." I really like that because that's an area that the agriculture community and hunters align. We support the responsibility of the use of our natural resources on the landscape. Continuing on with private land, the rangelands and cultivated fields that are owned by private landowners provide open space and abundant resources for wildlife. Deer and elk are often found on private lands. This last year, we radio collared over 1,000 elk and deer. We mapped it on Utah. So, on the map, the blue polygons are private lands.

So, 21 percent of the state is privately owned. The pink dots are mule deer and the orange are the elk distributed throughout the state. What we found is that deer were using 27 percent of their locations were on private land and 35 percent for elk. Deer and elk have a high affinity for these areas.

Moving on to water on private lands. Most water rights are held in private ownership. Wildlife need water not only to survive at a basic biological level but also to thrive. If you look at the contributions of landowners when it comes to water, quality and quantity, they've done a great job with that by developing springs and ponds, wells, troughs, pipelines, etc. This is a big effort. It's been done and the wildlife don't know the boundaries so if there's abundant water on the landscape, they are going to use it. In some parts of the state, landowners have improved and created wetlands for waterfowl and other wildlife which has been a great benefit.

Some of the partnerships that we've seen from the agriculture community is, private landowners often allow access for game and nongame surveys. We'll be access to private lands to classify deer and elk and those types of things but equally important is the nongame surveys that help prevent federal listings and ensuring we have data to know the distribution and abundance of a lot of the animals on the landscape. A lot of the landowners that we've worked with have partnered with us and the department of Ag and others to improve their habitat. Whether it's through the watershed restoration initiative or the grazing improvement program. Landowners allow public access which has been great. They have also participated in committees, advisory Boards, RACs, etc. We've really tried to get their input as we've made management decisions for wildlife. We've said this before but we'll say it again. The Division does not want to grow wildlife on the backs of private landowners especially when they have reached their social tolerance for how many deer and elk they are comfortable seeing in their fields.

Moving on to public land grazing. In Utah these landscapes evolved with herbivory or the presence of plant eating animals. Proper grazing practices can reduce fire related fuel loads, increase vegetative diversity and improve rangeland health, etc. The permittees, one of the major responsibilities on these allotments is to develop and maintain water system. As mentioned earlier with private lands, it's the same thing with these public lands. It's been a positive thing for wildlife. The last thing I would say about public land grazing is, the permittees spend a lot of time on the range and that's been a good thing. We've been able to get into some really good dialogue about what's needed for those ranges. A year like this year where we had a lot of drought concerns, it was good to see what our biologists were seeing and what some of the permittees were seeing. It influenced a lot of decisions for us. We had some good conversations on where we may need to do habitat improvement projects in the future.

I want to talk a little bit about some success stories. Alton CWMU is a group of landowners down in southern Utah. They fenced an entire community to prevent depredation for the landowners. It's incredible what they've done down there. They've also conducted numerous habitat projects that have benefited a lot of wildlife species. Jill Farry (sp?) is a landowner out of Box Elder County. He recently won an award for improving waterfowl habitat on his private lands. He didn't have to do that. He loves wildlife and chose to do it and loves to see the waterfowl come in. He also provided Walk-in Access areas for sharp-tail grouse. WIA is where landowners allow hunters to come onto their private property. You may say, why is this important? Well, 99 percent of our sharp-tail grouse in Utah live on private lands. Without that landowner tolerance and participation, we wouldn't have access to hunting. Finally, Brad Buller is another

one. In Hamlin Valley, he's enhanced sage grouse, deer and elk habitat on private lands through chainings, water developments, and a variety of things with him and his neighbors, it's been good.

Managing wildlife is a partnership effort. One thing that we're working with the agriculture community right now is some horse and burrow related issues. That's been important. We've had some good discussions and good movement there in responding to drought concerns, especially this year. We graze a lot of our waterfowl management areas but we don't graze all of them. In years like this where we had a lot of fires and a lot of pretty intense drought conditions, we allowed permittees to graze some of these properties on an emergency basis. We also increased antlerless elk permits, bison permits and pronghorn because of the conditions. One thing that we're working on is efforts to restore suspended AUMs. We're offering our support where we can in that effort. We're trying to restore habitats and do some monitoring as well. Predator management: the Division spends about \$1.4 million annually on predator management efforts throughout the state and that's benefitted producers. Also, one thing that we've started is a new agriculture and wildlife working group. This has been a good thing. This is a new group that works together. It's me and Troy Forest, with the department of Ag., then we have three representatives from the cattleman's association, woolgrower's association and farm bureau and representative from RMEF, SFW and Wild Sheep Foundation. It's been good to lay issues out on the table and try to give each other the benefit of the doubt and have a better appreciation for the perspective of others. It's been good.

As we were putting this power point together, the agriculture community, one of the things that they kept saying was, the Division has some good programs but we never promote them. We never do a good job of explaining what it is that we do. At their request, we put this together and I'll be brief of these. I think many here may know some of this.

The first is the Cooperative Wildlife Management Units. This is a program that promotes tolerance for wildlife by having open spaces and active wildlife management of private properties. The goal is to allow public access to private lands and in return, landowners can financially benefit. It's been good. LOAs are similar in that regard.

Walk in Access: We talked about this a little bit earlier. Landowners are compensated for allowing public access.

One program that I really like that doesn't get a lot of credit is the Farm Bill Program. This is where funds are available to improve habitats on private property.

Our Dedicated Hunter Program: Last night in the southern region, Kevin Bunnell, the regional supervisor, shared an experience of some dedicated hunters in helping a landowner and permittee fix fence and water pipes throughout the property. Over the past several years, they've built a good relationship and really made some headway in that. There's a lot more tolerance for wildlife because of these dedicated hunters.

Also, the Grazing Improvement Program. This is a program that's administered by the department of Ag. We're partners in this. It's to improve rangelands. In so doing we benefit wildlife and livestock. We treated about 5.3 million acres. That's the amount that's been impacted of these allotments and other areas since 2006. This is about a \$2.5 million program annually.

Our depredation program is a big one. It's pretty complex but I'll hit the highlights. Our agency hazes animals from cultivated crops, provides monetary reimbursement in some situations, provides antlerless permits and vouchers, fencing options, depredation hunts, anything we can within our code and rule and policy to help

increase tolerance for landowners.

The Watershed Restoration Initiative, we've talked about this a bunch. This is a program that has a lot of partners. Sportsmen, federal partners, landowners, there's a lot of players here. Together, we treated 1.9 million acres since 2005 and spent over \$300 million. The thing I like about it is that it works at a landscape level. It doesn't see boundaries. If it's SITLA land, and it can do good things for forage and improve healthy habitats, great. If it's private lands, same situation. The one thing that's underappreciated is the contributions that producers and private landowners have given to habitat restoration. Whether it's in-kind, using equipment, donating money or seed or whatever it is.

A few years ago, we provided private land only antlerless elk permits. That was a recommendation that we brought before the RACs and Board and it was approved. It's been well received. It's built tolerance and provided opportunities for landowners to decide what level of elk they are willing to tolerate on their property.

We have general landowner buck deer permits and landowner appreciation buck deer permits. These are permits that if you have private rangelands or cultivated crops you can obtain a buck deer permit on general season units.

In summary, Aldo Leopold said, "Conservation will ultimately boil down to rewarding the private landowner who conserves the public interest." I agree. We need the help of private landowners in the ag community in order to have the wildlife populations that we do. Wildlife benefits from agricultural activities and we're working together on issues with these new committees we're doing and trying to improve understanding. We have some programs in place to increase landowner tolerance of wildlife but that's not it. We're actively looking to engage in dialogue and see where we can improve. At the end of the day, this presentation is really about thanking the landowners and permittees for the good things that they have done for wildlife and their habitats. That's all I have.

Questions from the RAC

No questions.

Questions from the audience

No questions.

6) Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan

- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Questions from the RAC

Trisha Hedin: If you're in the audience and you want to make a comment, bring a comment card to either Morgan or Chris. At this point we are going to take questions from the RAC.

Eric Luke: With the new units, I understand before any implementation or transplants would occur, do you go to specific unit-by-unit management plan?

Jace Taylor: Exactly. So maybe a good example for everyone here, we have the Manti is this list. It's one that we talked about a lot in our committee. We spent a lot of time on it and we recognize that there is an opportunity there. If we were to put mountain goats on the Manti, there would be a unit management plan that would be put together with input with specific parties in the area. That would come to you guys on the RAC and the Board before any of that happened.

Eric Luke: Who would be involved with the unit management plan?

Jace Taylor: Similarly, like we did with the statewide plan we would involve all those who have an invested interest in it in that area. Sportsmen, federal agencies, producers in the area and those types of folks. Usually we involve the local governments as well in some of those discussions.

Eric Luke: Sportsmen groups?

Jace Taylor: Yes. The local biologist would have a much bigger influence on that than they would in the statewide plan obviously.

Todd Thorne: Which units have plans?

Jace: Everything on that top list. I believe that you guys have seen the unit management plans for those ones that we have established populations and been through the RAC and Board process. None of the ones on the bottom introductions.

Eric Luke: With the Manti, I see some concerns there. The Manti is a little different unit than all of the rest of them in that there's so much access. What do you anticipate for potential human interaction and the deer herds? What kind of an impact do you anticipate that the introduction of mountain goats could have on the existing deer herds?

Jace Taylor: I'd be happy to answer, but Wade's here and he would be the best at answering that.

Wade Paskett: There is a lot of access on the Manti. There are many ridges and canyons that have roads and ATV trails. Rusty Robinson, the Central Region biologist, and I last week, flew the South Manti from White Mountain to Tent Mountain. It's about 33 miles in length. The best habitat was on the west side of Skyline Drive where there isn't a lot of roads in those canyons and basins. It's a lot different than on the southeast side. Originally, as I told Eric, I was hesitant about the proposal when I heard about it couple years ago to put goats on the Manti because it modeled so well. Once I saw the model, it's pretty undeniable that it models well. It's similar to the Uintas for intact habitat. Of course, there's elevation differences between the two. But, flying it, there is potential for mountain goats. As Eric's pointing out is that there's overlap in the habitat use of mountain goats and deer. They'll be using the same habitat. There isn't the structure in the cliffs on the Manti that there is in other areas where goats are. So, they're going to be

below the ledges and above the ledges. I think as far as roads and human activity go, I think they have places to go outside of those areas.

Eric Luke: Would it be fair to say that the mule deer model would be very similar?

Wade Paskett: Yeah, on some of those summer areas it would be. Places where it would be different would be aspen areas where deer are fawning in where goats are not typically going to be.

Jace Taylor: From the statewide perspective, all of these other places where we've seen our mountain goat numbers increase in the recent past, we haven't seen any changes to our deer herds at least how it pertains to mountain goats. In fact, some of these places we have great deer herds. It might not be for that reason but everything that we've seen in literature and otherwise, there doesn't seem to be a whole lot of impact. While they may be using the same places, it doesn't seem to have a lot of negative impact on the deer herd.

Jeff Christensen: Any disease issues with domestic sheep and goats?

Jace Taylor: They can carry some of the same bacteria pathogens that we worry about with bighorn sheep, for example, that's where we have really high concerns with diseases. Some of those same diseases, pneumonia specifically, they can be affected by those same pathogens but we have not seen the same level of mortality or issue that we have with domestic sheep and goats.

Jeff Christensen: Any other unit in the state where you're running goats where there are high numbers of domestic sheep?

Jace Taylor: The Manti is very important area for domestic sheep industry. Anywhere with the same numbers? I don't think so.

Jeff Christensen: Do you have herds overlapping?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, we have places where we have domestic sheep and goats in the same areas.

Gerrish Willis: Can you go back to the previous slide that showed the Manti? What do the numbers—

Jace Taylor: I just barely put this together. What we have here on this left image is model habitat in orange for a number of areas throughout the state. The ones with the boxes that have the numbers are places where we have established herds. Willard, Wasatch, Nebo, Tushers, Dutton, La Sals and Uintas are where we have these goats. Those are the most recent population estimates. What I wanted to get out there was, in the Uintas where we have the most contiguous, most connected habitat, we have over 900 goats. A lot of other places we have 100, 200 mountain goats. I think the point there being that when we go through the unit management plan, the Manti, we don't have to have 1,000 goats on there. It may very well be one of these smaller ones as far as 100 or 200 animals or

whatever shakes out. We can have successful herds with lower numbers.

Eric Luke: Those numbers would be determined in the unit-by-unit plans?

Jace Taylor: Yeah.

Gerrish Willis: I was having a hard time understanding, those numbers are current population estimates?

Jace Taylor: Yeah, most recent estimates in all of those areas.

Gerrish: They have nothing to do with potential?

Jace Taylor: There are definitely places in the state where we keep the population smaller than what their potential is for a number of reasons.

Gerrish Willis: So, the unit plans is where the population objectives would be set?

Jace Taylor: Yep.

Todd Thorne: I have a couple questions in relation to goals and strategies. One of them is working with land managers. What's the Forest Service's view on mountain goats on the Manti?

Jace Taylor: So we had a forest service representative on the advisory committee. We talked through the issues and as far as it going on this plan, we were all in agreement that there is available habitat there and the specific issues would need to be looked at closer in the future but there is potential for mountain goats there. I'd hate to give a specific opinion and represent them.

Trisha Hedin: Can you tell me where we're at with the introduction of goats on the La Sals and the litigation of that?

Jace Taylor: Marty's here he might be the best one to give specifics there.

Marty Bushman: I can't tell you how the goats are doing, but the case as you know went from the district court filed by Grand Canyon Trust against the Forest Service. The district court dismissed that case on the basis that the Forest Service has never made a final agency action or decision relative to Grand Canyon Trust's request that the Forest Service remove the goats from the La Sals. It was appealed to the 10th Circuit. Grand Canyon Trust in that had a fairly lengthy portion of their brief that was devoted to the Forest Service in having primary management authority over wildlife. It all led back to the Forest Service not only had authority, not only unilaterally remove those goats, it has an obligation under federal law. We took exception with that. The state of Utah filed an amicus brief meaning, we're not a party but it was a brief to the court basically representing its position on wildlife management authority on Forest Service lands, and states have that management authority. Eleven other western states joined in that brief where was really helpful. The case was argued last month in Denver and none of the

questions went to the wildlife authority issue it was all about the finality of the Forest Service's decision and whether there had been a decision made. The case is not under advisement with the 10th Circuit.

Trisha Hedin: Thank you.

Questions from the audience

No questions.

Comments from the audience

Greg Bird, Utah Wild Sheep Foundation: I was fortunate to sit on this committee putting together this goat plan and the bighorn sheep plan. It was really well thought out and put together by the Division with a lot of different and interested parties. We as the Wild Sheep Foundation support the program in whole as presented tonight.

Troy Justensen, SFW: I too, sat on that committee. We support the plan. We put a lot of time and effort into it. I think the key thing to remember is even though the Manti and some of these other places are listed as possible sites, it would have to go through and have a management plan created where all the affected parties would have the ability to have their input. Just because it's on there, doesn't mean that tomorrow we're putting those goats there. We'd ask that the RAC support this plan.

RAC discussion

Eric Luke: Of course, I have a comment. I am all for expanding hunting opportunities for all species. I am concerned somewhat with the Manti because it is so different from the other areas. The elevation and the models show that it's good habitat but it's really the only unit that has a road right on top of the majority of the habitat. Not only one, but several roads. The other big concern I have is, and Jace brought up a fact that on other areas, they have flourishing deer herds and mountain goats. We don't have a flourishing deer herd on the South Manti. Our deer herd is hurting tremendously. My concern would be that if we introduce mountain goats, that is one more potential factor that could possibly slow the recovery of our deer herd. I'm torn on the whole idea. I support the expansion and opportunities but I do have some concerns. The fact that it will go to a unit-by-unit management plan helps ease some of that concern.

Trisha Hedin: We had very similar concerns with the La Sals. I understand where you're coming from.

Kirk Player: This kind of goes along with the sheep plan but I'll say it now. As far as the point creep goes, the idea of having a few more permits and a few different weapons to be able to go after is great but it's like trying to put out a forest fire with a syringe. That point creep is going to eat everybody alive. Hopefully everybody is staying in good shape because you're going to be 70 before you get to hunt any of these.

Jeff Christensen: How long before a herd is up and ready to hunt?

Jace Taylor: It depends. For the La Sals, I think it was 2013 that we brought them there and this year was the first year to hunt. So, it took five years or so on that one. I think four, five, six years, it depends.

Sue Bellagamba: I have concerns that mountain goats are non native species in many of these areas. By introducing a non-native species, there's numerous unintended consequences to native species and native habitat. I also have a concern that the management plan really is weak on cumulative impacts of multiple introductions of different types of big game animals.

Gerrish Willis: I have a comment, too. Looking at the list of groups that were represented in the advisory committee, I can see that it's kind of stacked with hunting interest primarily. I don't see the non-consumptive, non-hunters represented on that group and there are a lot of really good biologists who might have a different perspective on augmentation and introductions. I would advise the Wildlife Board that in the future to make sure that all voices are heard when you set up an advisory group like that.

Jace Guymon: I'd like to make a motion to pass the DWR proposal for their goat management plan as presented. I think that goats are one of the least impactful as far as other species, and it sounds really well thought out. And obviously in the future, we'll go over the unit-by-unit as it arises. I think this is a good plan for now.

Trisha Hedin: So we have a motion by Jace Guymon to pass the statewide goat management plan as presented, and we have a second by Kirk Player. All in favor? In favor: nine in favor. And opposed? So we have Gerrish Willis and Sue Bellagamba opposed.

I would like to note that I think Gerrish's comment about that advisory Board is extremely important.

VOTING

Jace Guymon made a motion to accept the Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented

Seconded by Kirk Player

Motion passed 9-2 (Opposed: Sue Bellagamba, Gerrish Willis)

7) Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

- Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

Questions from the RAC

Eric Luke: In a case where you have a unit that has disease and they have to be

terminated, is that something that the DWR does? I see potential there for opportunity for sportsmen to go in to help with that process. Does that happen now, or does the DWR pretty much just take care of that on their own?

Jace Taylor: In the past we have had interested hunters that have helped with that some. In the plan here, we've outlined that we'd like to continue to find those opportunities. When there needs to be a lethal action removal when appropriate, we can use sportsmen for it. It's tricky sometimes because a lot of these are time sensitive so we can't always take the risk of waiting to get someone else there. It is something we have and outlined in the plan.

Jace Guymon: This past September, I was down on Zion. I know the North end has a lot of coughing sheep. In a case like that where you've got a big divide between like the north then you have the south like the Canaans, could there be an emergency effort and pull from sportsmen to get them transplanted out of the south before they are infected? Or is it kind of let it run its course and see?

Jace Taylor: Back in July we started seeing coughing bighorn sheep in the Zion unit and at them time, right then we got working. The Zion National Park has been great working with us. We started testing animals, increasing observation efforts around the unit and we went through all sorts of scenarios of what might happen. That was one of the things that was on the table. With that herd, as we watched it closely and were prepared to do whatever we needed to do with the biologist down there, the great thing that has been is we haven't actually seen any mortalities down there in the Zion herd. We had a number of collared animals. As we watched those animals closely, none of them were dying. In fact, we had animals that were coughing back in July and August that have actually stopped coughing. We're hoping that we dodged a bullet down there. Yes, they do have some of the pathogens that we're often times most worried about but there are different strains or variants of that and some are not or less deadly. From everything we can tell so far, that herd is doing well. That is a good idea and something we had on the table.

Jeff Christensen: The big removal on the La Sals last winter, where you brought the chopper in and shot them.

Jace Taylor: The last time we had a big removal was on the Stansbury Mountains where we did a depopulation. Oh ok, so on the North San Juan. What we did there was we did what is called a test and cull. So, when you have a population that's been chronically and habitually had problems with diseases and they don't seem to recover from them, so kind of the opposite of what we're seeing on Zion, San Juan has gone years and years without recovering, and we continue to have animals that were sick and dying. What we do is it's called a test and cull. So if the population is small enough, we can go in and catch every individual animal in there, test them and find those that are actively shedding the disease, lethally remove them. It's been shown in other studies that you can help the herd recover from their issue. We also, with the North San Juan, brought animals in from the Zion unit.

Jeff Christensen: They were all shot by UDAF out of the chopper.

Jace: Yes, those ones where. That is one of those time-sensitive kind of issues where you've got to do the removal quickly after you do the test. We tested them, got results as quick as we could and did the removal. The longer we wait, things get spread.

Kent Johnson: Is there a list that you could put together of interested sportsmen? A way you can sign up in the drawing application? There may be some people you call on the phone, they're not interested in burning their once-in-a-lifetime opportunity on a 130-inch ram. Maybe somebody else is, maybe it's a guy that's 85 years old and just wants an opportunity to hunt sheep. Is that something that you've explored, putting together a list of people that are there and you have a list of people ready to call?

Jace: So how we do it, we take the list of the people that have drawn the permits and then the alternate list after that. We go through them in that order. We take whatever unit it's within or the nearest unit to it. If it's before the hunt has happened, we'll be contacting those that drew the permits and explain the situation to them and see if they are interested. After we go through that list we go to the alternate list. We have an alternate list that's in the order that they would have drawn out or if someone turned one back in. We go through it until we find someone that is interested.

Kent Johnson: That's the current process. I was asking if you put that as a question when you apply for the permit. "Are you interested in this opportunity? That may mean you have to go at a minute's notice." You would then have a shorter list of people to have to look at that you know are willing to do it up front where it's time sensitive.

Jace: That's a good question. I think most people are interested, it just really depends on the specifics of the scenario. When it is? What they are doing that week? Where the animal is, how old it is? That kind of thing. I think that the way we do it works pretty well. It can go pretty quick going through the list. It's not a bad idea.

Trisha Hedin: Any other additional questions from the RAC?

Darren Olsen: Can we go back to the list of augmentation and introduction?

Jace: Deserts or Rockies?

Darren: Both. So, as a Forest Service representative, we're concerned about any interaction of bighorn sheep with the domestic livestock. Are these introduction sites, any of those expect the risk of that being low? This is for desert, what about Rockies?

Jace: The fact of the matter is, we've been trying hard working with the bighorn sheep in the state for quite a while. To be entirely honest, anything that is on the reintroduction list is there because we can't put bighorns there or we've probably already done it. They'd be on the other list. So, they all have risks that we have not been comfortable with up to this point. Some of them higher, some lower. We've identified these ones, they have good habitat. The specific circumstances in these areas, we recognize there's a possibility that we could resolve those risks to a point where we'd be comfortable. All of them have issues that we'd need to work through before we had animals there.

Darren: So, if that's a reintroduction, you already have a unit management plan for those?

Jace: No. By reintroduction, I mean historically they existed there. We don't have unit management plans for anything on this reintroduction list.

Darren: So, in that case you would have to come forward with a unit management plan and recommendation?

Jace: Yes, exactly. So, say for example, we have the Wellsvilles. There are issues that we are not comfortable with at them moment. If those were to be resolved then at that point, we would create a unit management plan and you would see it if everything went well and we felt comfortable then we could do the reintroduction.

Darren: Thanks.

Questions from the audience

No questions.

Comments from the audience

Troy Justensen, SFW: I had the opportunity to sit on this committee as well. It was interesting to get all sides involved, to get the ag., the sportsmen and federal agencies to sit down and discuss the issues and come up with some reasonable solutions. All sides were giving some. To answer you question on these units when you're taking into concern of contact with disease, I don't know if there's a unit in the state, quite honestly, that doesn't have issues. I think we all know that the majority of the units in the state have issues with contact with domestic sheep. We as sportsmen are willing to live with that. We understand that those domestic sheep are going to stay there and we support that. We're willing to invest the money and time to grow these sheep to enjoy them while we can, fully understanding that at some point they are going to crash. Case in point, I've guided sheep for 30 years and I drove up the river today and not too many years ago, you'd see 200 head of sheep driving up that canyon, I saw zero. We continue to work to re-establish these herds for the enjoyment and the opportunity of not only hunters but non-consumptive as well. I would ask the RAC to support this plan. Ag, the sportsmen, the Division and federal agencies came together on this and it's well put. Is it perfect? No, but we did everything possible that we could to protect the operators and to ensure them that we won't want them off the range. We support the domestic livestock industry and we're willing to do whatever it takes to show that. So, I would ask you to support this plan. Thank You.

Greg Bird, Utah Wild Sheep Foundation: I'll echo what Troy just said. This was a really well thought out and time extensive process. It was very unique in the fact that we had lawyers sitting in every single meeting. The wording in this is really specific to help with some built in assurances to the domestic growers in the state. We want to be partners with them with the bighorn sheep and their operations. Our mission statement is that we want

to put sheep on the mountain. Our mission statement is not to take the domestic sheep off the mountain. We want to be partners all the way around. We felt like this program was really well thought out and we support it fully. Thank You.

Mike King: I had the chance to be on the committee as well. I would just echo what these gentlemen have said. I feel much better about myself today though because I also drove up the canyon and didn't see any sheep. If Troy didn't see any then it's OK if I didn't see any. I was impressed with the process that we went through during that time. I was especially impressed with how things kind of started off with folks being agitated that were on opposite sides of the coin but by the time we got through the process, all of those group had come together. I was impressed with the Division's willingness to put these committees together and listen to what the agricultural folks had to say because they definitely have some concerns and reason for that based on what has happened in other places. I was also impressed with the sportsmen groups willing to listen and work together. I would like to compliment Jace Taylor for coordinating this, putting it together and developing a plan. Also, Blair Stringham who facilitated the meetings. That meeting process works pretty smoothly when you have somebody that knows what they are doing to keep track of those things. It was a good experience for me to sit on the committee and I support the plan and would encourage you to do the same.

RAC discussion

Trisha Hedin: So at this point do we have comments from the RAC?

Eric Luke: I think it's important to note, I received a letter and I assume everyone else did from the Farm Bureau administration and they, too, conservatively supported the plan.

Trisha Hedin: So if we have no more comments, I will entertain a motion.

Jeff Christensen: I'll make a motion that we accept it as given.

Trisha Hedin: So we have a motion by Jeff Christensen to accept the management plan as presented. And seconded by Kent Johnson. All in favor. I believe that's unanimous. Thank you.

VOTING

Jeff Christensen made a motion to accept the Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan

Seconded by Kent Johnson

Motion passed unanimously

8) Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments

- Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Trisha Hedin: Questions from the RAC?

Eric Luke: Do you really think that no scouting while flying is actually enforceable?

Covy Jones: I think it will be closely monitored. There's a flight school in Cedar City and because of that, there's a helicopter school and a lot of flying. Our officers say that the second the hunts start, they get two calls a day on average that they look in to. All these planes have a tail number and identifying factors and I promise you that hunters watch this. This is one that we'll have to look into but I think that the sportsmen and women in the field will be the ones that will help us enforce this.

Eric Luke: To me, it's pretty difficult because unless a hunter sees them flying back and forth, and going out of their flight path, it would be pretty hard to determine whether they are scouting or not. If you see them flying back and forth, it's pretty evident.

Covy Jones: As a person who's flown a lot of wildlife surveys, I would say that in order to be successful at scouting, you have to do a lot of things. You have to really drop the speed of the plane or helicopter. When we fly a lot of our species, it's doors open on a helicopter. If you don't do those things, if you fly high speed, so you would notice if a plane slowed down, dropped their flaps and they are just cruising along at 60 miles per hour. You're right, they might opportunistically see animals, I would agree with that but it's pretty tough unless you drop your elevation and drop your speed to actually see what's going on, on the ground.

Jeff Christensen: You said improved airstrips, what is that?

Covy Jones: We have a definition in the rule. I'm trying to remember the wording. It means that it has been mechanically improved and it's an approved airstrip.

Jeff Christensen: Dirt strips that are private, it doesn't allow to land there?

Covy Jones: I think a lot of those would qualify on private.

Jeff Christensen: You'd have to have permission on these.

Covy Jones: Absolutely.

Eric LUke: Gravel road? Does that qualify?

Covy Jones: It has to be for that purpose. Some of us have done this. You can put a plane down in a lot of places but you need to have at least some runway. We had to clean this rule up, if we've got suggestions to make it better, we're definitely open to that.

Jeff Christensen: If you were going to improve it, I would say on a private strip they need

some kind of written permission. We have two private strips. I guess it would fall back to trespassing.

Kirk Player: You can prosecute them for trespassing.

Jeff Christensen: If you were going to add something in there, I don't know if you could say that on private strips you need written permission.

Covy Jones: Marty, you're here. What's your take on that?

Marty Bushman: Trespass laws would cover it pretty well.

Covy: It wouldn't change the trespass laws it would just be another feather in the hat.

Questions from the audience

Verd Byrnes: Can the Division touch on baiting of big game? Elk and deer? What are the rules?

Covy Jones: We gave an informational on this to the Wildlife Board in the spring. Currently, we allow big game baiting. We're one of the only states that allow it. Utah currently doesn't have any law or rule against it.

Verd Byrnes: What is allowed?

Covy Jones: We're just talking big game, right? There are no restrictions

Verd Byrnes: Are there any regulations for trail cameras or tree stands?

Covy Jones: Not in the state of Utah.

Comments from the audience

Verd Byrnes: The reason I ask him, because of the drought in this part of the state, especially on the San Juan, what we are seeing now is extensive use of trail cameras and tree stands. Because of the drought, everybody is moving into the riparian areas. That's fine, but now they are taking blocks of salt. You've got salt with the wallows in the springs and streambeds. Cattlemen are allowed to put salt within a quarter mile of a riparian area. Sportsmen are doing this and we need to figure out how to educate sportsmen, the guides and the outfitters that we can't be doing this to the resource. I don't know if it's in the publication for the rules is a good place to educate them. I did have some pictures—I apologize they were in the wrong media—to show you. We're destroying the habitat, that's the first thing that we're doing and we need to change it. Back east, they require ID for tree stands and cameras, I think but there's no way to identify who owns them so the land agencies have no way to enforce these laws. Education is the best thing we need to do.

Troy Justensen, SFW: We support the Division's recommendations with the following exceptions. We'd ask that the RAC vote on these as I bring them forward.

One pertains to the southern unit. On the Mt. Dutton, we ask that you do away with the late hunt. There is some concern that it's part of the mega units. It winters a lot of bulls from the Boulder, Panguitch, Monroe and they are on these big mahoganies up in the slopes and they are really susceptible. Our concern is that the top end on this particular unit is taken off every year so we would ask that you do away with that late hunt and bring the permits back either to a mid-season archery/muzzleloader or whatever. This was presented at the southern RAC last night and was passed.

The other recommendation that we have is in the southern unit. These next two are totally based upon creating opportunity. I know there's a lot of scuttle around and as you get to them you're going to know what I'm talking about. What we are trying to accomplish with these recommendations is, find a way that we can provide an opportunity for people to get out and have minimal impact on the resource. Meaning, the least effective weapon type at the least effective time.

On the next one, for those that are familiar with the Boulder unit, there used to be a unit called the Barney Top. It was a stand alone unit and now they have combined it with the Boulder. The Boulder is a giant unit. The Barney Top gets very limited use so what we would like to do is propose creating a primitive weapon unit. The two hunts that would exist on this unit would be an archery only and also a primitive muzzleloader. The Division made us aware that we'd have to go back and redefine what a muzzleloader is but what we would like on this restriction on this particular unit, it would have to be a flintlock, percussion cap, .209, no scope, not sabot. Once again, limiting the effectiveness. Muzzleloaders today, you can buy a muzzleloader that is a 600-yard gun. Rifles, we're stretching it now to 1,000 to 1,200 yards. The whole idea with this, is to provide opportunity to have limited effect on there. It would be, the Barney Top unit as a primitive unit. We understand that we would have to do some things to allow the muzzleloader portion of it but we'd like to create that as an archery only unit this year.

Next, you've seen this come through. This is the third time now that we are proposing an archery-only hunt for bighorn sheep, both desert and Rocky Mountain. To give you a little bit of history on this, we brought it through two years ago. It was passed by the majority of the RACs and we took it to the Wildlife Board. The Wildlife Board said, you don't have the support of Utah FNAWS, Utah Wild Sheep. So, we came back around and we got all of the major conservation groups to support last year. We came back last year and presented it to you will all groups and all of the RACs supported it. We took it back to the Board and the Board said, it didn't go through the sheep committee and also, we'd like a public survey to see what people thought. We took it back again. We took it to the sheep committee and they support this idea. The main reason being is that we need to look at ways and you pointed it out, there's no way that we can create enough resource for everybody to draw but there is a way that we can create for at least some people to have the opportunity to hunt these sheep. It's through a less effective weapon type. I'm not married to a bow. I really don't care. If we want to go to a .30-30 open sights, if we want to go to a sling shot, I don't care but somehow, we need to go to a less effective weapon type. We'd asked that we have these OIAL bighorn hunts for both desert and Rockies, we originally picked the Zion and the Newfoundland units but we'd leave that up the Division to see what unit fits best. It would be the toughest hunt with the lowest success rate and we'd plan those units in the same way with the season dates. You

supported this recommendation last year and we'd ask for your support again. Thank you.

Guy Webster: The only thing I'm kind of concerned about is our spike hunt, especially on the Book Cliffs, has substantially impacted the big bulls up there. For 30 years, we've given about 200 big bull tags. That's what we feel like we can sustain. We're killing anywhere from 300 to 400 spikes a year. The math is pretty simple, 5 to 7 years from now, there's not that many big bulls to continue that. We talk about point creep, it's substantially causing that to be even more increased. We've had to cut back the LE bull tags on the roadless last year. If we continue this trend, we're going to head that way more so.

Secondly, I went to the Wildlife Board and brought forth the proposal last year. Any unit on elk, I think the multi-season tag should maybe be limited to those units that are over objective on elk. If we've got units that are under objective, do we really need to be giving multi-season tags? We talk about opportunity, every one of those tag holders can still have opportunity, they may just have to choose which season to hunt. The muzzleloader is still giving you nine days to hunt. There's opportunity there. I think we can also increase opportunity if we're not killing all of the spikes to increase our LE bull tags in the future.

Greg Bird, Wild Sheep Foundation: We agree with plan as presented, with the exceptions and recommendations as presented by SFW. We agree with the Barney Top unit and doing away with the late Dutton hunts. We fully support the archery-only OIAL bighorn sheep hunts. These hunts, as Troy already stated are meant for opportunity. With redoing of the sheep plans, with it being increased opportunity permit-wise, these less effective weapon type hunts really have the ability to add opportunity. If these hunts go under 50 percent success, that's just one more tag we can put on the mountain. They're not meant to be 100 percent success hunt as most of our sheep hunts have been in the past, it's meant to be a tougher hunt. It will give us more opportunity so we do support it and we hope that you'd vote on it tonight and pass it. Thank You.

RAC discussion

Trisha Hedin: Covy, do you mind if I ask a quick question regarding archery only sheep hunt? Would it add tags to hunt or would it pull away from the existing pool?

Covy Jones: The intent would be to do it in a place where we could add permits, with the rationale being that lower success allows us to do that. We probably wouldn't recommend it on a unit where it was a one-for-one. Obviously, because if it's an any weapon hunt, you can already use a bow. So, we would definitely evaluate that and say, here it's going to be lower success. At the end of the day, we can't be 100 percent sure but if we don't try, we'll never know. The sheep plan members really wanted it. I'll be presenting on the survey to the Board but the survey was pretty supportive amongst OIAL hunters. That tells me that they're concerned about their ability to ever hunt one of these animals.

Trisha Hedin: My concern with the air guns not having to pay Pitman Robertson, I feel like they should pay that tax.

Covy: Agreed. When we put it in there that we wanted the review in 2020, that's serious. We're not just saying, oh, we'll look at it then. If they are not paying it or making progress towards that, we'll probably have a hard time continuing to support it.

Eric Luke: With the archery only sheep, how does that play in to the management plan? I know as presented, you raised the percentages to where there will be opportunity for more permits at least on some units.

Covy: We did a couple of things in the management plan. One of them was, OIAL hunts, because hunters wait so long to get one, we've always had in our management plans that we try to strive for 90 percent success. What we heard from the committee was really interesting. It was, "stop it, stop striving for a 90 percent success rate." There's only a couple of ways to address point creep. One is grow populations, two is harvest lesser quality animals or three is use a less effective weapon. You can have all the ideas in the world and it comes down to one of those three things. So, the management plan wanted to do both. Both, provide more opportunity. Maybe, manage for a lesser quality of animal on some units but also throw a hunt out there that a hunter can put in for knowing that it might only be 10 percent success. That way, you assume the risk. Basically, they told the Division, "stop protecting us, we want to assume the risk." We said, OK.

Trisha: Let's take comments from the RAC. And at a certain point, we'll have to start breaking this down. General comments.

Jace Guymon: Quick comment/question for Troy. So, the Barney Top thing I understand. Two of the best bulls on that unit are down there so it would be to force some people to go hunt over there. But, the Dutton thing, being concerned about the unit being top ended, it's surrounded by Boulder and Beaver the two premier units in the state. That's where all the best bulls are coming from. To my knowledge the only 400 inch bull off the Dutton in the last three years, late season is the one that the governors tag killed. So, that wouldn't fall into the late hunt anyway. I know a lot of people really like that hunt and there is potential for really big bulls but it's also only a 15 point draw. It's one of the easier late hunts to draw so if it's so easy to top end, the points would be higher. It is a really rough unit. It's a horseback unit. I think it's a really good late hunt, it's a physical one. It can be easy. There are areas that you can drive the road and kill a good bull but I guess I'm not quite seeing the reasoning for that on that unit.

Troy Justensen: Maybe one of the reasons you're not seeing them is you killed them. I'm really familiar with that area. That's where I grew up hunting, right there one the Boulder and the Dutton, John's Valley there by the old polygamist ranch. The recommendation actually comes from those locals down there. In talking with Josh Pollack and others, the concern is you have all these bulls coming from these different units and you have the ability with those open mahogany slopes with today's technology to put the herd on the top end. We'd even entertain the idea, lowering the tags. One of the reasons why we went back into the statewide plan when we developed the statewide elk plan, is we didn't want to blanket policy to manage the state as just one way. We wanted to go unit-by-unit. There are some units that quite honestly, what we want to do is develop a hunt structure for those units. The Dutton is one of them. There's a couple of units that the late hunt has

a big effect on quality. The Wasatch is one, the Dutton is one. We'd like to be concerned and take care of that. I know that some people say it's a great hunt. The reason they like it is because they kill big bulls. We're just trying to be a little bit conservative.

Eric Luke: Concerning the management hunts, particularly on the Paunsaugunt, I talked a little with Wade about it but it's not his unit. I would like to see the Division look into extending the length of that management hunt. I think what is happening, my daughter had that tag and I talked to several other hunters and I think that because it's only a five-day hunt it's forcing hunters to shoot a younger buck that qualifies as a management buck. They are killing bucks that aren't a true management buck. They are killing bucks that have trophy potential because they are so limited on time that they are shooting whatever they can see. The Henrys is a little tougher because you have the bison hunt that would conflict with lengthening that season. To my knowledge, there's not another hunt on the Paunsaugunt, the cactus hunt, but honestly those two hunts could run together. I know that the Division doesn't like to see hunts in the rut but actually, that's a prime opportunity to have these hunters take these targeted animals rather than a younger buck that qualifies.

Kirk Player: Coming back to the point creep, there is a forth option that eventually will probably have to be done. I understand it's not going to be popular but it's going to have to be restructured for some of these OIAL hunts and the San Juan and Henrys because it legitimately is going to be to the point in 20 years that you're looking at 80-plus-year-old people. I guess, maybe it won't be a problem because the hunter success rate will be lower.

Trisha Hedin: So, I think what we should do is, if there are individual motions that we want to make, we should make those now. Unless, we want to accept the whole proposal as presented.

Kent Johnson: Before we get into that, I do have a question. It was brought up about people using salt blocks too close to water. There is a regulation placed on livestock growers that they have to stay $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile away from live water. Who has oversight on that? There's got to be oversight, doesn't that rule cover anybody that is hunting?

Chris Wood: We discussed this a few years ago with the Forest Service specifically and I think we decided that it was the Forest Service land management that had the jurisdiction and authority to regulate that.

Darren Olsen: Our challenge is, with livestock they are permitted so we have some say in what they do. The general public is a harder issue for us. I do believe this individual has a good point. We've struggled with that and that is a concern. We regulate livestock operators but we don't do hunters.

Kent Johnson: That might be something the Division can place in the proclamation and in the rules as an information thing. Put in there that it is federal regulation that they keep any salt licks a minimum $\frac{1}{4}$ mile away from live water.

Chris wood: I don't know that it is.

Darren Olsen: It is for livestock operators. I can't remember, there is a distance. I don't know if it's quite ¼ mile, but there is a distance off water.

Jeff Christensen: Is there a reason why they still allow baiting? You have to register a bait on a bear, correct? Why are we not registering bait on deer?

Chris Wood: It's been discussed at length. What's the definition of baiting? Some of the agricultural community likes to bait because they draw in animals and make money off of animals that they can draw in. It's been discussed at great length over the years and it's something the RAC and Boards have decided not to regulate. That is my understanding.

Covy Jones: It's a tough one. There are a lot of ins and outs. Baiting has a lot of unintended consequences.

Jeff Christensen: Has it ever come up as an action item?

Covy Jones: Absolutely, the Board asked us to present an informational on it and we did. What we said is, we'll look at this as we go through the mule deer management plan because it's a huge issue. There are a lot of factors to consider. You mentioned habitat, in the state of Utah we have people who make their livelihood selling baits. We have private landowners in the northern part that for wildlife, run CWMUs and baiting is a big part of their agricultural business. It's not just black and white. When we draw the line, it probably will be black and white. It'll affect private landowners, public land hunters, so it's a tough one. It will affect livelihoods. It's a hard one to draw and we're not saying that we're not willing to go down there and draw the line because it also has some pretty serious consequences.

Jeff Christensen: For cattle, it has to be an approved site, correct? I know the allotments that I've ran on, it has to be an approved site. You can't just go dump that anywhere.

Darren Olsen: They encourage not putting it near a gate or a trough. We don't exactly specify "this spot." We do give some direction.

Jeff Christensen: Since I was involved with the Forest Service it was, "you have to do this site." I'm just curious why there are no restrictions at all on wildlife. You have to on the bear.

Covy Jones: We're talking about a very different scale with different reasons. We're talking 92,000 deer hunters versus maybe 700 bait stations for bear. Your point is well taken in that it's an issue.

Jeff Christensen: I mean, I don't really have a dog in the fight. I'm just asking a question.

Eric Luke: I think to register baits would create a huge issue for the Division because there are so many sportsmen out there and they're not putting out one or two cameras. I know some of these outfitters put out 60 to 100 cameras. So, what it would take to register those, each site, they would probably have to hire full time positions just to

monitor that alone. It is a tough situation. I think there could be some verbiage put in the proclamation that would encourage and make sportsmen aware that they need to be mindful of where they are placing them.

Covy Jones: Not to step in again but Jeff, you are right. Baiting wasn't typical in western hunting. As western hunters, we just didn't do it. It has become more and more popular over the years and that's probably why it was never addressed is because it didn't work very well. That's not the case anymore and the further south you go in the state, the more it happens on public land for sure. It's an issue that needs to be addressed, and education would be a good start.

Kirk Player: I just have two comments along that same line that haven't been mentioned as far as baiting but I'm sure that the Division probably thinks about it first and foremost, is the disease issue if you're bringing a bunch of animals together and something gets in them, it's going to be way worse. Whether, it's sheep or deer or elk. Like you mentioned, other states have drawn a hard line and there's going to be some growing pains with it and that's not going to be easy but it's not like it can't be done.

Trisha Hedin: Would we like to make a motion on adding verbiage? I mean, it seems like a really good first step. I don't know if we want to dip our toes into the whole baiting thing tonight.

Kent Johnson: I'd like to make a motion to ask the Division to add verbiage to all hunting proclamations to inform hunters of the negative impacts of putting salt near water on public land. They probably can't put it near water on a stream that runs through private land that exits onto public land either.

Jace Guymon: I don't know if legally there's no restrictions, so just put it as a caution saying there's potential that minerals can leech the water and contaminate the water source. Just an educational precaution.

Kent Johnson: Did you get that, Morgan?

Morgan Jacobsen: Just to consolidate, what if we said to ask the Division to add verbiage to all hunting proclamations informing hunters of the negative impacts of putting salt near water.

Kent Johnson: That works.

Trisha Hedin: So we have a motion by Kent Johnson. Do we have a second? We have a second by Jace Guymon. All in favor. I believe that's unanimous. Thank you. So do we have other motions?

Eric Luke: I'll make a motion to approve the motion by SFW to make the Barney Top an archery-only unit this year with the intention that it would go to an archery and primitive weapon hunt when the verbiage is cleaned up.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Eric Luke to make Barney Top an archery-only hunt

this year.

Eric Luke: For the coming year.

Trisha Hedin: Am I wrong, Covy? I think after every hunt you would monitor success rates. Can we just take it one step at a time?

Kent Johnson: Yeah, we have to go one step at a time.

Trisha Hedin: Are you OK with that, Eric? Just make the Barney Top an archery-only?

Eric Luke: Let me restate that. Let's make a motion to make the Barney Top an archery-only unit area.

Trisha Hedin: Great, so I have a motion by Eric Luke to make Barney Top an archery-only unit. Do I have a second on that? A second by Jace. All in favor. And it looks unanimous. Any other motions?

Kent Johnson: I'll make motion to ask the Wildlife Board to approve the Division to create archery only hunts for desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep, and the Division would decide which units are best suitable for that.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Kent Johnson that the Division make some archery-only bighorn sheep hunts. A second on that? I have a second by Todd. All in favor. That's unanimous.

I have a motion, and it might not get a second, and I'm OK with that. I have a motion to state to not allow the air guns until they pay Pittman Robertson excise tax. I'm OK if it dies.

Kirk Player: I'll entertain you.

Trisha Hedin: OK, I have a second on that by Kirk Player. Am I allowed to make a motion?

Chris Wood: I think so, yeah.

Trisha Hedin: OK, so all in favor. Ten in favor, and one opposed: Kent.

Kent Johnson: It has less to do with hunting and Pittman Robertson and more to do with free enterprise.

Trisha Hedin: Are there any other minor motions?

Eric Luke: I'll make a motion to ask the Division to do away with the late hunt elk on the Dutton unit.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Eric Luke to eliminate the late hunt on Mt. Dutton unit. Do I have a second on that? I have a second by Helene Taylor. All in favor. I have

two in favor, Eric and Helene. So the rest are opposed.

Eric Like: I have a question before I make another motion. A proposal was made to look at limiting the spike hunt on the Book Cliffs. What impact does that have on surrounding units? I know what Guy is saying and I think a lot of us have that same concern all over. One concern I have is, if it's limited, how many of those hunters are just going to go to other units and compound the problem?

Covy Jones: One of the compromises that the Division made, we have extreme quality in Utah for elk. There is no state in the union that has quality of elk that we have. When we did that, one of the compromises that we made with our constituents was that we would maintain spike hunting when we made a lot more limited entry units. There's a lot of good biology behind this and I'm not going to get into it. The Division views spike hunting as a good thing. We couldn't support eliminating spike hunting on a unit. It helps us on these limited-entry units. It takes a long time to grow an animal. It helps us maintain the appropriate sex ratios. There's a lot of issues going on in the Book Cliffs. I know we have elk issues out there. A lot of it is population issues but it's a unit where we've also got a lot of wildlife. We manage for trophy deer, trophy elk, bison. We have wild cow issues, wild horse issues. I think to point a finger at a spike hunt that harvests males is probably preemptive. We look at elk, deer, as well as the predators and their interactions and how that affects what's going on in the Book Cliffs. That's a really long answer. The short answer is there are a lot of hunters that value the spike hunt and to have the quality we manage for, we have to provide some opportunity. It's the last family hunt and we couldn't get rid of the spike hunt.

Eric Luke: What is that management objective on the Book Cliffs?

Covy Jones: There are two. Are we still managing it separate, Clint?

Clint Sampson: I think it's 7 ½ for roaded and 8 for the roadless.

Eric Luke: What are we at? What is the average aged killed there?

Covy Jones: The data from 2017 shows that it did drop a bit. It also had one of the warmest November hunts that we've ever had. That's why when we do this, we look at trends. We have to look at the next couple of years to see what is going on. At the end of the day, if we had to cut some limited-entry opportunity to maintain family spike hunting, we're ok with that. Just because I hunt spikes and someone else hunts limited entry doesn't mean that their hunt is more important than a spike hunter's hunt.

Eric Luke: Agreed, but we talk about the point creep and we're all trying to do things to help that. Cutting limited-entry tags on a unit that we're below objective...

Covy Jones: With all the issues in the Book Cliffs, I don't know that cutting spike tags would even start to fix that. You have wild cows all over, wild horses all over.

Eric Luke: Issue some of those tags.

Clint Sampson: I'm the biologist on north end of Book Cliffs. I'm glad to be down here. The age objective for the Bitter Creek side, the south side, is basically 6½ to 7-year-old bulls is what we're shooting for. The three-year average, not taking in account this last hunt was a little over 7½. We're still maintaining a fairly high age objective. In the roadless area, we management that one for a little bit older bulls; 7½ to 8-year-old bulls. The three year average there is a little over 7½, 7.6

Eric Luke: So, it's pretty much right at objective.

Clint Sampson: When we started this spike hunt ten years ago, three years ago I expected to see a considerable dip in the age because those 7½-year-old bulls were being hunted as spikes. Granted, the spike hunt has gained fame and popularity. We're having more people out there participating and hunting on the unit during the spike hunt. Maybe, it's starting to catch up to us now. Where we're killing more spikes than we did the first year of the spike hunt. Overall, we probably will see a dip in the age class after this hunt, in 2018, due to a lot of things. I'm sure the spike hunt plays a role in there too, but it was one of the hardest archery seasons I've ever seen. The opening weekend, it rained so anybody sitting in water got hosed. Then it got hot and dry all through the rifle. The muzzleloader hunters finally started to get some better weather to really kick them into the rut. I would expect it to kind of struggle. Last year, the main hunt that brought the age down was that late bull hunt in the roaded area. As you can see with a three-year average, we're still within objective. It's something we're very mindful of.

Trisha Hedin: Let's put this one to bed.

Kent Johnson: There was one other thing that Guy brought up that might bear looking at. I'll go ahead and throw it out in a motion to move this along.

I make a motion look at multi-season elk hunts and remove them from any unit that's not at or above age objective.

Trisha Hedin: So we have a motion to eliminate the multi-season hunt for any unit that is under objective. That's by Kent Johnson.

Covy Jones: As a point of clarification, do you mean the age objective or population?

Kent Johnson: I think the point was age objective, wasn't it Guy?

Covy Jones: Age would probably be better for that because the multi season tags are older bulls.

Kent Johnson: The bulls, they don't affect the population.

Trisha Hedin: Do I have a second on that?

Jeff Christensen: I'll second it.

Trisha Hedin: All in favor. Six in favor. All opposed. So in opposition, I have Kirk, Dana, Darren, Eric. Gerrish abstains. So do we have a final motion?

Eric Luke: I make a motion to accept the rest of the Division's proposal as presented.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Eric Luke to accept the remainder of BBOIAL as presented. Do I have a second on that? Seconded by Jace. All in favor. It's unanimous.

VOTING

Kent Johnson made a motion to ask the Division to add verbiage to all hunting proclamations informing hunters of the negative impacts of putting salt baits near water sources

**Seconded by Jace Guymon
Motion passed unanimously**

Eric Luke made a motion to make the Barney Top area an archery-only elk hunting unit

**Seconded by Jace Guymon
Motion passed unanimously**

Kent Johnson made a motion to ask the Wildlife Board to approve the Division to create archery-only hunts for desert and Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in units the Division deems appropriate

**Todd Thorne
Motion passed unanimously**

Trisha Hedin made a motion to not allow the use of airguns until those weapons become subject to the Pittman Robertson Tax

**Seconded by Kirk Player
Motion passed 10-1 (opposed: Kent Johnson)**

Eric Luke made a motion to do away with the late elk hunt on the Mt. Dutton unit

**Seconded by Helene Taylor
Motion failed 2-9**

Kent Johnson made a motion to remove multi-season elk hunts on any units that are under age objective

**Seconded by Jeff Christensen
Motion passed 6-4 (opposed: Kirk Player, Dana Truman, Darren Olsen, Eric Luke; abstaining: Gerrish Willis)**

Eric Luke made a motion to accept the remaining Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments as presented

**Seconded by Jace Guymon
Passed unanimously**

9) CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

- Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Kent Johnson: With your CWMUs, there were a bunch of reductions in turkeys. Are we having a problem with turkeys dying off in areas?

Mike Wardle: So, we currently only have two turkey CWMUs statewide and this recommendation would take that down to one. Folley Ridge will no longer be one. I think a lot of it has to do with a lot of operators feel like it's not worth their time and effort. There's just not enough money in it for them.

Eric Luke: Could you go back to Northern region CWMU? The Mountain Top, they reduced acreage but you are increasing 10 elk tags?

Mike Wardle: Permits aren't based completely off of acreage. One of things that I talked about in the beginning was wildlife distribution. I've seen times where CWMU might give up a 4,000-acre chunk here, but they add on 1,000 acres here and that 1,000 acres has a lot more habitat and a lot more wildlife there. Specifically, it would be more of a question for the Northern Region folks. In a lot of cases, it's not an acreage-based recommendation.

Eric Luke: I didn't know that. I thought it was based on total number of acres.

Mike Wardle: It's something we consider. It's not completely based on that, and I think the reason is not all acreage is created equal, if that makes sense.

Kirk Player: That's in contrast with LOAs, right? It's based on suitable habitat that is private. Looking at apples and oranges there.

Mike: Right. And the difference too is that LOA permits are valid for the entire unit, whereas a CWMU is only valid for that unit.

Questions from the audience

No questions

Comments from the audience

No comments

RAC discussion

Todd Thorne: I'll make a motion to approve the CWMU management permit numbers.

Trisha Hedin: So I have motion by Todd Thorne to accept the CWMU management plan as presented. Do I have a second on that? I have a second by Jace. All in favor.

Sue Bellagamba: I have a conflict of interest.

Trisha Hedin: So Sue is abstaining.

VOTING

Todd Thorne made a motion to accept the CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019

Seconded by Jace Guymon

Motion passed 10-0 (Abstaining: Sue Bellagamba)

10) R657-38 - Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments

- Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Eric Luke: On the hours, is it limited on how many hours you can get for helping with a banquet or the expo? Is there a restriction on that currently?

Bryan Christensen: We don't have limitations on hours for project written into administrative rule. We do have limitations within the dedicated hunter's ability to administer itself. We have a guideline we use for those kinds of things. For banquets and fundraising, the expo, those kinds of events, we do limit dedicated hunters to earn 12 hours per year on those types of things.

Eric Luke: Per year or per cycle?

Bryan Christensen: It's per year. So, in ways a dedicated hunter could participate in those types of events and get near or all of their hours if they do it during the right time frames. If they participated in a 12-hour in the first year, and those are a little more rare because there aren't too many of those fundraiser banquets for conservation groups after May. There are some that still do some. But if they did that, 12 after that timeframe, then they'd be ahead for that second year and still be able to get their 16 and be OK. We work with those internally and not within the rule so we can be more flexible.

Darren Olsen: You had 9,000 participants, is there a cap to that?

Bryan Christensen: There is an actual cap. It used to be 10,000, now it's done by unit. We can have up to 15 percent of the deer permit quota can be comprised of dedicated hunters. So, if we had 100 on a particular unit, we could have 15 dedicated hunters but that also incorporates last years group and the year before that are still in. The number we open up

each year changes. In theory, if we had 100,000 deer tags, we would have 15,000 potential dedicated hunters.

Questions from the audience

No questions.

Comments from the audience

No comments.

RAC discussion

Kirk Player: I'll make a motion to approve the Division's recommendations as outlined.

Trisha Hedin: So I have a motion by Kirk Player to approve the motion on Dedicated Hunter rule amendments as presented. Do I have a second? I have a second by Gerrish Willis. All in favor. It is unanimous. Thank you.

VOTING

Kirk Player made a motion to accept the Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments as presented

Seconded by Gerrish Willis

Motion passed unanimously

- 11) **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019**
- Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Eric Luke: What was the reason for banning the electric bikes?

Blair Stringham: We want to get out ahead of it. We struggled with this a couple of years ago and at that point, technology was at a point where we felt fairly comfortable with electric bikes. Since then, there has been quite a few advances in them to where they can go up to 60 miles an hour. Some have essentially a throttle so they are more like a motorcycle than a bike. We felt like from our perspective it would be a lot easier to regulate them by just not allowing them at all. We currently don't allow motorized vehicles behind our closed gates so we felt like they were similar to a motorized vehicle. We have found with these groups that there are a lot of different regulations that go along with those. There are lower classes of electric bikes that probably meet our needs as well as the users needs. That is kind of what we have learned through the process. It has been

an evolving recommendation.

Questions from the audience

No questions.

Comments from the audience

No comments.

RAC discussion

Kent Johnson: With regard to electric bikes, I read all of the emails and all of the emails that I received were in favor of allowing them. One thing I will put out in a comment and a caution is, I think what the Division is trying to do and is already thinking is to be out in front of it is the technology will advance and if you allow it, we'll end up with what we have with muzzleloaders now. What was originally intended as a primitive weapon season has now become the single shot, long range rifle season. That is my concern with them. What little bit of research I was able to do on them, the technology isn't that far ahead yet, they're still mostly just a bicycle with an electric assist, but the potential exists for this to become, well most of us here can probably remember mopeds. Then you're allowing vehicles on WMAs. That's all I've got to say.

Eric Luke: I would add one thing to that, as I was researching it out, one thing that came to mind is these bad boy buggies, which are basically a side by side but they are also an electric vehicle. I don't know if the electric motor thing plays into that but it's just something to be mindful of as you go back to that drawing board.

Trisha Hedin: And if you're going to stay in shape for that hunt when you're 85 you got to walk a little bit.

Kirk Player: Exactly. You just go out and ban them because when you're 80, that's the first time you're going to get a sheep or goat tag. On the serious side to that, my personal opinion and I did get the emails as well, you have to draw the line and it's going to be a really slippery slope to split hairs like that. Motorized is motorized. If you fall in line with what basically every other agency has done, correct me if I'm wrong, but the Forest Service, BLM, you can't take those on a trail unless it's a motorized trail. If you are going to say nonmotorized then, there is a motor there. It's power assist but it's a motor. You're not kicking anybody out and there's not many hills on the WMAs anyway.

Gerrish Willis: I'd like to echo those comments. There is one exception, Utah Parks recognizes e-bikes as bicycles and not motorized bicycles. To be consistent, the state should draw the line somewhere. I agree that e-bikes are motorized and they should be treated as motorized vehicles. I'd like to pass that on to State Parks, too.

Trisha Hedin: So can we entertain a motion?

Kirk Player: I make a motion that we accept the Division's recommendations as outlined.

Trisha Hedin: I have a motion by Kirk Player to accept the Division's recommendations on waterfowl hunts as outlined, and a second by Kent. All in favor. All opposed. I have Todd Thorne opposed. At this junction, we are adjourned.

VOTING

Kirk Player made a motion to accept the recommendations as outlined

Seconded by Kent Johnson

Motion passed 10-1

Opposed: Todd Thorne

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

The next Wildlife Board meeting will take place on Nov. 29, 2018, 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. 12, 2018, 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 15, 2018

Welcome and Intro Appreciation

- **WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURES- Randy Dearth**

- **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES**

MOTION to approve agenda as presented

Dan Abeyta

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

MOTION to approve the minutes from the last RAC meeting.

Daniel Davis

Tim Ignacio, second

Passed unanimously

- **WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE- Randy Dearth**

Our past Wildlife Board Meeting I think was on September 27, there were quite a few topics if you remember there was a conservation permit, the annual report was presented and the Wildlife Board voted on that and it was unanimous, 6-0. The conservation permit audit was completed and it was pretty neat; in 2018 there was 4.6 million dollars in revenue for better habitation funding for our wildlife which is really awesome. We brought in more than four and a half million dollars and that is just outstanding. 90% of that goes right towards better habitat management and 10% goes to the organization to fund their needs. That too was voted on and it was unanimous. The conservation permit allocation was voted on and that was unanimous. The antelope island additional permit request was unanimous. The Central Mountains/Nebo permits were discussed and the Pole Creek Fire really wreaked havoc in that area because the area was closed during the season for quite bit. They adjusted the season dates to allow a later hunting season for those folks that drew those permits and allowed in that area, and they voted on that and allowed that late hunting season there; and that was unanimous. Then they voted on the RAC and Board meeting dates for next year, and that was unanimous. I think that's all the notes I had off of that meeting.

- **REGIONAL UPDATE - Boyde Blackwell**

I'm going to intentionally keep this rather short, we have a packed agenda. The wildlife biologist are out beginning their classifications and this is when they go out and classify deer and count deer and if anyone from the RAC wants to go out with the biologist I encourage them to contact Dax Mangus and make an appointment and he'll line you up with one of the biologist that's doing that work right now. All of my aquatics staff right now are off in St. George on section meetings, this is when the whole section from all over the state get together and they discuss what's going on and some of the new stuff that's going on in their section and what's to be expected of them. We have made some changes in how our law enforcement works. Right now

we've changed to a direct line supervision meaning they will contact directly to Salt Lake now. Which I find is good for me, and we appreciate it. But they are out working hard. They had a really busy hunt. Well it was actually not as busy as it had been in previous years but it was steady. If you look on Twitter you'll see some of the things they did. Oh it was Facebook, if you're following the Division you'll see some of the things they did, the many things they did, the many hunters they checked and things like that. So we welcome you to take a look at that. Our whole region has been real busy the past three weeks or so putting pheasants out. We've got pheasants out on our WMA's and our walk in access areas and our wildlife section and our outreach folks have worked hard on coordinating that together and we usually try to get those out before the weekend. We've put a lot of pheasants out this year and we'd like to thank those sportsman's groups that we work with for helping us do that and provide opportunities for our sportsman. So with that Mr. Chairman I'll turn the time back to you.

- **Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife Conservation Presentation**
INFORMATIONAL - Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief

See slideshow

- **Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan ACTION** - Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

See slideshow

Comments from the public:

Greg Bird: Utah Wild Sheep. I was fortunate enough to sit on this committee with the Division and the other interested parties interested in this goat management plan and I just wanted to thank Jace for putting this together and inviting us to be a part of it. We hope the RAC votes on this tonight to accept, it's a well thought out plan and a lot of work has been put into it.

Troy Justison: Sportsman Fish and Wildlife (SFW). I had the opportunity to sit on this as well and we'd like to ask the RAC to approve this as well. We put a lot of time and effort into it and we think it covers a lot of the major bases and we do believe it is a good plan so we ask for your support. Thank you.

Comments from the RAC:

Dan Abeyta: I'll make one more comment, I do appreciate the language in there for potential impacts of vegetation and the Division seems to recognize it's stated pretty clearly in the plan. That they work closely with the Forest Service with vegetation monitoring prior to any introductions.

MOTION to accept Statewide Mountain Goat Management Plan as presented.

Brett Prevedel

Daniel Davis, second

Passed unanimously

- **Statewide Bighorn Sheep Management Plan ACTION** - Jace Taylor, Wildlife Biologist

See slideshow

Randy Dearth: Thank you Jace. Great presentation. I'd just like to commend the team that worked on this. They did an awesome job and I really appreciate the additional language that they put for our agricultural friends. That's great and working for an MOU is probably a really, really good thing too.

Questions from the RAC:

Tim Ignacio: On this MOU that you're talking about, where does the Tribe come in on this?

Jace Taylor: That's a great question, and maybe Marty could come in with some of the MOU's we already have in place for the Tribe. Do you want to come up and talk about what we have? We do have different agreements in place already.

Marty Bushman: I'm with the Utah Attorney General's Office. With the Ute Indian Tribe we currently have a hunting agreement that is between the state and the tribe that addresses broad issues that affect permits and hunting and hunting issues. The tribe is a little but unique as it's its own Sovereign; and on its trust lands it manages wildlife completely independently from the state. That's probably why it's not in this because we're looking between Forest Service that owns lands, BLM that owns lands and regulates grazing and the State that manages wildlife on those lands and trying to work together cooperatively and towards a common goal. With the Tribe we cooperate with you but you're your own sovereign lands you manage it independent of the state.

Tim Ignacio: So let me ask you a question. You take Book Cliffs, We had a cooperative agreement when we first went into this. Now I ask the RAC last year. We got 25% of those permits we're supposed to be receiving; but found out that the tribe is getting one for every ten you guys give. So to me that's not 25%.

Marty Bushman: That's with the exterior boundary?

Tim Ignacio: Yes. So to me that's not right. And for him to bring up sovereign nation, if you remember in that late 60's early 70's the Ute tribe brought in a bunch of bighorn sheep and we had the first bighorn sheep herd in Desolation Canyon. Now he's talking about protecting them. We've got sheep coming from Desolation that we planted into the Hill Creek drainage. Now they are going over into the Willow Creek. So what are we doing to protect these animals from going over and destroying that whole herd?

Marty Bushman: Well that was the object of the plan, at least when we're dealing with grazing is we are trying to abate that risk of disease transferring between domestic sheep and wild sheep. That is the object of the whole plan is to try and reduce that risk without trying to promote wild sheep and the expense of domestic sheep.

Tim Ignacio: So let me ask you one more question. Are you willing to sit down with the Tribe and get back to that corporate agreement that we came to years ago?

Marty Bushman: Absolutely.

Tim Ignacio: Cause for me, we aren't getting what we was promised. So you know I feel like we need to come back to the table and talk about this because we are not non-residents. We are residents of this place. We probably got quite a bit of land.

Marty Bushman: I'm probably not very knowledgeable of the explicit details, but...

Dax Mangus: Tim I'd be happy to sit down with you and go over the numbers. We do talk with the tribe and the tribe does issue 25% on exterior boundary lands. It's adjusted based on the percentage of the unit that is in the exterior boundary. Like the Book Cliffs unit, the whole unit from I-70 up, the exterior boundary is on the county line, the Grand county line. So for the Book Cliffs it ends up being like 14.9% instead of the full 25% because the southern half isn't a part of the exterior boundary and all that and how it calculated is all outlined very specifically in the cooperative agreement, and we follow that cooperative agreement and we'd be happy to sit down with you and go through the numbers and make sure its correct and if there is anything in there that's not correct we want to fix it. Our intention 100% is to follow the guidelines that are in that cooperative agreement. And I feel pretty confident that we have. If there is an issue we'd love to sit down and go through it with you.

Tim Ignacio: Well I think it needs to come back to the table. And have the game board there plus the council and sit down and talk about numbers here.

Dax Mangus: We feel like it's been a really good agreement, we've been able to accomplish a lot of good things. There's a lot of great projects that we've worked on together. Some of the projects on the south slope looking at deer movements and I know we've worked closely with the tribe in Willow Creek to try to take steps to protect the bighorn sheep and really the tribe is the entity that is most likely to be affected first if we do have an issue down there.

Tim Ignacio: That's right. It will affect the whole nine mile.

Dax Mangus: We're all on this one together. The sheep don't care about where the reservation boundary is, so we've got to work together and we're committed to doing that and want to continue to do that.

Tim Ignacio: You know as a biologist the sheep will go 150 miles.

Randy Dearth: Ok thank you Marty, appreciate that; and Dax.

Dan Abetya: I've got another comment for you Jace, and it's similar to what I've already mentioned to you with the mountain goat plan. That the Division works closely, when the plan for the herd comes up for modifications or adjustments to work early and up front and closely with those.

Jace Taylor: And with the BLM too, yeah.

Daniel Davis: The MOU process that gets brought up, does that process involve the public, like the RAC process in the wildlife board? Or are those agreements that are made without the public's input?

Jace Taylor: So the MOU is made really pretty bare bones. What it does is the signatories agree to follow this statewide management plan. So really the meat and potatoes that is done with this management plan is coming through the public process right now. So I think the answer is yes. What we are doing here, what you're looking at here to improve statewide plan is the MOU in itself.

Daniel Davis: So what you're feedback or requested changes are from those parties before they get applied to the MOU would that come back through?

Jace Taylor: So if you want to see an adjustment to a statewide plan, today is your opportunity to do that and whatever is approved by the wildlife board that will be the statewide rule that is referenced by the MOU. They are two separate documents. The statewide plan which is here has all the tools and objectives on the management plans, the MOU is basically the legalees saying that we the undersigning groups agree to follow this statewide management plan. So this today is your opportunity to have a comment.

Daniel Davis: Awesome, thank you.

Comments from the public:

Troy Justison: SFW. I had the unique opportunity to sit on this committee. I sat on a lot of committees in the last 20-25 years and nothing matches the experience we had here. There really is two defining moments that happened within this committee that united what I believe agriculture community and sportsman. The first is which what Jace has pointed out. The operator or the producer being able to legally be able to remove bighorns if they are in their herd. There's a lot of discussion on that. You can understand there was some concern about adoption that. When it was talked about pulling it, the two people that stood up and said if we pull this out of the plan we will not support it was sportsman and agriculture. Going into that building relationships and trust I don't think you would have seen. The other which was coming to accept the fact that the answer or the notion that we weren't going to reintroduce bighorns into the state that it was going to come to an end was not acceptable. That there is a place for sheep that we just need to work through it with producers and livestock operators, but there is a place for both. I'm very appreciative that the agriculture community supported that. What we did come up with is saying alright we know there is conflict, there's basically no place in the state that there isn't conflict. And we accept that. And we accept that wild sheep is basically going to be the loser, we're totally fine with that. We were able to get with the agriculture community and look at the state as a whole, we're not married to a specific place that we want these sheep let's see what makes most sense and let's work together. Quite honestly I think 10-15 years down the road we're going to look back and say you know what this is the time the agriculture community and

sportsman came together. It about fell apart, you know as well as I do, don't you. So I'm very optimistic today and Tim is speaking to a new day, we need a new day to try. We need to come together. That herd, tribal sheep, state sheep move back and forth. We need to work together, we need to manage that together or else we're both going to lose. We need to forget about the past and figure out the future to work together to figure out the traditions of your people, also the wildlife on the state side. I would ask that the RAC support this. I think it's a great plan. Is it perfect? No it's not. But we did everything possible as far as a state level goes to protect the producer. Now granted there is still the potential of federal agencies or being sued by environmentalist, but I'll tell you one thing, if that becomes, agriculture isn't going to be standing there by themselves, sportsman will be standing with them. So thank you.

Greg Bird: Utah Wild Sheep. In the interest of time I'll reiterate what Troy also said, we do agree with everything he just said. I just want to congratulate Jace, he's done a great job going around the state and presenting this plan and he's been very thorough. During this process he's mentioned the lawyer said in every single meeting the wording as such as a lot of protections for the agriculture and livestock industry. So we're glad that we can come together. We realize that at some point if one of us falls the other is directly behind. So we need to be together to protect this resource and its livelihood. So we ask you to accept this proposal as it's presented by the Division tonight. Thank you.

MOTION to accept the Bighorn Sheep Management Plan as presented.

Natasha Hadden

Daniel Davis, second

Passed unanimously

- **Bucks, Bulls & OIAL 2019 Season Dates, Application Timeline and Rule Amendments ACTION** - Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator

See slideshow

Daniel Davis: On the extended archery boundary, was there any consideration, the reason we made that north boundary change was because of the mountain deer, we got rid of that half mile buffer because of limited entry crossover, but that stretch of river from Jensen to the bird refuge there's really nothing past that buffer could we consider revisiting that for those folks on that side?

Dax Mangus: So you're taking from the Monument down the Green River to the bird refuge. We didn't look at that this go around. That's not something we recommended. Several years back we had the buffers on the river that presented a lot of law enforcement challenges, it was tricky to measure some of that stuff, and we had some issues. So we changed it to just clean straight boundaries on the river.

Daniel Davis: But on that region topographically do we see an issue with that over there?

Dax Mangus: You know we haven't had a lot of complaints on the east side of the river really.

Randall would you clarify the Tridell area and address the issues there and why you didn't have the same concerns there that you did on the west side?

Randall Thacker: Yeah. We did have some requests come in from different land owners to possibly be included in the extended archery for deer and elk. If we're doing to do one we're going to keep the boundary consistent. So we did the Tridell area as we looked at that boundary map that you received, it's hard to see on that, the colors are kind of crummy, but it's basically adding in that Tridell agricultural boundary, the tribal boundary will basically be that boundary. Right now it cuts off at the highway down there. Basically those areas have a pretty substantial buffer, being the tribal land, the amount of land that is there between tribal and the forest is 4-5 miles. And we rarely see those deer. Particularly the deer that are coming down into those fields and things like that. So primarily 90% of those are going to be resident deer and the elk of course are going to come down, they get pushed down, but there's not as much pressure on the tribal land so they usually stay up on the tribal land until after dark when they come in and be accessible to hunters anyway. But we're happy to see, let those agricultural folks in the Tridell, Lapoint area be able to remove some of those animals that are resident, basically stay there are year on their property. We're trying to help them out. Over in Farm Creek we did have request over there from a land owner too who specifically asked for his land to be included. He sits back just to the south and west over by the cemetery there's a partial and he borders up there against the tribe both sides right there and it is a difficult area and situation for him. He does get a lot of animal that do come into his property right there and so he was interested in trying extended archery right there to try and reduce the damages on his property. Actually when we talked to him he just wanted some value of having the animal on his property. So we discussed several options. But his property is only half mile to a mile from the side of his property to the forest boundary and we classify that area every year around now and watch those animals for the past 20 plus years and mountain deer literally walking from the forest and crossing that little piece of tribe and coming to the agricultural fields to eat. They go back they push back in and move into there. They are not exclusively in. There are some resident deer, don't misunderstand me, there are a few resident deer around but they are not the majority of those that would move down in especially those that no hunting pressure would occur on extended archery like this. We've actually worked with him and come up with another opportunity with him to have some value there. So I think he's good with that.

Tim Ignacio: I just want to let you know, I know the board on Tuesday approved the tribal members to go in and start hunting some of those cow elk. And if it does snow we are going to get them trapped and start moving them down south.

Randall Thacker: What area is that boundary Tim? I'm just curious.

Tim Ignacio: I think it's gonna exede from Little Water to Monarch on that range and they gonna do from 121 to north of the Green River, back road to Myton to Bridgeland.

Randall Thacker: That will target a lot of those problem animals.

Tim Ignacio: And we did approve to hunt the bull with the muzzleloader.

Randall Thacker: That's a big change too. I appreciate you letting us know. I communicate appreciation to the board for starting that cow elk hunt that can be helpful with problem animals.

Tim Ignacio: You know you might want to let some of your people know we might get it started by the 28th of this month.

Randall Thacker: Ok. That's good to know, thanks.

Daniel Davis: In the past we've seen the potential for game reporting. Mobile device game reporting. I was curious to see where we were at with that this year but I didn't see nothing on that. Can you give us an update?

Covy Jones: Yeah, I think it's awesome. It's a good thing but it's a big thing. You probably see it with. It probably won't start with big game. You'll probably see it with mammals first. Cougar, bear, probably start somewhere in there and work through. There was another state that tried to implement this blanketed statewide and it was an epic failure. And they went back to paper tags and we don't want to end up there. I think we can do this and do it right. It will happen, we're working on it. I'm actually really excited about it because for us it means instantaneous harvest report. For you it means no more annoying phone calls.

Daniel Davis: So the Book Cliffs is a pretty sensitive area for our region. There's a lot of concern with harvest age from last year. Taking the deduction and the actual hunt that's going on this year so far, what kind of feedback has the Division received from just this year and how's it looking for projection?

Covy Jones: I'll let Dax answer that, but first, the Book Cliffs is a unique unit just speaking of the Book Cliffs as a whole because in the Book Cliffs we manage for quality deer, quality elk, quality lions, quality bears, we do this on a unit with limited summer range and a lot of times pretty strict unit. When you look around the state I don't know if there is another unit in the state where we try to manage for that much quality. Sometimes, and there are a lot of factors too, but besides trying to manage for all that quality, you throw on top of that there are wild cows and horses competing for forage out there. We end up in a place where there are a lot of mouths competing for forage. It may be one of the only units in the state where bumping up against, I guess the elk just don't grow the way there do in other areas of the state, right? The population doesn't just take off the way it does in Wasatch or in other areas. So it appears you could be bumping up against a biological standard. A lot of mouths on the ground. With that said one of the when you have a population like that bumping up against the biological threshold is the mouths on the ground because males don't contribute to a population like females. Running a lot of males in a population that's bumping a biological threshold isn't a good idea. It can come less productive. Does that make sense?

Daniel Davis: It does but not the exact reason the spike hunt was initiated, if I stand correct, it's viewed more as an opportunity.

Covy Jones: Yeah kind of, and if you want to talk about the spike hunt after this Daniel I'd be happy to, but I think that Dax can talk about this specific hunt too.

Dax Mangus: So I looked at the data for this hunt for the past few years. The Book Cliffs, they Bitter Creek South part of the Book Cliffs manages for 6.5-7 year old harvest age for bulls. Last year the harvest age was 6.2, year before that it was 7.8, year before that it was 7.5 so we're in the 7's going back several years before that. So we're doing well exceeding our targets, but last year we didn't. We weren't through and looked at each individual hunt and all the hunts were actually pretty good, but the late bull hunt the average age on that was 4 something so that pulled the average down. It was the late bull hunt last year. This year we don't have any age data back yet, preliminary reports are totally anecdotal but I think it was a hard hunt. I think the rut didn't really kick in good in mid-September like it normally does. I know I talked to folks like Dr. Woodward and some others that had tags out there, we saw some other things that made things kind of interesting. Severe drought, really dry, and we saw collared buck deer some were harvested some our biologists found out on the ground and they were substantially smaller. Bucks that were 4 point last year, this year they were 3x4. So we had drought effects on antler growth, we had weather impacts, the rut was slow to start. I don't know that that impacts for everything. But I think that other factors were going on. I wouldn't be too surprised if we saw that ages were down again this year. I think it was a hard hunt from the folks I've talked to. I've also talked to a few folks that did really well and got some good old bulls. When we set permit numbers in the spring we'll have all those numbers and we'll sit down and continue to try to manage towards that age objective that's in the plan. If that means that we're below it and need to reduce permits that's what we'll recommend. If we're above it then we'll probably stay where we're at. I don't know if that answers your question.

Daniel Davis: It did. So with that spike hunt. Are we open to acknowledging the fact that when that did open it could have a direct correlation to the age right now based on the bulls that are being harvested right now?

Dax Mangus: You know there's a couple of things to keep in mind. The Book Cliffs isn't a closed population. You've got elk that move back and forth from Colorado. You've got elk that move back and forth from the Hill Creek extension, the Ute Reservation. Mortality on young bulls is actually really high. It's definitely possible that some of those bulls that are harvested as spikes would have been harvested by limited entry hunters later on, so there is potential for it to have had some impact on age of harvest of limited entry bulls, but at the same time the Division has decades worth of data showing that we are able to have a spike hunt and a limited entry hunt for trophy bulls on units like the Manti, the Cache, the Wasatch, so there's a possibility there is having an effect there but I think I would be really hesitant to say that the majority of any impact to trophy bulls is directly correlated with the spike hunt. I think that it might be factor that comes into play at some point, but I think that there are a lot of other factors coming into play as well.

Daniel Davis: Do we have any data as far as the success of that harvest?

Dax Mangus: For the spike hunt? As far as this year we don't have any data.

Daniel Davis: Not this year specifically but historically if we have data?

Dax Mangus: Yeah, it typically is a fairly good hunt as far as relative to success compared to other like hunts in the state. Last year, 2017, 24% success in the spike hunt for the any weapon and muzzleloader, not counting the archery. Archery isn't a whole lot more, there's not a whole lot of guys who go out and archery hunt spikes, also not a whole lot who go out with muzzleloaders, most of it's the any weapon.

Daniel Davis: State wide below that, correct?

Dax Mangus: Yeah the statewide average is for 2017 was 11%, Book Cliffs was 24%. So it's relatively high compared to statewide average.

Daniel Davis: So when we talk about 25% in the relative amount of hunters, what would that number be? How many hunters hunt that unit to come up with that 25% success rate?

Dax Mangus: We had, so 2017 in the Book Cliffs there were 978 spike hunters they harvested 232 spikes. So statewide there were almost 13,700 spike hunters, they harvested about 15,000 spikes. So the Book Cliffs accounted for about 14% of the harvest of spikes for the state last year. And the Book Cliffs makes up about 12% of the spike unit population in the state. So lots of numbers, lots of percentages there. So Book Cliffs population is about 12% statewide unit of population and had about 14% of statewide harvest last year.

Daniel Davis: Cool, thanks Dax.

Tim Ignacio: You brought up the reservation. And I've been saying that this spike hunt isn't only hurting you guys, it's been hurting us. In June we had an aerial survey. We had 668 elk on the Hill Creek unit. Where we used to have anywhere from 5,000-6,000 head. Where they all going?

Dax Mangus: You know I don't know, and we don't typically do June, we don't do summer ...

Tim Ignacio: I'm talking in December when we did ours. How many elk do you think we had?

Dax Mangus: I don't know.

Tim Ignacio: 299 head of elk.

Dax Mangus: How many cattle, horses, and bison did you have? I mean we have a lot more mouths

Tim Ignacio: We had 224 buffalo. Horses, you want some of them? I'll give them to you

Laughs

Dax Mangus: I think, especially with the drought, we're definitely seeing some impact on the habitats, over utilization.

Tim Ignacio: This has been going on for almost nine years Dax. I've been on that tribal board for ten years and it's been a steady decline. And for me what's sad is I know a good friend of mine, grew up on a road less archery hunt. He said that he went in there, you know how many bulls he seen? One. And he wasn't even a 300 class bull. And I know for a fact out of all those archery hunters that went in that road less only one killed. And it was a good bull, I'll say that, it was a good bull. We were chasing buffalo around down there we still need to go down there and find one, but sad to see in a limited entry hunt, people were killing two points. There is something wrong.

Dax Mangus: On the Hill Creek Side?

Tim Ignacio: No on your side.

Dax Mangus: Oh for the whole Book Cliffs. We have some habitat issues in the Book Cliffs for sure.

Tim Ignacio: You've got some big issues. These people are wanting at least a four point, 25-26 inch. That used to be ten years ago, that was dime a dozen down there, where'd they all go?

Dax Mangus: That's a good question. I'm excited to see the harvest data and see what we have and how it went. I've heard mixed reports, I've got a couple of neighbors that killed good bulls and I've talked to a couple of people that really struggled.

Covy Jones: Dax, did you want to talk about the other portion of this and what we're doing with collars in the Book Cliffs? Because we could point at one thing here and pick on one thing. But I think it's probably a lot bigger than that.

Dax Mangus: And we recognize that we've got some issues in the Book Cliffs. Our elk population is growing, but very slowly. Our deer population is shrinking. Right now the Book Cliffs has the lowest adult doe survival in the state from our collar studies. We're in the 60% range for adult doe survival, and that's a bad thing. That means your deer survival is on the decline. And we've been concerned about this for a while now. We have GPS collars on adult does, on fawns, and on bucks we've been placing collars on elk. We're also going to be placing collars on newborn fawns and elk calves next spring, and on bears and cougars. And with the GPS collars technology we get almost instant updates when an animal dies we can send folks out quickly to look at it. Some of the things we're going to be looking at is depredation rates, and one of the things we think about, and on the Book Cliffs this is a good unit for this, they call it kleptoparasites meaning that a cougar eats a deer and starts eating on and then a bear comes and steals it from the cougar so the cougar kills more. So some of those things we're going to be able to look at and see if we have those things happening. Cougar mortality on mule deer is our number one cause right now. And like I said lowest doe adult mortality rate in the state right now. There's definitely some red flags, but we're doing... If you go drive around out there you'll see our habitat guys have done a ton of work. We're working cooperatively with the BLM and with State Parks as well. A lot of work to improve the amount of forest available. A ton of water work, lots of guzzlers. There has been a ton of habitat work done, and it's been a target for our predator removal, coyote removal. And now we're starting this research as well to monitor deer and bison and cougars and bears and the movements and interactions between these species and

I'm hoping we can get some answers to these questions. But it's something we are aware of, we're trying to do something about it and some of these numbers can be quite concerning so I'm hoping that we can learn some things and figure some things out and take some steps to figure out why these populations are struggling.

Daniel Davis: So on the Book Cliffs being able to participate with you guys last year that was awesome thanks. I did notice a lot of the animal health was pretty low, pretty diminished body fat percentage. Worried about a harsh winter and survivability. And that went across all the species, right? Not just the deer. Now with the impact of that spike hunt, you're putting eight hundred and how many hunters out there? The Book Cliffs being a pretty unique unit in itself where you've got a road on every ridge and at the bottom of every canyon. Are we looking at any contributing factors of that maybe causing a little bit of the diminishment of that health or do we not even considering that?

Dax Mangus: Elk are pretty good at avoiding roads/ The Book Cliffs does have a lot of road access but they are pretty good to avoid roads and staying in the bottom ends of the canyons where they aren't as visible even if there is a road nearby. I don't know that the Book Cliffs is a popular place to just go drive around. You'll see just the limited entry for the deer hunt, for every guy that has a permit there are...

Daniel Davis: Three trucks with him.

Dax Mangus: Yeah. He's got a posse with him. This time of year you drive down to the Book Cliffs on any given day there's always people down there looking for bucks or trying to take pictures to see what they can see. I think human disturbance can have an impact on wildlife but it's probably not a huge one.

Comments from the public:

Jared Calder: Talking about the Book Cliffs again, I've been out there for the past three years and I was wondering, thinking about killing two birds with one stone. We have the management deer hunts down in southern Utah, on the Henrys and the Pansaugant. Why couldn't we do one in the Books or even Diamond as a youth only? So give like 25% of them to youth. Most of us older guys probably don't want to shoot a 28 inch 2 point. But there is a ton of youth that would love to. So I was just trying to propose a youth only management hunt for any limited entry hunts that it would be feasible in, if that makes sense.

Covy Jones: Management hunts have a place and a purpose and they sound like an awesome idea until you're out there and see some of the negative implications of a management hunt. There are a couple of reasons why we don't do this on... So there are two premium limited entry units in the state where we don't do this. And the reason is because there would be so much waist. We under hunt those units and there would be a lot of deer that just die of old age. So we only do this on the Henry Mountains and on the Pansaugant. On the Book Cliffs, first of all, we're able to meet our management objectives, our buck to doe ratios without a management hunts. So if we were to add management hunts we would then take permits out of the limited entry hunt. It would have to come from somewhere because they would harvest bucks and we're already

meeting the objectives. The other reason is because it can be a really good experience, and it can be a really bad experience when you talk to some of our officers that have enforced management buck hunts. They will tell you that the hardest thing that they'll ever do, and it's funny because you give these tags to the old people who can't see as well, and the youth that don't exactly know what they are doing when they are hunting, when you have to take away their deer because the points an inch and a half instead of an inch, it's a sad day. And it happens. I used to love the idea of management buck hunts, but the more I see the consequences of them, the more I see a youth say I never want to hunt again, the less I am in favor of them. They have a place, most premium limited entry units where we have a lot of waste.

Randy Dearth: Isn't it true also that the mule deer plan, that the premium units in the mule deer plan are the only units that allow those?

Covy Jones: Currently, no.

Randy Dearth: So we'd have to address that in the mule deer plan too.

Bob Christensen: I'm representing myself today and I appreciate you hearing me. A year ago, the Division proposed a three season elk tag for the general any bull units and the spike units. I addressed the wildlife board last year in opposition to that. I was worried about the increased pressure on the muzzleloader side of things with the general units in the state. Specifically in the Uintas, that general season muzzleloader which the end of it just came last week. I addressed the Wildlife Board, I said a number of things that the elk do in the Uintas and that most of them come down by the time the rifle hunt comes, stick around the periphery of the forest and are off the forest boundary. And everybody knows that so that's where all the people go rifle hunting because that's where majority are either off the forest boundary or around the periphery. There's a high concentration of hunters because that's where all the elk are. So when I addressed the Wildlife Board last year they had a little discussion about it and my suggestion was to all those 15,000 permits for the any bull permits that have the opportunity to go as multi-season, to put a cap on it. And someone from the licensing section said that they didn't have the ability to do that, their system would have the ability to do that. That the system wouldn't be able to handle that when they were buying online. So anyway this year, they decided to wait and see what happens, well we saw quite a bit of increase of pressure on the muzzleloader elk hunt. The neat thing about the muzzleloader elk hunt is there's not a lot of pressure out there and you can go after it. This year there were quite a few people out there, increased pressure. We had several groups on top of us. Which is fine, they have a permit to do that, and in talking to them they also said that they'd never hunted the muzzleloader elk hunt that they usually hunt rifle. So that three season elk tag had allowed them to hunt muzzleloader as well. A couple of areas that we'd see maybe one camp, and when I was out there scoping there were seven RV camps. There was truck horse trailer, there were four other trucks besides me that was looking for elk. Another area there was probably 2-3 times the people, and this is anecdotal from what I saw, but it did affect our hunt. We had some good bulls spotted opening morning, before opening morning, and we had people 20 minutes before light come in and busted the elk out. The one day that we didn't have anybody on top of us we were successful and we did get one good bull. But all the other days we had people on top of us which is quite a difference of experience we had the last 10-15 years that I've been hunting the muzzleloader elk hunt. So my recommendation to the RAC is I know I would

like to see, and I know a lot of other muzzleloader elk hunters would like to see that multi-season, that three season elk tag discontinued. If not, then at least putting a cap on the number of people can buy that. And if they are worried about overloading the system with people buying it online then they can put it on the draw. They have the youth elk hunt on the draw, the general season deer on the draw. I think there is an option there to put it on the draw with a cap, it wouldn't overload their system. That would be my suggestion to the RAC to recommend to the Board.

Do you have that number Dax, do you know how many

Covy Jones: I know how many of the 30,000 it's a 37%. So almost 40% of 30,000 went and bought one of those and loved every minute of the extra time they got. The hunters that bought them, a lot of positive comments. And I think the one thing that we're missing here is how did it affect harvest and that's a piece of data that we won't have until later and that's probably key to this.

Bob Christensen: I just wanted to mention with that, and Covy and I have talked about this a number of times and it's been good having the discussion. But I will say with that 37%, and of course you're going to have a lot of people that agree with it, I've talked to a lot of people that agree with it too, but they are usually the ones who have hunted the rifle hunt and now they are hunting the other seasons. The ones that are not very happy with it are the ones that usually hunt the muzzleloader and now they have the increased pressure on them. And that's the difference.

Rod Morrison: I'm strongly concerned about the negative effects that this spike elk hunt is having on our herd. Not only is it taking our bulls, it's taking the quality with it. I have a non-resident son that I put in with 24 points he did not draw. It's not a 20 point unit anymore. My idea of reason the spike hunt would not work in the Book Cliffs is because of the access. There is too much of a road, there's too much of any roads. They are getting to the elk and they are getting them. Thank you.

Blake Bess: Tonight I am representing the sportsmen, I'd also like to encourage the RAC to smash this spike elk hunt. It's taken its toll. The tribe has noticed it's taken its toll, what did they do? They cut permits. They know it's taken a toll. We need to do something and it needs to be done now. Go out to the Book Cliffs right now and look at the buck deer doing the breeding. The bucks that nobody would shoot during all three seasons and that's what's left doing the breeding. Junk two points bucks. Something needs to be done. Also I hunt the South Slope Yellowstone general season deer hunt and this year was the first year in my life I've been checked up here and the tribe had a road block. And that was opening day of rifle deer season. The best buck that came through that check point was a 20 inch three point on opening day. Something needs to be done. I contest the buck to doe ratio on the Yellowstone South Slope unit because it's poor, poor quality. Guarantee you that the good quality hunters are looking for more than a yearling buck with milk on its lips are gonna stop hunting the Yellowstone unit it's so bad. Thank you.

Greg Bird: Utah Wild Sheep. I handed out some handouts to the RAC members. SFW is going to make some recommendations. The Utah Wild Sheep supports the Divisions proposals as presented with the added recommendation that Troy will be making next. One of those

recommendations is the OIL archery sheep hunt has gone through this system twice. This is the third time it has been voted on unanimously twice this is the third time. It was brought to the big game board we were asked to make some concessions to run it through the sheep committee, we did that, it was approved through the sheep committee, and we were asked to do a public survey. That has been done and it will be presented to the Wildlife Board. It showed overwhelmingly positive feedback from the OIL tag holders. We would encourage you to vote on it again. We are asking for additional opportunity for big horn sheep, it would be a rocky unit and a desert unit that will be determined by the biologist in the regions. And the dates will also be set by them according to what they see fit. We would also agree with SFW's recommendations. Thank you very much.

Troy Justison: SFW. We accept the Divisions recommendations with the following adjustments. Greg brought up, and two of them are pertaining to the southern region and we ask that this RAC address them as well. One of them is the concern on the Dutton late hunt. We went through and redid the statewide elk plan we tried to get away from blanket management, meaning that one size fits all in the state can actually look at an individual unit and see what works like we've discussed today with the Book Cliffs. Our concern with that Boulder unit is its apart of that mega unit that includes the Beaver, the Boulder, the Panguitch, the Monroe, it bears a lot of the big bulls from a lot of these units and they pull out on these big mahogany ridges. Our concern is the top end takes a significant hit every year on the Dutton due to the fact that we have the ability to shoot farther with these long range rifles. So we would ask that the late season rifle hunt be discontinued on the Dutton and those tags be redistributed in either a mid-season hunt or back in the rut, but we'd like to do away with that late season rifle. The second which those familiar with southern Utah, years and years ago there used to be standalone unit called the Barney Top it was one of the first limited entry elk units in the state. It's relatively small and its a few years ago added to the Boulder unit. Not a lot of people hunt it. There is a limited amount of elk on it. What we'd like to do, and what all these presentations are on providing more opportunity that maintains quality that doesn't have as much impact on the resources. What we'd like to do is present a primitive weapon unit. On the handouts you'll see that there's actually two hunts recommended. One of which is an archery, the other is that we'd have a primitive weapon muzzleloader meaning we'd have no scope, iron sights, percussion cap, and night lock. We're getting too effective in killing the top end of animals and sometime we have to put the hunt back into hunt and we've got muzzleloaders these days that are quite honestly 500-600 yard guns all day, every day. But we've been informed by the Division that we're not able to create this primitive weapon hunt until we've actually defined what a primitive weapon is. Until the Division is able to do that we recommend that we carve out the Barney Top unit and create an archery only unit. This would provide additional opportunity. There may be one or two people that venture onto it that have a Boulder tag that could offer 10-15 hunters the opportunity to go on there and take them out of the point pool. The last of which is what Greg alluded to you, and this is the third time we've come before you with the hunt. The nuts and bolts of this is were trying to find a weapon type that is not as successful as a rifle. If we issue an any weapon sheep tag that is, help me, Jace mentioned we were managing for 90% success. Bottom line, we issue one permit, we issue one hunter that is going to kill that thing. We're looking for weapon types that are not as effective; and that is the reason we're looking at this archery only. The last few times the Board says, alright we don't have the sheep, and we need just a little more time. The Board says we don't have the wild sheep on board, we have the wild sheep on board. Comes

back it's unanimous. Come back next year they say you have to go through the sheep committee, had to go do a public survey, we've done that. I'm asking you to vote again, you supported it last year, and I ask you to support it again this year. Thank you.

Daniel Davis: In regards to your Mount Dutton, a lot of good friends have hunted that, it's quite the hunt. Now you consider an alternate weapon for another unit, why not there? Why eliminate?

Troy Justison: We're open to that. I'll tell you what we originally wanted there, we wanted to have an archery hunt there. But perception is, and we're leaning so heavily towards archery that we pulled it. People accuse me of being an archer. I am not an archer. I did not take my sister to prom, I don't shave my legs, and Brittney Spears is not my favorite singer, so I am not an archer.

Daniel Davis: I'd hate to know how you feel about hounds men.

Randy Dearth: I'm proud to be an archer, but I'm not showing you my legs.

Daniel Davis: So I had a question based on the multi season elk permits. When it was approved by the Wildlife Board last year it was approved on a year to year basis. So the question is, is this the meeting where we say yay or nay or is it the meeting in April?

Boyde Blackwell: This is the meeting where we are talking about the strategies, April will be season dates.

Covy Jones: We would still have time in April for permits, yes.

Randy Dearth: I've got to put down several items that we probably better talk about. Talked about discontinued the three season hunt, or put a cap on it. I've put down talk about the spike elk hunt, maybe getting rid of that. Talk about the South Slope deer hunt, it needs a lot of help. Talk about archery for big horn sheep hunts. Discontinue the Dutton late season elk hunt, and create a Barney Top elk hunt. Those are the topics I wrote down.

Brett Prevedel: I'd like to address, maybe make a comment about the Book Cliffs deer. We have all these issues out there that everybody's defined well. A lot of them like the horses are sort of out of our control. We have a couple that are in our control as a RAC and a Wildlife Board and one of them is predators. We've tried to address that and if you remember a few months ago we tried to propose a harvest objective lion hunt this year. There was a lot of discussion, it wasn't a real unanimous discussion, but we did pass that, forward it on, it was voted down by the Wildlife Board and the permits did not increase to compensate for the others that have a lower number of kills on the lions. So we have now as a result, I assume we're going to have more lions on the Book Cliffs. We did the same thing last year with bear. Proposed a harvest objective and it was passed by the RAC and it was opposed by several organized groups and the Wildlife Board did not support that. Also, so in my opinion the hunting of the bucks is just a symptom of the state the herds in when we have a 60% survival on does. And it's not the hunting that's maybe causing it. We don't have a lot of control and where we do have a lot of control we have to get a gaining consensus.

Tim Ignacio: I know we took the permits on our side the lion permits we have done a as of last Tuesday we have put out a bounty on the mountain lion. We have given another 15 bear tags on top of what we already had. So maybe that can help us all out. And our deer herds are in such bad shape that we've took the deer down to 30 permits that used to be statewide. We had a lot of tribal members upset with that board the elk tags, we've always had 100 elk tags, and we took those down to 30. Myself I had a deer tag, I did not draw out on an elk tag, I did not go hunt. So you know we're trying to help out here too also. And the horses we all just need to come together and take care of them. I know Richie has been over to the council's office and I think we all need to come together to make a conclusion.

Randy Dearth: Yeah that horse one is more of a federal thing than any of us can really deal with I think.

Richie Anderson: Can I address that really quickly? The feral horses issue is a huge issue for a number of reasons across the western United States, not just Utah, but Utah does have a significant issue with it. There is a lot being undertaking to manage that. I'm not going to go into the details because it is extensive. We have multiple agencies and individuals working on that. We are really close to being able to start managing those horses. Very close, closer than we've ever been. So that's going to help a lot. It is a big issue in the Book Cliffs as Dax mentioned the mouths on the ground competing for that forage, it's hard enough to manage the animals that are allowed to be there let alone we have an animal or species that is not allowed there, shouldn't be there it makes it ten times more difficult. Many of these horses are not BLM federal horses, they are feral horses and so we are making a lot of progress. Just make sure as sportsman you support our efforts in that because there are going to be groups that are going to oppose us that don't want any horse gathered for any reason ever. And so as we work on this we'll need the support from sportsman and everyone to accomplish it. I don't think anyone has pushed harder than I have on this issue. All the way from the state legislature all the way down. We have tremendous support, we've got a good thing rolling right now. So cross your fingers and we're going to take some pressure off that habitat.

Boyde Blackwell: Richie we've talked about that and we're going to be putting together a group to right a management plan for and put together a direction from all concerned, you included, and Dax and I will be meeting on Monday to discuss that and pulls some folks together and get working on that.

Richie Anderson: Just another comment that the tribe is in support of that and they will be participating with us on that.

Randy Dearth: That's maybe the best thing we've heard all night.

Daniel Davis: Is it possible to add to the list of discussion the east side boundary from the Green River from the monument to the bird refuge for extended archery boundary. Do we want to discuss that right now or table it?

Randy Dearth: If you bring it up right now let's go ahead and discuss it.

Daniel Davis: So I've gotten to know my fellow employees and we all know how that goes sometimes we see them more than our own families. Anyways they own a substantial amount of property over there on the east side of that river and they've come to me specifically asking the question why does that river define the area to end that hunt that would help pressure those animals off of their property? So that's why I brought it up, because when we did change the boundaries it was to affect certain areas so we blanketed that change based off of those outliers. And on that east side boundary, and if it take a blessing from law enforcement but they were also saying at the time that the issues there are limited they were saying the deer don't retract enough off the river to create a distance issue. So I would like to address that as a possibility to add that half mile buffer to the east side of the river.

Randy Dearth: Is there a boundary line that we could propose?

Daniel Davis: Not through there because there is interweaved oilfield roads and traffic like that and so when you intersect hwy-45 from the refuge where that boundary would start and where that private ground is. You have a hard time making that, because you would almost have to go with the horseshoe bend road and take that all the way up to the 45 and jog up to the red bend road and take that up through the river. Then try to correlate that when it would be easier to just go with that half mile buffer.

Randy Dearth: So you're just talking about a half a mile on that side of the river. Other discussion?

Dan Abeyta: So I guess I've got a question Daniel. How something like that, a half mile from the monument down to the bird refuge.

Daniel Davis: So a half mile on the east side of the river from the bank of the river over.

Dan Abeyta: So there's nothing, it's all private ground?

Daniel Davis: No there's some open ground through there, but what happens is the private land gets pressured from the west side of the river. As much as people like to contest, deer don't mind swimming, but when that pressure gets heated up you've got Stewarts Lake across from landowners there, you get down into that section near hwy-45 and the river, you've got a big agricultural place there. And up river from that. And when they start getting pressure from the public they regress to that other side of the river. I think it would even be safe to say private lands only on that side of the river, I think that would help address their issues too.

Dan Abeyta: I guess that's what I'm struggling with as far as looking at this and seeing how that's enforced.

Daniel Davis: The only problem with that is a lot of them are hay fields so the deer aren't going to stay once you get some pressure and apply pressure to it they are nocturnal and those types of things so I don't know that there is a happy medium to say private lands only with those potentials but it would help in the least.

Boyde Blackwell: Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if you would allow one of my CO's to come up and address his feeling about a half mile buffer to the river using that as a boundary.

Bryan Clyde: Our experience as far as law enforcement perspective is as far as buffers go, they are extremely hard to enforce. Simply because it's really tough to know as an archer if you're within that boundary or not. A law enforcement officer shows up and we measure it out and you're a quarter of a mile outside that's an illegal animal that you just took. So they are just really really tough to enforce as far as those buffers go.

Daniel Davis: On a general consensus I agree but we're talking about topographically where this is being addressed is that an issue? Do you see those hunters extending past that half mile?

Bryan Clyde: I mean if they are staying on the private lands then most likely not. But if they know they have a half mile buffer technically that's going to extend past those fields some so they may be outside on the BLM property or where ever and just not know where that line actually is.

I guess by what he says there may be some kind of boundary where you can say private property within a half mile of the river, I think to set them a boundary we'd actually have to propose something that is concrete and not a kind of anything that can be contentious of that. I like the idea, I just don't know...

Daniel Davis: There's not a road that goes all the way unfortunately, you'd have to extend out a little ways beyond, well quite a ways beyond the river to follow a road structure. It would take you all the way out there. It gets close and goes all the way out to the oil field then comes back. So to define that boundary it would be highway 40, north of highway 40, then you get into the Thunder Ranch region and that right there you'd maybe have to look at that road to Thunder Ranch property line or something to that extent. So there would be quite a bit of roads and our boundary change would probably go to two pages to include all of that. If anything is considered it would be grateful.

Randy Dearth: Is there something that you'd like to make a motion on that or is there...

Daniel Davis: Yeah, if we're ready for it, I'll make a motion.

Dax Mangus: Just for clarification it would be private parcels that intersect a buffer within a half mile of the river, so all those private parcels would be included in the extended archery, in that stretch.

Daniel Davis: Yes.

Randy Dearth: Dax, what's your concerns?

Dax Mangus: This is kind of new, this is a little bit of a surprise so I'm sitting here looking at maps and ownerships on our phones trying to figure this out. There are some parcels that are more than a half a mile away from the river, but they are connected to other parcels that have

other owners that are within a half a mile from the river. I'm just trying to figure out... I understand what you're trying to do from a biological standpoint it's probably not a big deal, from an enforcement standpoint it's pretty tricky. And I'm just trying to think on the fly here how to do this, so if we are going to do this how to include the land owners. I totally understand the intent, how to do it and write it on the fly here is tricky.

Daniel Davis: So what if you went a mile? Do you see anything past a mile then?

Dax Mangus: You get a mile and it's almost all BLM.

Brett Prevedel: I think you need to draw it on a map so you can describe it, don't you Dax? Do you just need to sit down and draw it on a map so you can describe it? And have an enforceable boundary?

Dax Mangus: And I don't know maybe you can trust us to sit down and do this to write something up and draw something up to meet your intent. I think we could probably sit down with the biologist and land ownership and figure something out that I think meets the intent of what you're wanting, I think we could probably sit down with our law enforcement guys and biologist and some maps and draw something that's defensible that adds in those private properties on that side of the river there.

Daniel Davis: So at this point Mr. Chairman, could we vote on this extension to be defined by the Division prior to the Wildlife Board? Is that language acceptable?

Randy Dearth: Are you good with that?

Dax Mangus: You know the Division would be happy to try to accommodate that and we can show it to you before we go to the board and you can tell us if we are off or something like that. If that works, I think we can do that.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chairman I'd like to amend my motion.

Dax Mangus: It sounds like we have some other fixes too, Dr. Woodward pointed out to me that we have the Rock Point Canal has now been piped, so I think we probably need, it would be great if you could include in the motion to also keep the boundary as close to what we have now, but have it not be some underground pipe where no one knows where it is.

Daniel Davis: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just strike my motion, let's start over. I make a motion that we address the boundary issue for the Rock Point Canal for the basin extended archery area, and work with the division to improve the incorporation of some of the lands on the east side of the Green River from the Monument boundary to the inlet of the bird refuge on the east side of the Green River.

Richie Anderson: I didn't quite understand that, what's the area again? Just repeat what you just said.

Daniel Davis: Well the Rock Point Canal doesn't have a very definitive boundary on that north end. We need to address that, it was brought up during the break. So I've addressed that so we can kill two birds with one stone. And then the Green River where it leave the Monument boundary, on the east side of the Green River following it south west to incorporate those private lands into that extended archery unit down to the wildlife refuge.

Randy Dearth: I've got some input there though, Dr. Woodward, it's my understanding that the Canal will still be kept for flood control. They are taking the water out of it and putting that pipe in hole. So the Canal will still be there it just won't have water in it unless it's flooding or they need something in it. Is that different than you're understanding? They moved it about six feet. So the Canal is still there, they just moved it about six feet? Where you're talking about they actually put the pipe in the canal and covered it.

Daniel Davis: So with that motion it gives us that chance to...

Dax Mangus: Daniel is this something you could give us a year to figure out? Be better for next year, or do you want us to wing it? I'm just a little uncomfortable. I want to do a good job and respond to what we're asked to do. But there is room for interpretation here and I don't want to go do something and it's not what people actually want, but we don't have the time to sit down and figure this out tonight.

Daniel Davis: I'm not asking for tonight by no means.

Dax Mangus: You know me, I'm not trying to kick the can down the road, and it's not that we're not willing to do it, it's just that we want to do it right and not cause a bunch of problems.

Daniel Davis: We have a month. No, I appreciate that. So I would be willing to sit down and hear concerns if we aren't able to come to a consensus then we push it for a year. We let the Wildlife Board know when we get there based on the motion.

Dax Mangus: I'm just a tiny bit uncomfortable with making stuff and making decisions after the RAC meeting is already over. I legally don't know that we can do that.

Richie Anderson: And it wouldn't matter to me if it was done this year or next.

Daniel Davis: I mean based on agriculture that's his department. They came to me as a sportsmen and...

Richie Anderson: I think the landowners would support hunting on that side of the river. But if it a takes a year, or if you need more time. If we can do it this year, great. If not. I agree with your general deal, I'd like to see hunting on that side of the river, at least on the private.

Dan Abeyta: Mr. Chair, I'd really like to make a comment. I really agree with what Dax is saying. I like where Daniel is going with this but I really think that we're not going to make a difference this year. That extended season ends here in what a couple of weeks? So let's take our time and...

Randy Dearth: I guess what he's saying is it won't happen next year either, you'll be looking at the 2020, two years down the road if we wait until next year to do it.

Dan Abeyta: Yeah, whatever season it will be in effect, I just think you know it's not a major change but I think take your time and do it right.

Dax Mangus: We'll do our best with whatever you ask us to do.

Randy Dearth: We know you will, thank you. Other comments?

Daniel Davis: I want to be lenient and I understand your concerns, It's just...

Randy Dearth: We can do it this year, if we can't do it this year the Wildlife Board is going to say you can't do it this year we'll do it the following year. But if there is any chance of doing it this year it will probably be a good thing to shoot for.

Richie Anderson: Yeah, I think if we can do it this year it would be better, we basically put off two years if we don't.

Daniel Davis: And based on my motion I left the leeway to establish that prior to the Wildlife Board not a decision that needs to be made tonight.

MOTION to address the boundary issue for the Rock Point Canal for the basin extended archery area, and work with the division to improve the incorporation of some of the lands on the east side of the Green River from the Monument boundary to the inlet of the bird refuge on the east side of the Green River.

Daniel Davis

Richie Anderson, second

Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Any other items we need to discuss other than those six I brought up at the beginning of this?

Dan Abeyta: Yeah, I'd like to talk about the concern that was brought up on the multi season elk hunt. I know that I was in the Board meeting when they talked about that and it seemed like there was some movement and support and concern of a quota on those multi season. I think that there was 37% on the 30,000 bull elk tags that went multi season? I see that number continuing to go up, I don't see it going down. And I think that we ought to take a look at a cap. I don't know what the other regions are saying on the multi season or the effect it's having, especially on that late muzzleloader season. But I think it would be good to take a look and look at a cap.

Randy Dearth: Covy, was that addressed in any of the other four RAC meetings?

Covy Jones: This is the first concern that has been brought to any RAC. That said this is not the .that would probably be better for the April meeting. That is not a season date or hunt structure, those hunts are already in place. That's a kind of numbers. The other thing is that will give us some time to bring back some data. It's one thing to say we had some increased pressure, increased sportsmen in the field, increased hunters, increased opportunity; but did it affect the number of elk harvested? So we need that to make a decision.

Dan Abeyta: Yeah that sounds right.

Randy Dearth: So we will postpone that item to the April meeting. The next one I had was discussion on the spike elk hunt. I'd like to put that on the discussion topic for next.

Brett Prevedel: How would you actually get rid of it when it's a part of a state wide spike elk hunt?

Daniel Davis: So in the management plan, Covy can correct me, but we have the ability to annex units out of the general spike method. Am I stating that correct?

Covy Jones: No, probably not. The one that was done. So they recommended to stop hunting the Monroe rifle before the last management plan was passed. And since then there is some language in the statewide management plan that has a strategy, I'd have to read it to know, but what it says is...

Daniel Davis: So I guess the outlying question is, does that management plan trump any change that the public sees fit?

Covy Jones: It's hard to start managing outside the code. It says we have to write a plan. I don't know how you look at it. There is not verbiage that says you have to have a spike elk hunt. It says you have to have 15,000 permits unless it falls, unless it gets above a certain number of success. It also says in spike hunting that we need to maintain youth hunting opportunities and family hunts. Just to put on another set of glasses for a second. Statewide I've been getting big, big pressure to maintain the spike elk hunt. In fact two RACs made a motion to let the Wildlife Board know how much that meant to them. And to say please don't touch the spike elk hunt. And proportionally I understand there is more harvest success in the Book Cliffs, and unfortunately you might not believe this, but there are fewer hunters for the size of the population. If we were to divide it out one of the recommendations I've heard is to divide it out and make it proportional to the elk population for the hunters we'd have to increase spike permits on the Book Cliffs by about 700 to equal what the other units are. So the other units, although they are at lower success they have a lot more hunters. You look at the Cache, the Fishlake, the Wasatch and they are hunted a lot harder. With elk sometimes when you hunt them harder it means decreased success, that's just how it is. But it probably would go against the spirit of the plan. If you're asking me that, yes, it would go against the spirit of the plan. And there are 27,000 people that hunt either spike or any bull and that is taking into account some archery that doesn't go into the quota, right? That don't put in for limited entry. So in the southeast region last night they brought up some concern saying if it ends here you displace a thousand hunters and they go to the Wasatch I'm going to want to end it in my backyard. Then the Wasatch wants

to end it there they go to the Manti and they are going to want to end it in their backyard. Pretty soon we are left with a system that only allows for quality hunting which is not the compromise we decided to make when we decided for quantity hunting. Utah manages for more quality in elk than any state in the nation. But we also have a system that provides for opportunity and the Division would oppose this as a recommendation. Biologically if you're running up against carrying capacity like I said before, you don't want more males on the ground. There are several studies, one done in Colorado saying just because you don't hunt spikes doesn't mean you have more bulls. They leave. Bulls leave, they won't stay there. When you hunt elk at a lower and you get too many, in a population that is not closed, you get too many males they leave as yearlings and two year olds. So if we want to end up in a system where we feed other units, awesome. But I would seriously take a look at the collar study and other things and find out what's going on in the Book Cliffs. There is probably an issue here, I mean everybody in the room can agree on that. But as far as pointing at one thing and saying this will fix it, I don't think it will. Let's see what our calf survival is. We're losing a bunch of calves to predators or something else. Let's see what our adult survival is, let's see what our body condition is, let's see what is going on out there and then we can make an educated decision and say ok, here are the limiting factors for this population. This is why it's not growing like it should. This is why we are not maintaining and here are the things we should do. That would be my caution.

Richie Anderson: One thing I would caution the sportsmen and DWR both is to take this year's numbers, whatever data comes in from this year and kind of don't make any radical management decisions based on this year's numbers. The reason being the drought changes everything. I mean our cattle aren't acting right. It just is different and so as you look at this year's numbers really look at that drought and what it's created. To make a management decision and put a lot of weight on this year's numbers, it's not going to be accurate, it won't be an accurate management decision. Thank you.

Randy Dearth: I think you're exactly right Richie. I think our numbers were a little low last year with the elk, and this year it's in the toilet. This hunt is just not the hunt that we want it to be, and I don't know what the answer is.

Daniel Davis: So I want to recall 12 years ago. Is that how long that hunt strategy has been in place? We addressed this, we had actually formed a northeastern wildlife coalition with a lot of locals for all the wildlife conservations groups and the coalition was to prevent this hunt strategy from taking place. And we went through this cycle of let's see what it will do. And biologically, not it's not a biological hunt. It was never intended that way by the elk committee when they first established that. In the Book Cliffs is also a unit where you can't harvest a cow with your archery tackle on a spike hunt. Everywhere else in the state you can. So that tells you it's not a biological hunt. Now a lot of these people that have reached out to me and brought these concerns up as well as myself. I've held those tags, went out and spike hunted I shared an experience where the only antlered bull elk my father has ever harvested was a spike in the Book Cliffs and would he give it back to see it go back to the way it was before? Absolutely. And a lot of these people that are hunting it and taking advantage of that spike hunt for the opportunity is because it's their backyard. And so they themselves are the ones coming forward with these complaints. I'm not getting email from Salt Lake emails from Utah county, this is Uintah Basin and as a representative I see it hard to let it go much further because we're in that age class now

where it's going to take years to rebound and last year I tried to get some bull numbers cut, we want to take some mouths off the range, but then we saved 50 cows. So I have a hard time there, I think there is some biological management I think we can do there, but for the unit itself its revered as a favorite for elk hunting and we're losing it.

Brett Prevedel: Back to the predator discussion, I don't think you can have it both ways. I don't think you're going to propose more predator hunting and then cut cow elk tags to compensate for it. At least without the study from the calves. At least until we have the numbers. If there is an assumption the bears are having a significant impact on the elk calves. That is a fair assumption right? Then you can't have it both ways, you can't have more predator tags like we did this year or like was the support from the local sportsman's group.

Daniel Davis: So if I could have about an hour of your time one of these evenings, I'd love to go over the dynamics of the predators and how they react to excessive harvest and maybe shed some light on why those ideas were brought forward.

Brett Prevedel: They are conflicting in my mind.

Daniel Davis: When you harvest a mature tom you create a vacuum. You draw young predators same thing with bears, when that female has kittens or young, they are going to get as far away from that as possible. The minute you start harvesting that older age class out biologically managing...

Brett Prevedel: We don't want to get this too off on a tangent so we can stay on topic, but that's my comment.

Richie Anderson: So really the issue is how do we maximize hunting opportunity and still maintain quality of animals, correct?

Daniel Davis: Yes.

Randy Dearth: Yeah because this is a quality hunt.

Daniel Davis: Because with that you've got people waiting 20 years for a unit that is not a 20 year unit at this point.

Richie Anderson: Well I've got no ideas on this one.

Covy Jones: For those that are putting in for limited entry it is a quality hunt, for 27,000 other people who are hunting spike and any bull are hunting just that across the state. When we start to limit that they are going to jump into limited entry or could possible jump into limited entry and increase draw odds.

Daniel Davis: So how many of those are putting in for the alternate species where you can't put in for elk. 16 years for a deer permit where I can't apply for elk, so that would skew that data right?

Covy Jones: There are people that would choose to hunt limited entry deer over limited entry elk. I know people who just don't hunt limited entry elk, so yeah Daniel, that's a fair point.

Daniel Davis: Thank you.

Dan Abetya: Dax earlier you mentioned we've had one year of harvest, 2017 where you're average age was 4.2 something like that?

Dax Mangus: On the late rifle hunt it was in the 4's. Overall age for everything was a 6.2. The objective is 6.5-7 and we manage on a three year average. The year before that was 7.8, the year before that was 7.5 so those two years we were .8 and .5 above the objective and this last year we were .3 below. The three year average is still within the range of the objective.

Dan Abeyta: Going back in time have there been any other years where you've had concerns about the quality of the elk hunt down in the Book Cliffs?

Dax Mangus: Yeah over the years the age has moved up and down a little bit and I don't know when it was we cut some permits from the limited entry. I remember they drew a graph that looked like a real perceptions drop because it went from .9 to 6.8 or something. So we've made adjustments and that's why we collect that data every year, we collect the teeth, we make adjustments we go through the recommendations process. We try to manage for those objectives and we try to keep it stable and avoid really high peaks and low valleys but we do try to keep it stable that's why we adjust permits on an annual basis.

Dan Abeyta: Do you feel like we're there in terms of making a change? In terms of eliminating the spike elk hunt in the Book Cliffs? That it's affecting the limited entry bull hunt. Are we there?

Dax Mangus: I don't think so. I think there are a lot of factors. I don't want to totally ignore the spike hunt and it could potentially have some affect. I don't know that if we'd never had the spike hunt in the Book Cliffs I don't know that we wouldn't be in the exact same position right now. Especially when you factor in drought effects and a lot of other things we have going on. And the fact that we are hunting spikes out there isn't causing our elk population to grow super slowly, you know. If anything it ought to help increase if you are limited in resources. There's some issues, we recognize there are some issues that's why we're starting these studies and doing habitat work. Eliminating the spike hunt is a silver bullet for addressing those issues.

Dan Abeyta: How far below the population objective is the Book Cliffs?

Dax Mangus: The objective is 75,000 elk and I think the last estimate was 56,000. I might have to double check.

Randy Dearth: Yep, sounds right.

Dax Mangus: So almost 2,000 below.

Boyde Blackwell: These management plans that we bring out to the RACs and around the state are from time to time meant to keep us from doing knee jerk reactions to issues. This spike only has side boards to protect the elk and I think as long as we are within those sideboards we need to be careful about going in and changing management plans and changing our management on an annual basis because we have conditions that force us to feel some concern for things, but we need to be cautious because we manage just about everything on management plan. And if we start to feel like we need to make changes it becomes a knee jerk reaction and we make changes on everything sudden. We ought to be careful.

Daniel Davis: I'd like to address your concerns a little bit. So when the spike hunt started it was extremely popular, people were like ok ten inches of antler, great. Well when the success started coming back from the Book Cliffs then it became more and more popular and more and more would hunt because of the success rate the ability to access ground. And so for those first two or three years, that's when the interest picked up. Well if our age targets at that seven year range, I don't think the data is lying to us at this age, and everybody that has come to me that spend as much time out there as they do their backyard that's the obvious that we're seeing is that that age class of bulls weaned out as a yearling. Ten inches of antler is what we're missing today as a seven year old bull.

Randy Dearth: I do know that this year is a really tough hunt and I think part of it might be the drought conditions and stuff. But out of the 16 people I know had tags out there they harvested four bulls one of them was a pretty nice bull, 350 class, and the rest of them were 300 or 315s and one is still hunting. So it's a tough hunt and the class of bull isn't, you know it's a concern. I'm sure there's many different things that is causing it personally. I can't say the spike elk hunt isn't one of those things. I know this is the third year in row that we've talked about the spike elk hunt, so I don't know what we can do about it. But at least if we have a motion or if we want to take something to the Wildlife Board to consider to be looked at.

MOTION to eliminate the spike elk hunt in the Book Cliffs.

Daniel Davis

Tim Ignacio, second

Failed 2-4

Randy Dearth: The next one we had a comment to vote on was the South Slope deer hunt that it is in very bad shape. Let's talk about that.

Dan Abeyta: I would ask the Division to maybe provide some numbers that was the SS Yellowstone that it was on. Maybe Randall could talk about buck to doe ratios, population estimates.

Randall Thacker: Population trend is down a little bit last year because of the winter we had, we had a pretty serious loss there but we still had a 50% success rate on the rifle deer hunt up there that's phenomenal, it's better than it's ever been. We've actually killed more bucks than we ever have on the Yellowstone, six years of data. The hunter success of it being 50% is way up there in the state. The Vernal is at 60% last year so it can be even higher. These are some of the higher

units in the state. These units are general season units, both of them, they aren't managed for a trophy class, and they aren't managed for an average age. They are general units that are there. The buck to doe ratio is managed for it's at 18.3 is what we saw last year at the end of the hunt. We haven't classified yet that will happen in the next few weeks here as the hunt really gets going. We wait until the peak of the rut because there is a huge difference even going two or three days behind you really want to hit the right peak and it's amazing how many more bucks show up. So it's managed for 18-20 and its right where it should be, it is at the bottom of that range now the past two years it's been up at 20. So it is down a couple of bucks per 100 does but not quite. We'd expect that after the year we had before and the high success rate on the hunt. Hunters out there would like to see bigger and better bucks on every unit especially on general season units that are out there. I personally hunt it with my family, I know a lot of big bucks came off. I checked a lot of check stations. I think it's just a matter of opinion whether it's a good or bad year that way. Definitely a different hunt this year because of the weather depending on which hunt you were hunting. It was very different depending on the time the water came. We didn't have any water then we got it all at once after about two and a half weeks there. And Yellowstone always has the complicating factor of the tribal land, being all the lower elevation area too. A lot of those deer are pushed too, just like the elk do. But the deer do push down on that unit. Yeah everybody would like to see bigger and better bucks I'm sure on all of the units we've got. But success rates are great, classification, and buck/doe ratios are there; it's a matter of opinion if that's good or bad I guess.

Dan Abeyta: Ok, thanks Randall.

Daniel Davis: I don't know that there is anything we can address to that tonight. It would have to be the potential of a permit reduction later on. A process for next year.

Randy Dearth: That would be April.

Dan Abeyta: There is probably no room for a motion at this point.

Randy Dearth: Very good. Ok the next we talked about or had some comments on is the archery hunt for the sheep both the mountain and the desert.

Brett Prevedel: Didn't they eliminate the Newfoundland? Was it still a hunt this year for rifle?

Covy Jones: Newfoundland, we have a thriving herd.

Brett Prevedel: So the Newfoundland still has the seven tags or whatever and two seasons.

Covy Jones: Yeah it has two seasons, and I forget how many permits, but there are a lot of permits out there.

Brett Prevedel: What we were told last year is this permit would have to come out of that.

Covy Jones: I don't know the answer to that. There is no such thing as addition to, but there I think what we were asked to do, and we can support this with the new hunt, we managed the OIL

species for extremely high success and what we've been asked to do in the plan by the group tonight is create a hunt on the unit that is going to have lower success. So basically we are giving the power back to the hunter. You want to go try this in late November, early December for two weeks with a bow? It will be 10% success. Good luck. And hopefully that will help everybody's draw odds. So is it addition to? Kind of, it will help everybody's draw odds.

Brett Prevedel: In Zion that's probably accurate, but in Newfoundland you're going to have good success.

Covy Jones: Sure.

Daniel Davis: So right now if I understand the proposal correctly it's just to approve the method and then whether we allocate tags for that would happen in April. So basically they are requesting approval to even consider this for a hunt.

Brett Prevedel: It's supported by the Division?

Covy Jones: We didn't bring this one but we can support it.

Dan Abeyta: What did the other RACs do, what did the northern region vote on this Newfoundland, and the southern on the other three?

Covy Jones: The northern region did not, the southern region I believe did, the southeastern region did, and the central region did.

Dan Abeyta: Why was the northern region not supportive of this, do you recall?

Covy Jones: I think one of the things was that there was a lot brought by different groups that night and they were kind of overwhelmed and sad this is kind of too much. At the end of the day this is really you guys' decision to recommend to the Board.

Daniel Davis: And Troy is correct this is the third year it's gone around unanimous across the state so they were asked to do these studies and I remember the Wildlife Board meeting explicitly. They did their due diligence yet again to try to create an opportunity.

MOTION to approve the two limited entry archery sheep seasons proposed by Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife.

Brett Prevedel

Daniel Davis

Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Alright the next concern that I wrote down was to discontinue the late season elk on the Dutton. I don't know if that was the SFW agenda.

Dan Abeyta: Yeah, discontinue the late rifle on the Dutton.

Randy Dearth: Ok let's talk about that.

Brett Prevedel: What RAC is that involved in, southern?

Covy Jones: That is the southern.

Brett Prevedel: And what did they do?

Covy Jones: Mike? Yeah they voted to discontinue the hunt in the southern. That one's been all over the place in the RACs.

Brett Prevedel: Is that an objective total? As far as objectives in the numbers was it within objective? Or is it low, is it high?

Covy Jones: I believe so. The concern with the bull hunt there is those bulls on that high plateau down there move all around. So winter elk from the Boulder, from these other units go to the Dutton. So if you have a late bull tag some might say you have an opportunity to get a bull that was grown on the Boulder, the Beaver, one of these other units. And there is a couple of different perspectives and one of them is putting in for the late hunt on the Dutton and the other one is a whole top end argument. So it's really perspective and which set of glasses you have on.

Dan Abeyta: Does the data support that then? The late hunt on the Dutton is really producing some top end animals?

Daniel Davis: I can attest to that, yes. It's a desired hunt.

Covy Jones: It's a very hard unit to hunt but they do harvest some good bulls.

Daniel Davis: They earn it.

Dan Abeyta: I was just wondering what the average age harvest, if that was available, if you knew is that really a year, two years above objective for harvest?

Covy Jones: We'll try to get average age for you.

Daniel Davis: I don't support it. I'll voice that right now.

Randy Dearth: You don't support the continuation of it, or?

Daniel Davis: The discontinuation of it the proposal. I feel like there are other ways to mitigate what we harvest, again April time frame. It's no different than the archers wanting to hunt the rut is the way I see it, right? Sorry the Book Cliffs is a dead horse but when those elk start to rut they are photographed on guzzlers clear out as far south as Moonshine two weeks later they are harvested out on the White River by a youth archery elk hunter. You know it's just by chance the nature of the beast. If that's a desired hunt, then leave it a desired hunt. If you want to reduce the amount of take I think a permit allocation number would be the best way to handle it and not just

strike it. It's a little bit different than what we try to address with the Book Cliffs. A lot different I guess. So that's my stance.

Rose Fedelleck: We didn't hear that.

Randy Dearth: They both agreed with Daniel.

Brett Prevedel: Yeah it should be addressed in April.

Daniel Davis: So what was the proposal Mr. Chairman? I don't think we need to move for a motion if nobody...

Randy Dearth: Ok do I have a motion? No motion, so this topic will die. Alright the next concern that we heard that I wrote down was to create a Barney Top archery elk hunt. Covy, did the other RAC's discuss that? As a primitive elk hunt, yes.

Daniel Davis: So what SFW is proposing is a new archery only unit because the Division doesn't have that primitive weapon defined.

Brett Prevedel: So carving this out of an existing unit and making a new unit.

Daniel Davis: Yes sir.

Brett Prevedel: Would not be that simple, would it? I mean don't we manage as herd units?

Covy Jones: It would still be managed as part of the Boulder. Yeah this one is a tough one and again I have a tough time with another groups recommendations; I mean theirs are theirs and ours is ours. So I'm in a little bit of an awkward spot, does that make sense?

Randy Dearth: How hard would it be to do that?

Covy Jones: Can we do it? We can. Should we do it? I don't feel comfortable speaking of it.

Randy Dearth: Would it be a whole new unit, is that what you'd have to do for this?

Covy Jones: It couldn't be a whole new unit because the age objective from the Boulder to manage to and that's where there are some complications.

Daniel Davis: I think Mr. Chairman that the appropriate step here is to make a motion for the Division to define a primitive weapon hunt. And then SFW can come back through and propose that hunt once that definition has been made. But to classify it as an archery unit and only hold one hunt on there, I think we'd be better off defining that style, method of hunting and then look at applying that to a unit. Instead of looking into the future now not knowing how that's going to be defined and have this archery only unit. Does that make sense to everybody?

Richie Anderson: I agree I think we need a little bit more information. I'm a little worried about pushing more when it's archery. Archery is obviously a bit more difficult and I think it limits more people. So I think I agree with Daniel, we need a little more information on what they are wanting exactly.

Daniel Davis: So they are looking to move applicants through the process so it creates additional opportunity to help reduce that point creep that we're seeing with the increased participation. Well it kind of plateaued, but we're getting it again right? So that's their ideas, a low success hunt, more permits to cycle through that will more opportunity. I would rather see that definition come out before we went to that extreme, not knowing where that laid and then we're sitting with this archery only unit that is intended for that.

Randy Dearth: I think that if we are in favor of a primitive weapon hunt down the road then we ought to make a motion if we're not or we don't care and just let the topic die then it stays as is. I think with that in mind that if we want to make a motion, let's make it.

MOTION to ask the Wildlife Board to define primitive weapon.

Daniel Davis

Brett Prevedel, second

Passed unanimously

Randy Dearth: Alright, that was the last item I had on this one. Was there any other things we want to carve out of this particular action item before we approve the balance?

MOTION to approve the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the Division.

Daniel Davis

Richie Anderson, second

Passed unanimously

- **CWMU Management Plans and Permit Numbers for 2019 and Landowner Association Permit Numbers for 2019 ACTION** - Mike Wardle, Public Wildlife/Private Lands Coordinator

See slideshow

Randy Dearth: Thank you Mike.

Questions by the RAC:

Daniel Davis: The overall consensus is permit number increases, does that fall within the plan? I'm sure that's the only way the Division would support those.

Mike Wardle: Right when we increase permits on a CWMU it's not always completely in line with what we're doing on a bigger unit, right? And a lot of it has to do with wildlife distribution. Take the Paunsaugunt for example and a lot of those are harvested on private land, so without access to the CWMU permits available some of these bucks are never getting harvested. So

sometimes the answer is yes usually. If we are decreasing permits on a unit a lot of times we are doing the same on the CWMU but there are times that it depends on the wildlife distribution.

Randy Dearth: On the Willow Creek they are requesting two permits which I know they qualify for. When Willow Creek CWMU was established they qualified for the two elk permits, but they didn't take them at that time and they were left with the Diamond Mountain Land Owner Association. I'm sorry the Book Cliffs LOA. Are they getting reduced this one, by those two tags, or is this in addition to that?

Mike Wardle: So I'm thinking, correct me if I'm wrong on this. West Willow Creek Ranch left the LOA last year, is that correct?

Randy Dearth: Three years ago.

Mike Wardle: So that acreage reflected the LOA last year. When the LOA renewed we recommended a reduction in elk. If you recall that I believe they requested nine and us recommended three and the Board ended up giving them six. Then this year, and the CWMU is still separate than the LOA. Does that answer your question?

Randy Dearth: I think it does. So they were reduced by... they qualified for three and they got six. Ok. I just knew that three years ago when we did this they approached the Wildlife Board and they left them keeping those two tags... Ok.

Tim Ignacio: I've got a question. That's what happened, and I questioned that. When they first turned that back to Mustang they let the ranch down below keep the tags and they gave him additional ones. And I asked don't those tags stay with that and not go with that?

Randy Dearth: At the time Willow Creek didn't get any elk tags, they were just going after deer tags and I don't think it was pronghorn, was there pronghorn in there too? So there wasn't any elk tags in there at the time, and this is the first time I think that you're asking for elk tags, is that correct?

Mike Wardle: Mr. Chair, if I could clarify. We are talking about two separate programs. An LOA receives a unit wide permit, so when an LOA qualifies for a permit that permit is valid for the whole entire unit. CWMU, which is what Mustang Fuels is now, West Willow Creek Ranch, when they are asking for two elk permits, and we are recommending that, that permit is only valid for their private property. It's not valid for the entire unit as the LOA is.

Daniel Davis: So to clarify that you are correct to establish this unit there was some give and take by Mustang, Willow Creek separating itself from the LOA in lieu of that they took the allotted deer permits and they qualified for and ask that the elk permits be left for limited entry. And that's what I perceived the intent was. Now whether that was what the true intent was or not, I think that's why we were so confused about it because that is how we understood it at the time.

Randy Dearth: Yep. I think it's great the way it's done. I definitely support it.

Brett Prevedel: We could address the issue in the spring, for permit numbers, if now they have two elk permits. When we do permit numbers for the LOA.

Boyde Blackwell: No we address LOA and CWMU permit numbers right now. Not in the spring. We would address antlerless in April, but not the bucks and bulls.

Randy Dearth: So right now I guess the proposal is from the Division for the Book Cliffs LOA they qualify for three permits but we are suggesting they get six. There is no change.

Mike Wardle: Well, that's what took place last year. And that's a three year COR.

MOTION to accept the Divisions proposal as presented.

Daniel Davis

Natasha Hadden, second

Passed 5 in favor, 1 opposed

- **R657-38 – Dedicated Hunter Rule Amendments ACTION** - Bryan Christensen, Dedicated Hunter Coordinator

See slideshow

Daniel Davis: On average, what's the average number of participants new to the program each year with a fresh renewal?

Bryan Christensen: As far as brand new, never done it before?

Daniel Davis: No, first year people.

Bryan Christensen: It changes every year, but it hovers between 2,000 and 3,800. Somewhere in there depending on where we look at it. It's not an even 3,000 it just depends on when people joined up and exit. You can call it roughly 2,500-3,000.

Daniel Davis: So if I recall right, the reason we changed it in the first place was do we have eight hours times that many people in four month window to be allowed to participate that first year?

Bryan Christensen: Yeah, I think that is one of the best questions. I'm the one that brought this out and changed it last time to go away from that eight hours the first year. I've met with each of our regional coordinators and we've hashed this out at length to decide is this really the right route to go back? When our original goal was to reduce that stress in that draw period in late May to mid-August. We've done a lot of refinements in this program since then and some of that is we are now providing projects statewide that have unlimited numbers of volunteers that can do it. At many places can be done at the discretion of the Dedicated Hunter, so you can go out, do it on a Friday/Saturday/Sunday or whatever works for you. We're creating more of those projects that is going to help facilitate some of issues we had before. We are also really confident, and I really have talked to all the regional coordinators at length, they are very confident we can provide more than enough hours for all the first year people to get all their hours, those eight

hours without a problem during that time frame. It will take diligence on the draws, as soon as you draw start looking for those projects.

Daniel Davis: Like you say it's on the participant so on those year round opportunities to be able to that, we have a great program here, no pun intended, but a lot of the involvement seems to increase in the fall. So it's kind of after that summer time frame, so is that going to create needing to travel halfway across the state to be able to get to that work environment to satisfy that eight hours?

Bryan Christensen: The answer to that is maybe. We do habitat projects and part of the orientation for dedicated hunters is you'll have more success in this program if you are willing to travel. And that doesn't mean four, six, eight hours travel. It might mean two, two and a half. A lot of places you only have to go maybe an hour to get to a really good habitat project; that also depends on where you live. If the Division hosts a whole lot of habitat projects down in the southern region because that's where the focus is, that's where the projects are going to be. We try as regional coordinators to provide as many projects as we can statewide so you don't have to travel as much but if you want to work with deer habitat/deer projects you kind of have to be able to travel to get to those. We don't like to grow deer in the city, that's for sure. Got to at least leave cities. So the answer is maybe, depending on where you live you may have to travel.

Dan Abeyta: I guess there's a lot of other non-habitat projects that the first year DH could participate in to get those hours as well. In June there is free fishing day, there are kids fishing events statewide. So I think there's other opportunities as well to get those hours.

Questions from the public:

Tyrell Abaglone: I'm a participant in this DH program. My question is, there is one way we could simplify this. I mean I like the idea of the eight hours so it's eight the first year, then 16, then eight. Why can't we do eight the first year then 12 the next? I know Tonya, I don't know about the other regions, but I know she has hell trying to get people to participate in fishing day. I know when I did it, it was about a 5-6 hour day. With one day you can have half your hours taken care of and in people's minds they might be willing to participate in that a little more. Would that be something we could look at?

Bryan Christensen: We could certainly talk about the breakdown of numbers. Where we kind of came down with the 8-16-8 a lot of the bigger projects, knowing that people do travel they want to get as many hours they can in one day because they've taken a day off or traveled a couple of hours to get to it. It's rare we can host projects that can give you ten hours in a day. It's really, really rare. But common for us to have a work day that is eight. 3-4 hours is even more common. Events like free fishing or things like that. So you may have to do, depending on the project you pick you could end up having to do multiples. As far as the quantity that first, second, third year we just didn't want to exceed eight for the first year. We think that may be too much. And then the second year, the beauty of the second year is you can really do all of your hours after you join. So you have about a year and a half get three days' worth of work in and then that last year just one day. I wouldn't mind if you wanted to talk more about breakdown hours. As

coordinators we felt like the 8-16-8 would administratively work really well and feel like there is enough time to get 16.

Tyrell Abaglone: I'll tell you I've had a hell of a lot of fun. I've only harvested one deer the last three years, but having the opportunity to be with the kids. I helped out with that why heck program and that's where I got most of my hours. And with the 8-16-8 it's going to have people wondering where they are at and if you had an 8-12-12 they'd know where they are at. I mean Ally here ended up with me. She wasn't able to participate as much as I was able to. I mean we got right down to the wire and we weren't sure what she was left to need getting. And I know within this northeastern region, a lot of the projects require materials. Like the gushers and whatever else. I work for the county I don't really have enough money to fork out on top of that as well. The free fishing day works out great. Thank you.

Brett Prevedel: So can they accumulate extra hours the first year or are you limited to eight?

Bryan Christensen: The second you join and have that email you can start doing all your hours the first year. And there are DH that will do all 32 before the first season starts. Then some take a break, some decide to keep doing service. We have a lot of DH who exceed 32, even exceed 100 hours of service during the time frame.

Ally Bywater: I also participate in the DH program and like Tyrell was saying up here in the northeastern region there isn't much opportunity to help and actually get our hours. There is very limited things. But if you look down in the southern regions a lot of these other ones I'm sure you know as a coordinator, you can help build fencing, you can help officers do this or that and that's not really an opportunity we really have here. I don't know if Tonya is being denied that opportunity or if we are just not allowed to build fence up here for some reason.

Bryan Christensen: No there's not any limitation as far as that goes between regions. Sometimes the difference between regional projects does have to do with the funding that is available. When there is a huge burn scar and the money goes towards re-seeding and planting bitterbrush, stuff like that. Sometimes certain projects in certain places are funded and that's different every year. As far as fencing and stuff like that, it depends on where there is a need. If the region determines there is properties that need to be fenced and it's going to help with depredation issues or other wildlife related problems the region could certainly add those projects.

Ally Bywater: Then why haven't they in the past?

Bryan Christensen: I'd have to have that discussion with Tonya and see what has been available here to do. See what has been proposed, but I haven't had that specific conversation.

Tonya Kieffer-Selby: So I would just note that in the DH program, I've only been here for two years and it had been the same since its installation. So the region wasn't as DH heavy at creating projects. So it's been something over two years that's taken a while to get all of our biologist mindset as well as our law enforcement and citizens mindset changed to understand that it is a program we offer multiple facets and opportunities to get your hours done, it's just it's taken time. So I do as much as I can to reach out to all of you guys, I'm emailing, calling, I text

both of you personally when I need something done. So I've made a personal effort to reach out to make sure you both get your hours. It's just a mindset where it's taken two years to fix 30 years of changes.

Boyde Blackwell: How does it feel to be a movie star?

Bryan Christensen: Are you talking about the elk video? We can talk about this after.

Boyde Blackwell: Ok, I just want you to know it was an outstanding video my family all enjoyed it and I shared it all over the place.

Bryan Christensen: Let me tell you this though and since you've made a Segway here. That was a northeastern bull elk. And the best place to hunt is right here in the northeast.

Boyde Blackwell: I don't know if you guys know what I'm talking about but it was on Facebook and twitter. He's the bearded guy, he really had a big full beard and he was the guy telling you about the elk running around on both sides of him and yeah it was impressive. Good job.

Bryan Christensen: Thanks, I'm sure all the regions are as prideful to hunt what they have but the biologists do a great job here. I love being in the northeast region.

Comments from the RAC:

Daniel Davis: So I have a little experience with this program, this is my fifth year in a row, so having experience with what is being proposed going back to that eight hours is tough. Now I have faith that Tonya's done a good job because I get the same emails and same invites and everything as well it's just a little hard saying ok we see a change coming for our region. Because I'd hate to see that influx of new enrollees come in and not be able to put them to work or require them to travel halfway across the state with no compensation. And I don't know if there is somewhere to credit that part somewhere along the line and I know it's flexible and approved on those natures and I understand that. But that's my reservations with it.

Boyde Blackwell: I've seen the program really go a lot, grow a lot over the past two years, seriously. The biologists are feeling more comfortable with getting more projects done. We haven't had a lot of fencing projects because we just don't have the same amount of fence knocked down as the southern region does. They are horrible down there. But our guys are looking at those kinds of things and we're getting more and more of those things. Tonya posts them. I think if you were to look at it now vs. five years ago there is a significant change.

Daniel Davis: It's just a weird dynamic. Kids get out of school and you have a young family it's just a recipe for conflicts. Now as a DH I'm dedicating myself right. As a participant it was a sweet benefit to be able to not have to stress out that first year to get that first tag.

Bryan Christensen: And we fully recognize that. We took a lot of time and thought over this. We want to be confident that we won't come back in a year and say just kidding. We want to be sure that we'll have enough projects that the second you join we'll encourage you to get looking. Its

ten weeks, if you don't count mid-May. If you count the end of May when draw results are promised, I think it's May 30th, if we count from there to the beginning of the archery hunt and not everybody does archery. Just that time frame is ten complete weeks. And what we're asking for basically is draw, apply and draw with the mindset that within a ten week period you need to get it. And if you can't, if you know you can't do that it may have to be a consideration to whether or not to join the program. And we hate to say that, but a ten week period during the summer is pretty good period for one day. Three of four days, that's a vacation, to get one day in. so that's why we are going to focus on as many projects that can have unlimited numbers of volunteers throughout the state in multiple areas and that we feel like is going to be a benefit. We appreciate the concern.

Tyrell Abaglone: I know like with Ally this year when she was trying to get into that free fishing day, Tonya needed us to come over to Vernal to get some of the fishing poles and this that and the other. She asked us how many hours we needed because we live all the way out in Altamont, and the free fishing day we were going to be participating in was in Rock Creek. So that was driving all the way over here just to turn around and go back, yet you guys can only allow us one hour toward our DH hours. Is there any way we could widen that up for the driving and that?

Bryan Christensen: So some of those thing get complicated because driving time... let me use an example... when I first started this it was about six years ago when I joined the DH stuff and I found that there was group that drove up, they wanted to do a project up in the northern region. They drove up from St. George, then they drove back. Worked for about an hour and a half. They wanted 7.5-8 hours each since they drove from St. George and back. But we got an hour and a half work from that group. So if you look at it from that angle there is certainly an imbalance there. Give credit for work that didn't happen. We realized they travelled and made that sacrifice, but an employer generally doesn't start paying you until you get to work and our state laws and this is really what governs travel time, our state risk management and volunteer national audits and stuff like that they don't want to see any time starting until they are at the volunteer site. So generally that's when we start things. There are some exceptions and that is if we send you somewhere to pick up items, if you're hauling materials or equipment or things like that for us. At that point you're volunteering so that time, you mentioned an hour I don't know where you had to pick it up to where you ended up, my guess is probably about an hour. So that's where we do credit travel time, is when you do actually delivery goods or hauling items, things like that.

Tyrell Abaglone: That was probably my next question because for these guzzlers and stuff like that you guys are just looking for materials and she was going to do that but the reason I kind of half talked her out of it is cause I thought the hours we got paid for as far as the materials was going to be the \$20.00 an hour on the receipts, but I wasn't sure if you guys were going to pay us to go pick up the materials and then bring them to you. I figured it would be easier for her if she just paid for the rest of her hours instead of doing the headache of doing the same amount. I wasn't sure if she got paid for hauling the materials too, or if it was just what was on the receipt.

Bryan Christensen: Yeah it depends again and that's why the regional coordinators handle those specifics because, and again, there's all these weird situations where you don't want to send somebody to Lowes and go shopping for a pencil and then spend the time walking around

looking at the cool tools, and getting stuff saying while I'm here I need to get that thing for me. So we need to watch out for stuff and keep things pure. But anytime you're doing physical work, hauling materials for us, things like that, there is always room to create credit because you are actually in the act of volunteering. But when it's just traveling to and from a project the answer nine times out of ten is going to be nope.

MOTION to approve as presented with the Division looking at the distribution of hours at possibly being 8-12-12.

Brett Prevedel

Natasha Hadden, second

Passed unanimously

- **Waterfowl Recommendations and Rule Amendments - 2019 ACTION - Blair Stringham, Waterfowl Program Coordinator**

See slideshow

Randy Dearth: Thank you Blair. I'm glad you mentioned electric bikes because that has been a hot topic for this particular issue. As far as that goes you said you're probably going to make some recommendations. Are you thinking about eliminating that or, what are you thinking there?

Blair Stringham: I don't know at this point but I do know that we have received a lot of feedback that we didn't receive prior to coming out with this recommendation. So this recommendation would be to completely not allow electric bikes but WMA's and I think we'll probably try to find some middle ground with that than an all-out going wherever and doing whatever. We'll probably have something revised at the Wildlife Board Meeting, I just don't know exactly yet.

Dan Abeyta: Could you give us a general idea then?

Blair Stringham: Yeah, so there's different classes of electric bikes. There's a lower class that you basically have to continue to pedal all the time it's not a lot of assistance, it doesn't have any kind of throttle mechanism on it. The class three bike has a full throttle, it's more of a motorcycle than it is a bike. So our intent is to keep it something that is going to be more like a bike than motorcycle. Then we also just have concerns that people are taking these off out through the marsh and there could be potential to damage to the habitat so we want to maintain and keep these people on the dykes than drive across the marsh or the rivers.

Dan Abeyta: Any thoughts on age restrictions?

Blair Stringham: As far as age of using them?

Dan Abeyta: Yeah because a lot of emails I got were from older hunters who said they can't reach.

Blair Stringham: Yeah that is one of the things that has come up through this process that we will consider before we put this thing together. It is a really popular way for those guys to get out and we heard that.

Randy Dearth: Yeah I think I'm in that age class.

Daniel Davis: I'd limit the age class and do it more by physical ability because age doesn't have to mean everything.

Randy Dearth: Ok, I'm in that weight class.

Laughs

Brett Prevedel: Does the horsepower/class have anything to do with the off the dyke use?

Blair Stringham: Somewhat, so the ones that have a full throttle you could pretty much drive them across the marsh they have a lot of different tires you could put on there to allow them to go across wet vegetation. We probably haven't thought through that far yet, but trying to keep them on the dyke is essentially what we are trying to put in place.

Comments by the RAC:

Richie Anderson: I'd just encourage the DWR to maximize access. I know a few waterfowl hunters that are to the age and ability that they can't do too much big game anymore. I can see these electric bikes helping them. Electric bikes are fairly new, are we talking about that big of issue yet? Can we give it some more time and see is it really going to develop into an issue that we really even need to propose it? There's plenty of people that would benefit from these electric bikes and give them opportunity. I would really discourage anything that would limit them on that opportunity. I guess that's my question is how big of an issue are we really looking at? Are we really nitpicking here, do we need to give it some more time?

Blair Stringham: Yeah so the people currently using electric bikes are probably a pretty small group of people. I guess our intent on this was to try to get ahead of it. We've seen technology advance at a pretty rapid pace. We see people come out there with all kinds of homemade contraptions and things like that and our thought was that we could get out ahead of this and but there is some additional consideration we need to weigh before we do something we feel comfortable with.

Randy Dearth: I think I fully support Richie's comments there. It seems to me it's like the scope on the muzzleloader thing where we kind of got ahead of that and said we want a power scope and then we realized that it's really not a big deal at all. I would definitely support a motion to allow electric bikes.

Blair Stringham: Currently in the rule we do allow electric bikes, this rule amendment would be to not allow electric bikes. So I guess essentially to...

Daniel Davis: Do away with that rule.

MOTION to do away with the rule change on the electric bikes on WMAs.

Daniel Davis
Richie Anderson, second
Passed five in favor, one opposed

MOTION to approve the remainder of the waterfowl presentation as presented by the Division with the exception of the previous motion.

Brett Prevedel
Natasha Hadden
Passed unanimously