

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

August 26, 2021, DNR Auditorium

1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah

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

Revised 08/24/2021

**Thursday, August 26, 2021 – 9:00 am**

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman   | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman  | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log<br>– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman   | <b>CONTINGENT</b>        |
| 4. DWR Update<br>– Justin Shirley, DWR Director   | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b>     |
| 5. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022<br>– Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 6. Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendments for 2021-2022<br>– Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator   | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 7. Expo Permit Audit<br>– Kenny Johnson, Admin. Services Chief  | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 8. Expo Permit Allocation<br>– Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief                                   | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| 9. Drought Permit Recommendations<br>– Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator                                 | <b>ACTION</b>            |
| <del>10. 2:00 p.m. Time Certain – Board Hearing<br/>– Todd Eskelsen</del>                               | <del><b>ACTION</b></del> |
| 11. Other Business<br>– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman  | <b>CONTINGENT</b>        |

**Wildlife Board Motions**

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

Fall 2021 – Target Date – Resident Only permits for the Youth Elk hunt

**MOTION: I move that we ask the division to review the possibility of youth any weapon elk tags going to residents only and bring back the information next year. This is to be placed on the Action Log.**

Motion made by: Randy Dearth  
Assigned to: Covy Jones/Lindy Varney  
Action: Under Study  
Status: To be presented November 2021  
Placed on Action Log: December 3, 2020

Spring 2022 – Target Date – Progress on changes to the 2023 Draw Application Dates

**MOTION: I move that we track the division’s progress of the 2023 draw application date changes with an update to the Wildlife Board in 1 year. This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Kevin Albrecht  
Assigned to: Lindy Varney  
Action: Under Study  
Status: To be presented April/May 2022  
Placed on Action Log: April 29, 2021

Spring 2022 – Target Date – List of allocated permits by unit to be published on the division website

**MOTION: I move that we direct the division to place a list of allocated permits by unit on the division’s website. This is to be placed on the action log.**

Motion made by: Randy Dearth  
Assigned to: Justin Shannon  
Action: Under Study  
Status: To be presented April/May 2022  
Placed on Action Log: April 29, 2021

**Action Log Assignment**

December 3, 2020

Chad Wilson – DWR and the CWMU Committee to put a presentation together educating the public on the benefits of the CWMU program.

# Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

June 3, 2021, Electronic Meeting

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/9QV-CweVldI>

## AGENDA

**Thursday, June 3, 2021, 9:00 A.M.**

1. Approval of Agenda **ACTION**
  - Byron Bateman, Chairman
  
2. Approval of Minutes **ACTION**
  - Byron Bateman, Chairman
  
3. Old Business/Action Log **CONTINGENT**
  - Kevin Albrecht, Vice-Chair
  
4. DWR Update **INFORMATIONAL**
  - Rory Reynolds, DWR Director
  
5. HB 295 Waterfowl Rule Amendments **ACTION**
  - Blair Stringham, Migratory Game Bird Program Coordinator
  
6. R657-39 Electronic Meetings Rule Amendments **ACTION**
  - Kyle Maynard, Assistant Attorney General
  
7. Electronic/In-person Meeting Process Update **INFORMATIONAL**
  - Ashley Green, Assistant Director
  - Staci Coons, Wildlife Board Coordinator
  
8. Conservation Permit List – 3 year permits **ACTION**
  - Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief
  
9. CWMU Advisory Committee Vacancies **ACTION**
  - Justin Shannon, Wildlife Section Chief
  
10. Parker Sage Grouse Hunt Closure **ACTION**
  - Heather Talley, Upland Game Coordinator
  
- Time Certain 1:00 pm**
11. Wildlife Board Hearing – Mr. Clifford Stubbs **ACTION**
  
12. Other Business **CONTINGENT**
  - Byron Bateman, Chairman
    - Election of Chair and Vice Chair

**Due to the continued presence of COVID-19 in Utah and associated public health and safety risks, large public gatherings are still strongly discouraged by the CDC and many local health departments. Based on these risks and recommendations, the Division of Wildlife Resources and the chair of this public body have determined that Regional Advisory Council and Wildlife Board meetings will continue in a purely electronic format for the time being. Anyone wishing to comment on agenda topics in future meetings or to observe this meeting may do so by logging on to the Division’s webpage at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html> where instructions and links are provided.**

### **Wildlife Board Motions**

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

#### **Fall 2021 – Target Date – Resident Only permits for the Youth Elk hunt**

**MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to review the possibility of youth any weapon elk tags going to residents only, and bring back the information next year. This is to be placed on the Action Log.**

Motion made by: Randy Dearth  
Assigned to: Covy Jones/Lindy Varney  
Action: Under Study  
Status: To be presented November 2021  
Placed on Action Log: December 3, 2020

#### **Action Log Assignment**

December 3, 2020

Chad Wilson – DWR and the CWMU Committee to put a presentation together educating the public on the benefits of the CWMU program.

April 29, 2021

Lindy Varney and the DWR to give the Wildlife Board an update on the Division's progress of the 2023 draw application date changes in one year.

April 29, 2021

Justin Shannon and the DWR to post a list of all allocated permits by unit on the Division's website.

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**  
June 3, 2021  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Wade Heaton 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 Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the April 29, 2021 Wildlife Board Meeting.**

3) HB 295 Waterfowl Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth and failed for lack of a second.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Division's recommendations as presented with the caveat that we form a working group to get together and bring information back to the Board.**

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that the Division establish a special use permit for guided waterfowl hunting on Waterfowl Management Areas for the 2021 season, and that guides who guide on WMAs in Utah would need to apply for this permit.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we form a working group to establish guiding rules and regulations, and licensing waterfowl guides in the State of Utah.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.**

4) R657-39 Electronic Meetings Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's rule amendments as presented.**

- 5) Conservation Permit List – 3-year permits (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the conservation tag allocations as presented.**

- 6) CWMU Advisory Committee Vacancies (**Action**)

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

**MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU committee as presented.**

- 7) Parker Sage Grouse Hunt Closure

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

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Parker Sage Grouse hunt closure as presented.**

- 8) Other Business – Election of Chair and Vice Chair

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we elect Kevin Albrecht as the Wildlife Board Chair.**

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we elect Randy Dearth as the Wildlife Board Vice Chair.**

- 9) Wildlife Board Hearing – Mr. Clifford Stubbs

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed 4 votes in favor and 3 opposed.

**MOTION: I make the motion that Mr. Stubbs knowingly violated Wildlife Code Sections 23-20-4 and 23-13-4, and further the motion that this Board affirm the hearing officer's order regarding Mr. Stubbs' license to take and pursue bear and cougar.**

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**  
June 3, 2021  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
Online Attendance

**Wildlife Board**

Byron Bateman – Chairman  
Kevin Albrecht – Vice-Chairman  
Rory Reynolds – Exec. Secretary

Randy Dearth  
Wade Heaton  
Karl Hirst  
Donnie Hunter  
Bret Selman

**RAC Chairs**

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

**Division Personnel**

Adam Wallerstein  
Ashley Green  
Ben Nadolski  
Blair Stringham  
Carmen McDonald  
Chad Wilson  
Chris Wood  
Cody Jones  
Covy Jones  
Darren DeBloois  
Dave Beveridge  
David Smedley  
Dax Magnus  
Dennis Shumway  
Greg Hansen  
Guy Wallace  
Heather Talley  
James Christensen

JD Abbott  
Jason Vernon  
J. Shirley  
J.D. Abbott  
Justin Shannon  
Kenny Johnson  
Kent Hersey  
Kevin Bunnell  
Kip King  
Kyle Maynard  
Lindy Varney  
Madeleine Whittier  
Mark Martinez  
Matt Bartley  
Matt Briggs  
Michael Begley  
Michael Wardle  
Mike Canning

Mike Christensen  
Miles Hanberg  
Paige Wiren  
Paul Gedge  
Paul Washburn  
Riley Peck  
Robin Goodman  
Rory Reynolds  
Staci Coons  
Torrey Christopherson  
Wyatt Bubak

**Public**

Brent Ward

Clifford Stubbs

**Utah Wildlife Board Electronic Meeting**

June 3, 2021

Salt Lake City, UT

The meeting will stream live at: <https://youtu.be/9QV-CweVldI>

- 00:00:50** Chairman Bateman called the meeting to order and took a roll call. All Board Members and RAC Chairs were present.
- 00:02:38** **1&2) Approval of Agenda Minutes (Action)**  
The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.  
**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda for the June 3, 2021 Wildlife Board Meeting, and approve the minutes of the April 29, 2021 Wildlife Board Meeting .**
- 00:04:08** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**  
Vice chairman Albrecht noted th.at the Division is still working on producing the technology update presentation that will be shared with the Board.
- 00:04:48** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**  
Interim Director Reynolds gave the Board updates on the Division’s Administrative Services. Aquatic, Conservation Outreach, Habitat, Law Enforcement and Wildlife Sections. Director Reynolds also thanked outgoing board members Chairman Bateman and Donnie Hunter for their service.
- 5) HB 295 Waterfowl Rule Amendments (Action)**  
Migratory Game Bird Program Coordinator, Blair Stringham, gave a pre-recorded online presentation that was posted on the Division of Wildlife Resources website.
- 00:15:13** **Additional Information**  
Blair Stringham presented additional information that further explained the Division’s recommendations on this agenda item.
- 00:26:02** **Board Questions**  
The Board asked questions about the potential biological impact of guided hunting on Waterfowl Management Areas, the intent of H.B. 295, guided hunting opportunity on property other than WMAs, the feasibility of implementing a permitting process on WMAs and species opportunity on WMAs versus other statewide public and private properties.
- 00:43:43** **RAC Summaries**  
Each RAC passed the waterfowl rule amendments with varying opposition and stipulations.
- 00:55:15** **Board Questions and Discussion**



The Board asked the Southern RAC chair to restate that region's motions. The Board discussed the potential positive aspects of regulating or restricting guided hunting on WMAs, and the value of creating a working group to gather and assess collected data. The Board asked if action on this issue could be delayed. The Board also commented on the value of the RAC process, and expressed appreciation for the RAC chairs. Furthermore, the Board asked who would approve the special use permits should the Board vote to regulate guided hunting on WMAs, and also asked if conditions could be added to the permits.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth and failed for lack of a second.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Division's recommendations as presented with the caveat that we form a working group to get together and bring information back to the Board.**

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that the Division establish a special use permit for guided waterfowl hunting on Waterfowl Management Areas for the 2021 season, and that guides who guide on WMAs in Utah would need to apply for this permit.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we form a working group to establish guiding rules and regulations, and licensing waterfowl guides in the state of Utah.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented.**

**6) R657-39 Electronic Meetings Rule Amendments (Action)**

Assistant Attorney General Kyle Maynard gave a pre-recorded online presentation that was posted on the Division of Wildlife Resources website.

**01:26:31 Additional Information**

Assistant Attorney General Kyle Maynard presented additional information that further explained the Division's recommendations on this agenda item.

**01:27:55 Board Questions and Discussion**

There were no questions or discussion from the Board.

The following motion was made by Donnie Hunter, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we accept the Division's rule amendments as presented.**

**01:29:19 7) Electronic/In-person Meeting Process Update (Informational)**

Wildlife Board Coordinator Staci Coons gave a presentation titled, "Hybrid Meeting Protocol, Wildlife Board and Regional Advisory Councils."

**01:33:45 Board Questions and Discussions**

The Board asked for clarification on the locations of in-person meetings, and commented on the value of the hybrid meeting model.

**01:35:28 8) Conservation Permit List – 3-year permits (Action)**

Wildlife Section Chief, Justin Shannon, Covy Jones, gave a presentation titled, “2022-2024 Conservation Permits, Recommended Permit Allocations.”

**01:44:34 Board Questions and Discussions**

The Board expressed appreciation for the Division’s being proactive in permit recommendations given the current statewide drought conditions, and also expressed general appreciation for the program.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the conservation tag allocation as presented.**

**01:48:30 9) CWMU Advisory Committee Vacancies (Action)**

Wildlife Section Chief Justin Shannon gave a presentation titled, “CWMU Advisory Committee Members.”

**02:02:01 Board Questions and Discussion**

The Board commented on the importance of the committee.

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

**MOTION: I move that we accept the CWMU committee as presented.**

**10) Parker Sage Grouse Hunt Closure (Action)**

Upland Game Coordinator Heather Talley gave a presentation titled, “Parker Sage Grouse Population Status in 2021.”

**01:59:55 Board Questions and Discussion**

There were no questions or discussion from the Board.

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

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Parker Sage Grouse hunt closure as presented.**

**02:02:15 12) Other Business - Election of Chair and Vice Chair (Contingent)**

The Board addressed the last agenda item at this time, and revisited agenda item number 11 at 1:00 p.m.

The Board also addressed an agenda item for the August 2021 Wildlife Board meeting.

Director Reynolds thanked the Regional Area Councils and the Wildlife Board for their patience over the past year, and commended them on the accomplishments achieved in the midst of challenging circumstances.

The Board members thanked Chairman Bateman and Donnie Hunter for their years of dedicated service to Utah's wildlife; and the Board members thanked Division staff for their focused dedication and hard work.

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we elect Kevin Albrecht as the Wildlife Board Chairman.**

The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Wade Heaton and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we elect Randy Dearth as the Wildlife Board Vice Chairman.**

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

**MOTION: I move that we adjourn the meeting.**

**02:20:37** Meeting adjourned.

#### **11) Wildlife Board Hearing – Mr. Clifford Stubbs (Action)**

**04:01:05** Chairman Bateman called the meeting to order and read an introduction prepared by the Division.

**04:02:41** Technical issues.

**04:18:31** Chairman Bateman again called the meeting to order, introduced the Board's legal counsel and read an introduction prepared by the Division.

The Board heard arguments, evidence and testimony from both the prosecution and the defendant, and then deliberated before voting on a motion.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Kevin Albrecht and passed 4 votes in favor and 3 opposed.

**MOTION: I make the motion that Mr. Stubbs knowingly violated Wildlife Code Sections 23-20-4 and 23-13-4, and further the motion that this Board affirm the hearing officer's order regarding Mr. Stubbs' license to take and pursue bear and cougar.**

**08:30:55** Meeting adjourned.

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Summary of Motions**

1) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (**Action**)

CR SR NER

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

**PASSES:** Unanimously

NR **MOTION:** I move that we accept Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 as presented, except leave the current cap in place.

**PASSES:** 6 in favor, 3 opposed

**MOTION:** Recommend the Wildlife Board look into furbearers for nonresident furbearer licenses and into a draw for beaver trapping in currently closed areas.

**PASSES:** Unanimously

SER **MOTION:** That the DWR consider setting a system that allows public trappers to participate in harvesting beavers in areas closed to trapping, rather than hiring professional trappers.

**PASSES:** 10 in favor, 2 opposed

**MOTION:** To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented.

**PASSES:** 11 in favor, 1 opposed

2) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (**Action**)

CR **MOTION:** To not allow the take of collared cougars within the six-unit study for the next three years, by the use of hounds, until revisited in 2025.

**PASSES:** 11 in favor, 1 opposed

**MOTION:** To make a recommendation to the Director's office to extend the cougar spot & stalk hunt date beyond December 31<sup>st</sup>.

**PASSES:** Unanimously

**MOTION:** To accept the balance of the recommendations as presented by the Division.

**PASSES:** 10 in favor, 2 opposed

NR

**MOTION:** I move we not allow the take of collared lions in the 6 study areas in the Central Region, with the exception of depredation or spot and stalk.

**PASSES:** 8 in favor, 1 opposed

**MOTION:** I move to accept the remainder of Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revision for 2021-2022 as presented.

**PASSES:** Unanimously

SR **MOTION:** I move that we prohibit the killing of collard lions in the six units designated in the study in the Central Region by the use of hounds for three years.  
**PASSES:** Unanimously

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

**AMENDED MOTION:** To adjust the spot and stalk season dates to match harvest objective season dates.

**AMENDMED MOTION PASSES:** Unanimously

**ORIGINAL MOTION PASSES:** 8 in favor, 1 opposed

SER **MOTION:** To adopt the Utah Houndsman Association proposal to prohibit the take of collared cougars on units not in predator management.  
**PASSES:** Unanimously

**MOTION:** To ask the director to consider changing the Beaver East Unit from a predator management unit, but keep the quota high enough to meet the recommendations made by the district biologist.

**PASSES:** 10 in favor, 1 opposed

**MOTION:** To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the division.

**PASSES:** Unanimously

NER **MOTION:** To prohibit the take of collared mountain lions statewide.  
**PASSES:** Unanimously

**MOTION:** To approve the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the division.

**PASSES:** Unanimously

# Central Region RAC Meeting

Video Conference

July 27, 2021

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/EF4v5OsQwHE>

**Tuesday July 27, 2021 6:00 pm**

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair   | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 2. Approval of Minutes<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair  | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update<br>– Brock McMillan, RAC chair  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 4. Regional Update<br>– Jason Vernon, Regional Supervisor  | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |
| 5. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022<br>- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator      | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 6. Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022<br>- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator | <b>ACTION</b>        |
| 7. Strawberry River WMA Habitat Management Plan<br>- Tory Mathis, NER Habitat Manager                        | <b>INFORMATIONAL</b> |

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at [www.wildlife.utah.gov](http://www.wildlife.utah.gov)  
*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.*

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
July 27, 2021  
Springville, Utah  
**Summary of Motions**

1) Approval of Agenda

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

**MOTION: To approve to approve the agenda as presented.**

2) Approval of May 11th Minutes

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

**MOTION: To approve the minutes of the May 11th Central Region RAC meeting as transcribed.**

3) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022

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

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

4) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022

The following motion was made by Ben Lower, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 11 to 1. Chase Crandall opposed.

**MOTION: To not allow the take of collared cougars within the six-unit study for the next three years, by the use of hounds, until revisited in 2025.**

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

**MOTION: To make a recommendation to the Director's office to extend the cougar spot & stalk hunt date beyond December 31<sup>st</sup>.**

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 10 to 2. Opposed by Danny Potts and Joshua Lenart.

**MOTION: To accept the balance of the motions as presented by the Division.**

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed

unanimously.

**MOTION: To have Brock McMillan continue as Central Region RAC Chair for the next two years.**

The following motion was made by A J Mower, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: To have Ben Lowder continue as Central Region RAC Co-Chair for the next two years.**



**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
July 27, 2021  
Online Attendance

**RAC Members**

Brock McMillan – RAC Chair	<b>Absent</b>
Luke Decker (online)	Jake Steele
Eric Reid	Steve Lund
Ken Strong	
Ben Lowder	
AJ Mower (online)	
Scott Jensen	<b>Excused</b>
Michael Christensen	
Danny Potts	
Josh Lenart	
Jim Shuler – New Non Consumptive Rep	
Chase Crandall – New Agriculture Rep (online)	

**Wildlife Board**

Gary Nielsen

**DWR Personnel**

Jason Vernon	Scott Root
Matt Briggs	Michael Christensen
Dale Liechty	Rusty Robinson
Elicia Cotcher	Wes Alexander
Darren DeBloois	

**Public invited to join online:** <https://youtu.be/EF4v5OsQwHE>

**Central Region RAC Meeting**  
 July 27, 2021  
 Springville, Utah  
<https://youtu.be/EF4v5OsQwHE>

<b>06:00:00</b>	RAC Chair Brock McMillan called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present on the broadcast. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations and public comments will be taken during the meeting.
<b>06:04:00</b>	<p><b>1) Approval of Agenda (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.</b></p>
<b>06:04:00</b>	<p><b>2) Approval of Minutes (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Ben Lowder and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: I move that we approve the May 11th minutes as transcribed.</b></p>
<b>06:10:00</b>	<p><b>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</b></p> <p>RAC Chair Brock McMillan updated the RAC.</p>
<b>06:06:00</b>	<p><b>4) DWR Update (Informational)</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
<b>06:13:00</b>	<p><b>5) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a>.</p>
<b>06:13:00</b>	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation</p>
<b>06:14:00</b>	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>None</p>
<b>06:16:00</b>	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>The RAC discussed one comment from one public to not increase the bobcat tags or extend the season.</p>
<b>06:18:00</b>	<p>Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Scott Jensen and passes unanimously.</p>

	<b>MOTION: To approve the Division’s recommendations as presented.</b>
<b>06:21:00</b>	<b>6) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (Action)</b> A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</a> .
<b>06:42:00</b>	<b>Public Questions</b> Core Huntsman/Utah Houndsmans Association – He and Darren discussed sheep on the Pahvant unit, evaluating allotments, adding triggers to the policy.
<b>06:45:00</b>	<b>Public Comments</b> Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation. Logan Christian/Mountain Lion Foundation: 3 recommendations: Supporting Beaver, East, have no more additional permits, Hunters not permitted to kill collared cougars. Sunday’s Hunt/Humane Society: Oppose recommendation changes. Corey Huntsman/Utah Houndsmens Association: Prohibit killing collared lions, with the aid of hounds, three-year plan. Brian Hoover: In support of Corey proposal, 2015-2025 management plan letter to the Board supporting study. Matt Farnsworth/Utah Houndsmens Association: Remove verbage from the rule section 4A problem on public lands, Beaver East unit, HB125, when a unit comes into and out of predator management through public process, move some HO units into LE and split units. Chase Brereton: Supports season dates and beaver trapping draw system.
<b>06:22:00</b>	<b>RAC Questions</b> The RAC asked whether spot and stock were unit specific, clarification on rule change and DWR study, number of collars and who pays for them, private-lands units success rate, depredation “hot-spots”, spot and stalk good on which units, HB clarification on Rule 23-16-10, monitoring of the 33 units and three-year predator management plan.
<b>07:06:00</b>	<b>RAC Discussion</b> RAC members discussed population numbers approved last year and data suggesting it is working well, expense of collaring cougars, support of the 3-year collared cougar study.
<b>07:18:00</b>	Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 <b>MOTIONS</b> The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Ken Strong and

	<p>passed 11 to 1. Chase opposed.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To not allow the take of collared cougars within the six-unit PMP study for the next three years, by the use of hounds, until revisited in 2025.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Scott Jensen, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To make a recommendation to the Director’s office to extend the cougar spot &amp; stalk hunt date beyond December 31<sup>st</sup>.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lower, seconded by Ken Strong and passed 10 to 2. Opposed by Joshua Lenart and Danny Potts.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the balance of the motions as presented by the Division.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To have Brock McMillan continue as Central Region RAC Chair for the next two years.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by AJ Mower, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To have Ben Lowder continue as Central Region RAC Co-Chair for the next two years.</b></p>
<p><b>07:45:00</b></p>	<p>Chair &amp; Co-Chair Vote</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MOTIONS</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Scott Jensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To have Brock McMillan continue as Central Region RAC Chair for the next two years.</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by AJ Mower, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To have Ben Lowder continue as Central Region RAC Co-Chair for the next two years.</b></p>
<p><b>08:00:00</b></p>	<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>

# Regional Advisory Council Meeting

Weber County Commission Chamber

Ogden, Utah

July 28, 2021

The meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/MVqq5jzdHwI>

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure  
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes  
- RAC Chair **ACTION**
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update  
- RAC Chair **INFORMATIONAL**
4. Regional Update  
- DWR Regional Supervisor **INFORMATIONAL**
5. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022  
- Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator **ACTION**
6. Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022  
- Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator **ACTION**

**Presentations can be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html> Public Comment can be provided by clicking the link under the presentation.**

CR RAC – July 27th, 6:00 PM  
Wildlife Resource Conference Room  
1115 N. Main Street, Springville  
<https://youtu.be/EF4v5OsQwHE>

SER RAC – August 4th, 6:30 PM  
John Wesley Powell Museum  
1765 E. Main St., Green River  
<https://youtu.be/xWeo-629MIU>

NR RAC – July 28th, 6:00 PM  
Weber County Commission Chambers  
2380 Washington Blvd. #240, Ogden  
<https://youtu.be/MVqq5jzdHwI>

NER RAC – August 5th, 6:30 PM  
Wildlife Resources Conference Rm 318 North  
Vernal Ave, Vernal  
<https://youtu.be/f5VA1-ki2to>

SR RAC – August 3rd, 7:00 PM  
DNR Cedar City Complex  
646 N. Main St., Cedar City  
<https://youtu.be/fiDJvakgJQg>

Board Meeting – August 26th, 9:00 AM  
Dept. of Natural Resources  
1594 W. North Temple, SLC  
<https://youtu.be/jjtXvHdKVfE>

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
Summary of Motions**

- 1) Approval of Agenda and Minutes of May 12, 2021 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by , seconded by and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move to approve the Agenda and Minutes.**

- 2) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Emily Jensco and passed For: 6, Against: 3. Casey Snider, Junior Goring and David Earl.

**MOTION: I move that we accept Furbearer and Bobcat harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 as presented, except leave the current cap in place.**

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Brad Buchanan and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board look into furbearers for nonresident furbearer licenses and into a draw for beaver trapping in currently closed areas.**

- 3) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Matt Klar and fails, For:3, Against: 6.

**MOTION: I move that we recommend not allowing the take of collared lions statewide with the use of hounds, other than for depredation or spot and stalk.**

The following motion was made by Junior Goring, seconded by David Earl and passed. For: 8, Against:1. Casey Snider

**MOTION: I move we not allow the take of collared lions in the 6 study areas in the CRO, with the exception of depredation or spot and stalk.**

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Junior Goring and passes unanimous.

**MOTION: I move to accept the remainder of Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revision for 2021-2022 as presented.**

DRAFT

**Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**  
July 28, 2021  
Attendance

**RAC Members**

Mike Laughter – Vice Chair  
Ben Nadolski- Exec Secretary

Ryan Brown  
Brad Buchanan  
David Earl  
Junior Goring  
Randy Hutchison

Emily Jensco  
Matt Klar  
Darren Parry  
Casey Snider

**Board Member**

**RAC Excused**

Paul Chase  
Kevin McLeod  
Justin Oliver

**Division Personnel**

Jodie Anderson  
Hayley Smith  
Darren DeBloois  
Sydney Lamb  
Jim Christensen  
Eric Anderson

Mike Christensen  
David Smedley  
David Beveridge  
Trevor Doman



**Regional Advisory Council Meeting**

July 28, 2021

Attendance

<https://youtu.be/MVqq5jzdHwI>

**00:01:07** Vice-Chair Mike Laughter called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures.

**00:06:02** 1) **Approval of Agenda and Minutes of May 12, 2021 (Action)**

The following motion was made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.**

**00:06:31** 2) **Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Ben Nadolski**

\*Waterfowl- Approved Divisions recommendations not to allow guides on WMA's as presented with caveat that we form a working group to gather information and bring back to the board. Motion failed for lack of a second. Next motion was to establish a special use permit for guided waterfowl hunting waterfowl management areas for the 2021 season and guides need to apply for this permit. That motion passed unanimously. Next motion was to form a working group to establish guiding rules and regulations and licensing waterfowl guides in the state of Utah which passed unanimously. Next motion was to accept the remainder of the balance of the Divisions recommendations which passed unanimously.

\*Electronic meeting rule amendments passed unanimously.

\*Conservation permit list for 3 years and that tag allocation was passed unanimously.

\*CWMU advisory vacancies as presented passed unanimously.

\*Sage grouse hunts on Parker Mountain closed due to lower than expected numbers passed unanimously.

\*Election of board leadership passed unanimously.

\*Hearing results to discuss wildlife code violations by Mr. Stubbs passed 4-3.

**00:09:58** 3) **Regional Update- Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**

Process for monitoring drought conditions. Agricultural depredation and conflicts. CWMU renewal applications. Opportunities for joining biologists in the field. Great Salt Lake levels low and challenges. Vacancy in law enforcement. Busy with aquatic

invasive species. Willard Bay wipers stocked. Kokane salmon introduction. New population of western pearl shell. Emergency regulations for drought conditions in fisheries. Maintaining WMA's and fire restrictions.

**00:22 :03** 4) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (Action)

Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**00:22:38** **Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Recommendation to remove cap and pelt price. Expectations on how many more animals will be taken. Concerns about prey. Management plan to be reviewed as necessary. Research on bobcats and metrics. Discussion about committee to be put together to revise plan. Measure of population on kit fox and harvest.

**00:28:47** **Electronic Public/Public Comment**

5 total responses. 20% strongly agree, 80% strongly disagree. Comments about not having enough bobcats to justify increases. Ethics of trapping being cruel. Social media groups and talk of live trapping. Reduced tags make people be more selective about animals they are taking. Proposal for non-resident trappers have to buy a furbearer license for protected and non-protected species. Second proposal to open Blacksmith and Woodruff for beaver to a draw unit. Out of state license clarification and management authority.

**00:36:27** **RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison seconded by Emily Jensco and passed For: 6 Against: 3. Casey Snider, Junior Goring and David Earl

**MOTION: I move that we accept Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 as presented, except leave the current cap in place.**

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Brad Buchanan and passed unanimously.

**MOTION: Recommend the Wildlife Board look into furbearers for nonresident furbearer licenses and into a draw for beaver trapping in currently closed areas.**

**00:47:21** 5) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (Action)

Presentations could be viewed at <https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html>

**00:47:54 Questions from RAC Members/Public**

Reduction in Box Elder justification. Calculating take on private ground. Recommend eliminating cap on cougars. Harvest of cougars from last year and predator management law. High probability and impact. Expect to see reduction statewide. Study on fawn survival. Lowering predator numbers to let population come back. Proposal from Houndsmen Association and study looking at cougars and scavenging rates in the central part of the state.

**01:02:23 Electronic Public/Public Comment**

Mule deer permits justification due to drought. Explanation of increase in elk permits. 5 total participants in online survey. 1 strongly agreed, 1 neither agreed nor disagree, 1 somewhat disagree and 1 strongly disagree. Comment made in opposition due to mule deer herds struggling. Comment specific to chronic wasting disease and carrying capacity. UHA email sent regarding the cougar study and proposal to prohibit the kill of collared lions with the aid of hounds on the 6 units within the study boundaries for a 3-year duration. Suggest a revamped cougar management plan and implement a 3-year protection. Concern about opportunity taken away if this passes. UHA comments regarding data collection, management opportunities and how the plan asks for additional study objectives. Informational items regarding removal of public lands verbiage in the rule. Beaver east moving to predator management designation. Action item to the division regarding establishing documentation and publishing criteria for moving into or out of a management plan. Moving lion to focused areas and split units. Western wildlife conservancy opposes the plan regarding cougars and increasing predator management units. Mountain lion foundation recommends not adding the Beaver east unit to predator management status until clear criteria is established. Opportunity for public to provide feedback. Support UHA comments and recommendations. Reevaluate objectives and set realistic targets and factor in impacts of domestic livestock and disease transmission. Humane society opposes recommended changes for cougar and bobcat including increase in bobcat hunting permits and the use of predator management plans for cougars.

**01:32:02 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

Spot and stalk numbers. Predator management plan process. Collared cats in Northern Utah. Sportsmen and livestock collaring lambs. Central meeting and opinion regarding jurisdiction. Spot and stalk not effective. Collar depredating cat and identification.

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Matt Klar and fails. For: 3 Against: 6. Casey Snider, Junior Goring, David Earl, Emily Jensco, Brad

Buchanan, Darren Parry

**MOTION: I move we recommend not allowing the take of collared lions statewide with the use of hounds, other than for depredation or spot and stalk.**

The following motion was made by Junior Goring, seconded by David Earl and passed For: 8 Against: 1. Casey Snider

**MOTION: I move we not allow the take of collared lions in the 6 study areas in the CRO, with the exception of depredation or spot and stalk.**

**\* Mike Laughter- For the minutes. Kevin McCloud was not present for the meeting and was having trouble getting on.**

The following motion was made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Junior Goring and passes unanimous.

**MOTION: I move to accept the remainder of Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revision for 2021-2022 as presented.**

**02:05:22** Meeting Adjourned. Motion to Adjourn: Made by Ryan Brown, seconded by Matt Klar.

DRAFT

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting**  
**August 3, 2021**  
**6:00 p.m.**

**Attendance**

**RAC MEMBERS**

Brayden Richmond	Austin Atkinson
Craig Laub	Gene Boardman
Verland King	Chad Utley
Nick Jorgensen	Chuck Chamberlain
Dan Fletcher (video)	Tammy Pearson

**Division Personnel**

Kevin Bunnell	Darren DeBloois	Alyssa Jackson
Mike Wardle (media)	Denise Gilgen	Kyle Christensen (media)
Jason Nicholes	Paul Washburn	Teresa Griffin
	Tyrell Orme	

**Wildlife Board Members**

Wade Heaton (video)

**00:00:01 1) Welcome**

Chairman Brayden Richmond called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC Members introduce themselves.

**Brayden Richmond:** Just a couple reminders on the RAC procedure, it's been so long since we've had public here. Just a quick reminder, we'll go through each agenda item. With this new process it's been great. The plan is, even though we're back to live sessions, we'll continue to share the proposals online so people have a chance to view those ahead of time. We really appreciate the Division doing that. That's going to help these meetings a lot I believe. So what we'll do is we'll open it up for questions from the public, then we'll do questions from the RAC, then we'll do discussion. That will be the general procedure as we go along. With that said, let's jump into item number two. We need to approve the agenda and the minutes. Does anyone want to make a motion there?

**00:02:03 2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**

**The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Chuck Chamberlain.**

**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda and minutes as presented.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**00:02:26 3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update by RAC Chair, Brayden Richmond**

**Brayden Richmond:** Wildlife Board meeting update. Let me go through that, item by item. Again, a fairly big Wildlife Board meeting. We had a motion, the waterfowl rule amendment. There was a motion made by Randy Dearth that failed for a lack of a second; the motion was that we approve the Divisions recommendations are presented with the caveat that we form a working group to get together and bring information back to the Board. There was another motion by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bret Selman that past; and that was that the Division issue a special use permit for the guided waterfowl hunting on waterfowl management areas for the 2021 season and the guides that hunt on WMAs would need to apply for this permit.

There was another motion made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Wade Heaton that passed unanimous. It was, I moved to form a working group to establish guiding rules and regulations and licensing waterfowl guides in the state of Utah.

Another motion was made by Kevin Albrecht and seconded by Donny Hunter that passed unanimous. That motion was to accept the remainder of the Divisions recommendations as presented.

The next action item was the electronic meeting rules and amendments. There was a motion made by Donny Hunter and seconded by Randy Dearth that was unanimous. That was to accept the Divisions rule amendments as presented.

Next was conservation permit list, the three-year permit lists. There was a motion made by Karl Hirst, and seconded by Bret Selman, and that passed unanimous. That motion was to approve the conservation tag allowance as presented.

Next agenda item was the advisory committee vacancy, there was a motion by Randy Dearth and Kevin Albrecht that passed unanimous. The motion was to accept the CWMU committee as presented.

Next agenda item was the Parker Sage Grouse hunt closures. Motion made by Wade Heaton, seconded by Kevin Albrecht, passed unanimously. The motion was to approve the Parker Sage Grouse hunt closure as presented.

The other business was the election of a Chair and a Vice Chair. The following motion was made by Byron Bateman, seconded by Randy Dearth, passed unanimous that Kevin Albrecht would serve as the Wildlife Board Chair. Then a second motion made by Byron, seconded by Wade Heaton that Randy Dearth would serve as the Vice Chair.

There are all the minutes and motions from the Wildlife Board Meeting. Any questions or comments there, that anyone has? Ok, with that I'll turn it over to Kevin to go over any regional updates.

**00:06:14 4) Regional Update (Informational)**  
**Kevin Bunnell, SRO Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** Thank you Brayden. First let's talk about the habitat conditions and what we've got going on. Certainly the rains are helping, that we've been getting. Our upper elevations look pretty good, everything above 7,00-7,500 feet around the region is in pretty good shape. From there going down on elevation it gets less and less good the lower you go. Our lowest elevations haven't shown any response to the rain until the last four or five days, we really started to see some green up. As I've driven around the region, I'd say it looks how it should in May instead of August. Just kind of starting to show some growth. A lot of those ranges didn't even germinate earlier in the year. Things are getting better, but they're still not great. I guess the bottom line is we'll take the rain, but you don't end two years of drought with three weeks of rain. I guess I'd ask our BLM and Forest Service reps if they have anything they'd like to add to that in terms of what it looks like on the mountain, Chuck, and what you're hearing.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Things are looking better, but we've had some of our water stations record 400% of normal for the month of July. So it's brought us from 55% in the water here to 75%. Most of that water is coming straight off the mountain so it's not infiltrating like it should, so infiltration rates are low. We're still behind, it takes snow pack to catch up to what we need. So, we're still waiting.

**Dan Fletcher:** I second everything that's been said. Our higher elevations are starting to come along with a little bit of green up. Lower elevations are still suffering, we haven't had a green up at all in a lot of cases. The rain out in the West Desert has been fast, and we've had some erosion and some run off in a lot of areas. We'll take the rain when we can get it, and hopefully we get a good snow pack so we can start catching up here.

**Craig Laub:** As far as farmers it's kind of a catch 22. The rain is good and we love it, but some have been struggling to put up hay too, so that's the down side of it.

**Verland King:** Over in Wayne County we don't put up much hay, so my prayers were answered with praying for black hay. We got two inches of rain the day before yesterday, so I have to put my sprinkler system back together. But it's really helped, the rains. Like they said it's like May. It's the first time on record that the cows are eating the same time as the elk.



**Gene Boardman:** Up on Southwest Desert on my side of it, we didn't get any rain.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Still struggling hard. I haven't been out west much, but that's good to know, thank you. Anybody else? Ok, let's move on continuing with our habitat section. We've closed all of our Wildlife Management areas to any kind of open flames following the restrictions that were in place for the rest of the state. We've also closed the Filmore shooting range, because we actually had a fire that was started by target shooting up there. We think we're in a place where we've gone and done some mitigation and removed vegetation and that aligned with the moisture, we're hoping to reopen the Filmore shooting range this Friday. That will provide a place for folks around Filmore to go again.

In our aquatic section. Water levels are still really low, I drove past Otter Creek and Koosharem Reservoirs today. Otter Creek is maybe holding steady right now with the rain, Koosharem is dry, there is no water in Koosharem Reservoir at all. We'll stick with our regulation changes in all of our reservoirs. I think they're scheduled to go through the end of September, or end of October. We're still going to be in a situation where fish are going to struggle. I know Minersville Reservoir has been rediscovered by a lot of people, now that they can fish with bait for a little bit. I'm glad people have had a chance to take advantage of that. It will take us time to rebuild those fisheries. It's not going to happen overnight. It will be three to five years of good water conditions to get some of those fisheries back. And that's just the reality of what it will take. Last thing on aquatics, we're trying to schedule a public meeting to discuss rotenone treatment at Navajo Lake, it's been taken over by Utah Chubs. So we're reaching out to the folks up in Duck Creek. We have visited with the folks in Iron County and Kanab County Commissions, they're both fully supportive of us taking that. We just want to make sure that we're including the public and getting comment back on that. That hasn't been scheduled yet, but it will be upcoming in the next couple of weeks.

Wildlife section is in the middle of their elk classifications right now. Cow to calf ratios are low, as we would expect with poor condition of the adults coming off the range. As the information that we're getting off all our collars is our fawn to doe ratios, or fawn survival is going to be pretty low as well. So again, it's going to three to five years of good moisture to rebuild a good fish population, I think it's going to take the same of good moisture conditions to rebuild our deer populations. So we'll keep monitoring that and doing what we can to mitigate those impacts. As in most dry years, we've dealt with a number of bears around the region. We haven't had any real serious issues, but we've captured a few bears and dealt with them. We've moved some nuisance beavers around from places where people don't want them, to places where they can do some good up in higher elevations.

Moving on to Law Enforcement, we're currently down six officers in our region. We're at six out of eleven, so we're at less than half capacity in our law enforcement. We've had a number of officers that have accepted promotions, which we're thrilled for

them. But we're short staffed right now so I hope people will be understanding that there will be some longer response times than what people are used to.

That's all I've got for an update unless there are any questions, I'd be happy to try and answer them.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Kevin. Let's move on. The first agenda item we have is the Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendation. Then after that we'll go into the cougars. We'll start with the bobcat harvest recommendations.

**00:14:25 5) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (Action) - Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<http://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

**00:14:41 Questions from RAC Members**

**Darren DeBlois:** I can summarize. Most of the furbearer stuff is the same. We changed the dates for the year for bobcats. We've seen a couple of metrics come back within compliance of the plan we recommend extending the season an additional week on the front end, which is not a full season, it's a bit shorter. And go ahead and allow individuals to go back to six permits per person and removing the cap. So that's kind of it in a nut shell.

**Gene Boardman:** The plan is statewide, and the bobcat situation looks pretty good statewide, but I'm wondering about the southern region, because we cut everything back because of the drought. I'm wondering about that.

**Darren DeBlois:** It seems like there are two things that drive bobcat harvest, one is small mammal population, so as those cycle we expect to see a response in bobcats. Talking to our upland game coordinator, they do things like rabbit routes and that's been down, it's up a little bit, so that can contribute. We saw a lot of juveniles in the harvest, which indicates statewide that there's been a birth pulse and that there have been young that have been produced. We look at it every year, in a perfect world we'd have some kind of population metric, but we do the best we can. We can't go out and count bobcats, so we have to use what we can, and that's what the plan prescribes. It's within the plan guidelines. The other thing that drives population harvest is pelt price, knowing when pelt price is up, people tend to take a lot, when pelt price is down they tend to not take as much. Those two things really are the drivers.

**Austin Atkinson:** Quick question, how fast has that permit cap been selling out in years past?

**Darren DeBlois:** That's a good question. I'd probably have to get back to you on that. It goes pretty quick. People jump in line and it does obviously sell out, so people get in and get what they can. A lot of times when you limit the numbers of what people can get, a lot of people in the family suddenly become interested in trapping. So those permits go.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Denise and Alyssa, do you guys remember from last year how quickly we sold out of bobcat permits? Ok, so best guess maybe a week or so.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** I have a question on the cap, have we ever just taken the cap off before?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, we just put the cap in place a couple of years ago. Again according to our metric guidelines we had all our metrics outside of our management objectives, so those are some of the remedies we use. For the duration of the plan there hasn't been a cap, I think this is the first time.. Do you remember a time Kevin, reducing the cap after the new bobcat?

**Kevin Bunnell:** The bobcat plan is super cryptic on that Chuck, so it outlines when there is a cap, and when there isn't. How many metrics are inside or outside of normal? We followed it when we needed to put the cap on according to the plan. Now those metrics are in normal ranges so the plan would prescribe that the cap come off, so that's why.

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, the plan has a base line, a season length, no cap, and six permits per individual. That's kind of what we aim to maintain, but obviously if we see negative metrics, we reduce.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** So we have a pretty good feel for what's going to happen when we take the cap off?

**Darren DeBlois:** We'll see a lot of permits, and then we'll watch it. We look at bobcats every year, so if we feel like we took a lot of bobcats, and pelt prices are up, we'll come back with a different recommendation.

**Brayden Richmond:** Good questions. Any additional questions? Ok, we'll take questions from the public.

#### **00:19:58 Questions from the public**

**Brayden Richmond:** As you come up, please state your name, and your question. No questions from the public. Kevin do you want to summarize the input we got?

**00:20:12 Electronic Public Comment Report (Informational) - Kevin Bunnell, SRO  
Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** This one is really easy. We had no public comments on furbearer and bobcat recommendations.

**Brayden Richmond:** Pretty easy. Alright, comments from the public? We don't have any cards, so we'll assume we don't have any comments. There are only a few people here, so if someone wanted to jump up, we'd let you. But we'll keep moving along. Comments and discussion from the RAC?

**00:20:43 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

**Brayden Richmond:** Man, the questions must have solved all the concern. If there are no comments, then we'd entertain a motion.

**The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Verland King.**

**MOTION: To accept the Divisions proposal as presented.  
Motion passed unanimous**

**00:21:53 6) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022  
(Action) - Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator**  
Presentations could be viewed at  
<http://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

**Brayden Richmond:** Again, we'll start with questions from the RAC.

**00:21:58 Questions and comments from RAC Members**

**Darren DeBloois:** If it's alright with the Chair and the RAC I think we've had a couple of meetings and I think if we could run through predator management plans a little bit that might be helpful to our discussion a little bit.

**Brayden Richmond:** That would be great. Also I was going to ask you in the Central RAC, you described why you didn't think it was appropriate to reconvene the cougar committee at this time, even with the legislative changes. I think that would be great to cover right now, I thought your explanation was really good.

**Darren DeBloois:** Ok, I'll do both. First of all, I think there is some confusion. In the presentation I kind of went through the process of why predator management plans are a thing, and I kind of went through the process of the recent legislation that requires the Director to take immediate action if we see ungulate population failing to meet objectives. But I think there is a little bit of gray area or confusion on how these plans got

implemented or how did they cease to be in effect. So I thought I would take just a minute and walk through that.

We do have a policy, so when the legislature acted, one of the caveats in the language is that the Division needs to determine if predators are causing or contributing to the decline in those ungulate populations. So we went to the literature and put our heads together to make a policy to try and determine when that was the case. I'm going to focus on deer, predator management plans do include possibility of elk populations and big horn sheep populations. But most of the time we're talking about deer objectives, so I'll stick to that. If anyone has any questions about sheep or something like that I'll go into that.

There are really two instances when we would recommend a predator management plan for a deer herd that is failing. One is fairly obvious, and that is when we see cause specific mortality from cougars at a high level. A good example of that is the Manti. We have collars on a lot of animal around the state, so we go and examine those animals when they die and try to determine the cause of death. The Manti we're seeing 20-30% cougar mortality on adult does. Overall doe survival was about 79%, if I remember right, and that's unusual. We also saw deer that were in really good body conditions, so they weren't limited by habitat. It looked like a predator, a top-down predation that caused suppression of that herd. So in that case we implemented predator management to that herd to try and reduce the density of cougars on those herds and let that deer herd recover. It has been one year, but we have seen that cause specific mortality decrease. So now we're seeing about 97% adult deer survival on the Manti, and that's after one year predator management on the Manti. Keep in mind, we have fairly high quotas on Manti prior to that, so even working the problem that's an example of cause specific. You want to go in because you can see that cougars are killing a lot, especially adults and young as well.

The second instance is what we're experiencing in a lot of the state as well, and that's an environmental factor, a drought. It causes those mule deer populations that were at a fairly high level, and maybe approaching what the range could sustain, crash. Because of a duration of two or three years.. it could be winter or a drought, especially in the southern part of the state. What happens is you have a high level of prey animals supporting a level of predators and they're kind of in sync. That predator population will eventually decline, but it doesn't decline right away. You're carrying a high level of predators on the range and they can exert and increase the amount of pressure that is on a deer herd that's already crashed or significantly declined. Literature also shows that if a deer population is already significantly below the carrying capacity of the habitat, that's really when predators can have the most affect. Once they get close to what the range can sustain, then other things would kill them. If a cougar didn't get them then they'd starve to death in the winter so it becomes less affective. So in those cases what we're trying to do is reduce the density of predators, bring those populations more in line and then move on from there. So that's a couple of instances of how these plans are implemented. Now how do we get out? When do we determine if a plan has done what we want it to do? First of all typically one year isn't enough, so we plan to run these plans for three years. We evaluate them twice a year though. We look at them in July and again in December. We try to see first of all if we're having the desired affect on the predator population. Generally we want to see females in the harvest above 40% to see a decline in overall

cougar populations. The second thing we look at is what's the mule deer herd doing. So the Manti is another good example. We had in the 70's for adult deer survival we're seeing that come up to 97%. We want to see how that plays out. If that remains the case, then you could argue that the outcome of the predator management plan has dealt with the problem. This is all to do with big game populations with things like depredation, that's another thing I'd be happy to talk about, but predator management plans are focused on those wild ungulate populations.

Hopefully that's helpful. We'll talk more about it because we have some proposals tonight. The only other thing I'd add is predator management plans are Director action. So he's required to act immediately when we see these things. That's something that the RAC doesn't get to vote on, and the Board doesn't get to vote on, because the Director does that under his authority. We inform the RACs about what's going on, but it's not something that is an action item typically.

**Kevin Bunnell:** That's the way the legislation set it up, not a choice that we made. That's what we get directed to do by legislation.

**Darren DeBlois:** Right. So obviously I'd be happy to answer any questions that arise, because I know it will be a topic of discussion. I just wanted to clarify; I think it was a little bit of a black box based on the discussion we had in the last couple of meetings.

As far as the plan goes, we did need to do a review of the cougar plan, the sunset is in 2025 but five years prior to the sunset the plan calls for a review. In light of the legislative changes, we took a look internally to see if we needed to have a committee come together. We felt like we did need to make some tweaks, and you saw those in the presentation of the plan, but overall we didn't feel like there were any new metrics that came out in the last couple of years that needed to be changed. When cougar populations are not under predator management plans, we felt like the plan is still sufficient to manage those population at the moment. We did an internal review, we made some recommended changes in order to reflect the new legislation, but we didn't elect to put a new committee together yet. Having said that, there are a lot of things that are going to be coming together over the next few years. USU is going to be wrapping up the study they've been doing. They're going to try to try to develop a population model based on their data. That will be something new that we haven't had. We've had a way to estimate population based on female survival and kitten survival, so that will be something new. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife is drafting a cougar update to their cougar guidelines that will be out in the next year or two, and that will be a tool we use. We anticipate putting a group together for the next rounds, we're probably looking at 2024 for putting a committee together for that plan coming up for sunset in 2025. Does that help, Brayden?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yes thank you, I thought that was a great explanation. When you said that at the Central I felt like that really helped clarify some things. Thank you again.

**Darren DeBlois:** The only other thing I wanted to add was Amy Canning noticed a typo or an error in the presentation I wanted to clarify. On the La Sal's, San Juan Mountains, and Book Cliffs East units we have a restriction on hounds for people that don't have bear permits, and we got the dates off by a day. So after the 13<sup>th</sup> of April, it was the 14<sup>th</sup>, so after the 13<sup>th</sup> of April, hounds would be allowed on those units for pursuit unless they had a bear permit in their pocket. It's the same as it was last year, we just didn't shift the day right when we were going through everything.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, when we get to that point do we need our recommendation to be passed as presented except for that date, or if we pass as presented..

**Darren DeBlois:** I'm presenting that now, that's our recommendation. I think you'll be good if you pass as presented. That's all I have, I'm obviously open for questions.

**Gene Boardman:** I've got a couple of questions. If I understand it right, from listening to the other RAC and what I've read, there is like 53 different cougar units. The legislature and Director are managing 33 of them and the Wildlife Board gets to manage 20?

**Darren DeBlois:** There are 33 that are under predator management plans, yes. And there are 20 that we're talking about tonight. That's correct.

**Gene Boardman:** And the 33 basically because of what the legislation has done have been taken out of the Boards jurisdiction?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, the Director has acted on those already.

**Gene Boardman:** Ok. This is probably a question that should be directed to others, but isn't the legislative action that says the Board is supposed to be responsible for managing cougars?

**Darren DeBlois:** Ultimately the state legislature trumps all. The legislature established the Board and it does give the Board authority to make decisions on Wildlife issues. The legislature is the people's representatives and ultimately they have the authority. So the way it works is, they pass the law and give responsibilities to different agencies and groups, and the governor is responsible for executing legislation they passed. So yeah, it certainly is within their authority to make changes to those rules. Hopefully that answers your question.

**Gene Boardman:** Otherwise given to the Board. Ok. When and how do these units come out of predator management?

**Darren DeBlois:** It depends on the unit. Generally speaking, we can talk about specific units if you want within the region. We'll have our biologists come up. One thing we wanted to do when we wrote the new policy is put the authority and power back to the

district biologist level. So the district biologist have a lot of leeway in making these decisions. They're the ones on the ground, they understand the populations, they understand what's going on locally, so we really want to have their input. We ask them to tell us why, give us a justification to why it's going to predator management and articulate what conditions they would look at to bring them out. Generally speaking, the conditions to bring those out of predator management is reversal of what they saw in the first place. A lot of times those are when we see these conditions improve then they'll come out. That being said there are times when we think predators aren't an issue, and they're not so we look at that as well. If it looks like we reduce predator densities and the deer aren't responding, then that would be another instance where that would come out. But we really do leave that up to our district biologist and our regional managers. We want them to make the decisions as they know what's going on the best, locally.

**Gene Boardman:** But do they have any authority? Or do they just make recommendations?

**Darren DeBlois:** Well we all just make recommendations to the RACs and the ultimately the Board is who has the ability to enact things. So far as I'm concerned, I put a lot of weight in what our biologists and regional managers send up to me. That's by design, I spent most of my career in a region as a district biologist so maybe that's my biased, but I really do feel like the person on the ground that knows the local community, knows the unit, knows what's going on ought to be the one making those calls. So that's really what I've emphasized and what I try to do.

**Gene Boardman:** But the Director put them in and he's the only one that can take them out, right?

**Darren DeBlois:** The Director will enact them, but we're relying on our district folks to make those recommendations to the RAC.

**Gene Boardman:** But still, he's the only one that can take it out?

**Darren DeBlois:** Right, but we'll do that based on the regional recommendation. So if the district biologist and the manager says hey, we feel like this isn't working, it will come out.

**Gene Boardman:** Ok, I've got one more. Can you envision a scenario where the cougar predation would be beneficial such as with a disease in the herd?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, it's something we'd want to take into consideration. If you had high levels of Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) there is probably some things that you'd want to do on the deer side as well. And I know that our big game folks have looked at that. I think in general we'd want to make sure, if we have to reduce herds based on a disease, it probably wouldn't make a lot of sense to do a lot of predator work, it kind of depends on what's going on in the unit; there might be some prey switching. It gets complicated, but certainly there would be some scenarios. There have been some



units that we've opted not... where a unit might qualify but we've struggled to get quotas in the past, and we could open the flood gates, but it's not going to increase harvest, so let's leave it under the plan and see if there is another way to address it. There is certainly instances of that.

**Tammy Pearson:** Gene had some really intricate questions there, mine is just simple. If you have your committee, is it a state wide committee? It's not a regional committee?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah. Just like all of our other plan committees, we want representatives from all interest groups, so we'll bring some big game folks, predator folks, agricultural folks, just any group that is affected by these animals we'd want to have representation as we've done in the past.

**Verland King:** Some of the emails that we received, it seemed like the predator management plan was a swear word. It seemed like you're comfortable with it, are you? I like the idea, maybe it's a comment, but being able to do something now. Because my experience with DWR and some other things, is that it's so slow, and by the time the action gets taken, it's too late.

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah. That's what the legislature wanted to emphasize, is that we don't always have a year to wait. If we start seeing problems in the winter and we're going to wait until July to make some decisions, we need a mechanism for the Director to say, hey we're going to have a really hard winter we need to reduce predator densities as these deer populations crash and the Director has authority to do that.

I don't know if it helps Gene, but we did bring the policy around last year I think it was. So the Board did have a chance to vote on the policy. They certainly did have a chance to weigh in on how we implement these plans. That's the idea is to be able to act fast and hopefully you're not a year down the road trying to play catch up. The reason why I think there are so many units in predator management right now, is just look out your door and see what's going on out there on the landscape. We've seen a couple of really bad years for mule deer and it's state wide. We'll see going forward how things pan out, but right now were concerned about deer numbers.

**Austin Atkinson:** I have a couple of questions. If that predator management plan is turned off, or we pull a unit out of that, and that happens mid-season, what happens to that unit then? Does it roll back from unlimited to a harvest objective? Or where would that sit?

**Darren DeBlois:** It would most likely go to harvest objective, so we'd set a quota. The goal is once it goes out of predator management is to get back to the plan guidelines. So we'd look at what our current females in the harvest for the unit. If it's 50% for example, we'd look at where we were with the quota before or how many were harvested and make a determination on how to get back to that. I wouldn't expect it to change overnight, so it could take a couple of years to get back to where you're in sync again with those metrics. I would expect to see us adjust a little bit. There is also going to

be some time for that population to sort of stabilize too. With high harvest we'd expect to see a lot of young cougar's sort of coming and going within the units. Especially if older cats have been taken out of the area, and that would take a little bit to settle out. So we'd expect to see older age classes maybe not come back quite as quickly as maybe females in the harvest, that sort of thing. As it takes sometimes to get a reduction in population numbers, we expect to take some time to kind of come back to how it was before. And maybe that's not the management goal, maybe we'd like to manage it a little lower density, and we'd make adjustments there. But the bottom line is there within the plan guidelines. So if we kicked above 50% females, or 40% females in the harvest we'd make a reduction in harvest objective for that unit.

**Austin Atkinson:** To clarify that, when it gets above 40% female harvest, even on a predator management plan unit, is there a trigger there? I'm trying to understand if we're hurting the population, do we know if we're hurting the cougar population or not?

**Darren DeBlois:** What we determine when we went through the plan was that was based off some research from Colorado, and a lot of research from Utah, that was sort of a threshold above 40% you'd start to see a decline in cougar densities in an area, so that's why we use that as a trigger. The objective under predator management is to be above 40%, that would indicate that we're decreasing cougar densities on that hunt unit. Once it comes out of predator management then the plan would apply and we'd be managing to make sure we're under 40%. Does that answer your question?

**Austin Atkinson:** Yeah, I think it does. What I'm trying to understand, is if it's above 40 we say it's working, but say we go to 80% females killed; is there a trigger to turn it off?

**Darren DeBlois:** That would depend on the individual plan. I don't think we have any plans that have that as a trigger. We're usually looking for more response from the prey population. Then just as a practical matter unless you had a very small harvest, 80% you just don't generally see that. You've got a lot of transient males that kind of come and go, and they tend to be the most venerable animals in the unit. 80% wouldn't necessarily trigger something.

**Austin Atkinson:** I guess my question is, I was looking at current harvest to date on these unlimited units, and I don't know if 35 or 26 in one unit is good, bad, high, low, I don't know, cause I'm not a houndsman so I don't track that. So it's hard for me to say when there's no quota; is that high or low? And I don't know if you can interpret that?

**Darren DeBlois:** General rule of thumb, if the sample size is small and the total harvest is less than 10, it probably is just due to chance. If you've got 20-30 cougars that have been harvested that percentage is probably representative of what the houndsmen are taking, not necessarily what is available. They'll pass on females at times. As a rule of thumb, the closer to 40 you get the more stable that population would be. The further below 40 the more likely you are to see a growing population. The second thing to look at

is your adult age classes. Populations with a lot of older age class adults tend to be a little more stable than the ones that have a lot of juveniles showing up in the harvest.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Darren, I think what would be helpful in the future, if I can interpret Austin, instead of just giving a number of harvest if the plan is relying on the percent of females in the harvest put that number in there; so they can say we harvested 35 and 50% of them were.. you know what I mean? Let's put the number in the information.

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, that makes sense. Sure.

**Nick Jorgenson:** Even with these numbers and the objectives there is still some guess work that comes with the numbers in each area. How many years does it take, in experience, to stabilize a certain number in a certain unit?

**Darren DeBlois:** There has been a little bit of research. Monroe comes to mind that's one that's local, but correct me if I'm wrong Kevin, but my memory is they harvested fairly significantly on the Monroe for about three years. This is a study that Dr. Wolf at USU did. They did see a reduction in population on the Monroe. Once they backed off that and reduced the quotas fairly significantly within three years they were back to where they were to begin with. They can come back fast. One thing we see with our current GPS collars is that these animals move. This is a population that has a high interconnectivity throughout the state, especially up and down the Wasatch range, I'm talking about the mountain range that runs down the middle of the state. We see cats from Manti moving up through Echo over the Uinta's into Wyoming. We had one cat from the Cache that went up through the Uinta's and into Wyoming. We had another that went to the Tetons up by Jackson; and it's come back and now it's over by Twin Falls. These are female adult cats, so it's almost an interstate type of situation where you have animals coming and going. That's why if you back pressure off, they can come back really quickly. There is always this movement going on, usually young males, but we've certainly seen it in females as well.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Kind of piggybacking on Austin's question here, it sounds like, if I understand this, is our triggers to come out of a predator management plan is based off of prey and prey response and not on the predator themselves. Does that cause any concern that on an unlimited hunt that we could over harvest those and cause some damage?

**Darren DeBlois:** The objective would be to lower the density. With prey it could be a response or a lack of response. So with prey, if we see for example 40% harvest on mountain lions on a unit maybe over two to three years and see no response from the deer on the unit, the conclusion could be that maybe cougars weren't limiting. So that might be a possibility. The other thing I have spoken a little about this, but we have this source sync dynamic throughout the state. There's a lot of places in the state where people just can't access during the winter. Salt Lake County is a good example but there are these little pockets, these little areas throughout the state that tend to provide

cougars as they reproduce to other areas. It's a little bit of a safety valve, if we harvest really heavily on a particular unit, there are those source population that can feed back in. It's something we look at for sure, but there is some safety in the system that way.

**Austin Atkinson:** A couple more questions. The Henry Mountains for example, I hear that there are a lot of lions out there. Obviously it's hard to get to so a lot of people go, so we have an extremely low harvest. Do we have any other tools in the Divisions tool set to incentivize houndsmen to go over there, or is there any other mechanism to get more harvest over there? Or is it just leave it unlimited and hope gas prices drop?

**Darren DeBlois:** At this point we're going with the current strategy; we haven't talked about other incentives. We do have non-governmental organizations that have put some efforts in to some units on their own and increased harvest that way. But right now the Division isn't looking at anything additional.

**Austin Atkinson:** And a follow up to that, we have all these groups in Utah that love sheep, they love deer, they love elk, but do we have a need for more groups or sportsmen's groups to step up and help fund these studies. I know we've got BYU and U of U, but do we need more? Just to throw that out there.

**Darren DeBlois:** We do have funding sources when we sell.. we aren't currently offering cougar permit in conservation permits because of the situation we're under and things change so much. But we do have that as a funding source, and we can certainly approach organizations for funding, even if they don't sell lion permits. Then of course the houndsmen association, they're currently.. how many collars did you guys... six? They purchased six collars and these are \$1,100 collars. They purchased six collars to help us get off the ground with a study we're looking at in central Utah to look at scavenging rates. So, I don't feel a pinch, I feel like we've had the funding. In addition we can ask the Directors office for funding for projects. They've been willing to fund that. Typically we're looking to answer questions about management and how to improve our information for management; that's what USU is looking at, several things population, estimation, we're looking at how often bears steal cougar kills and how that affects cougar kill rates. Just some basic questions. Then of course other states are doing things that we can look at as well.

**Austin Atkinson:** One more question. I'm not a cougar hunter much myself, so I'm trying to go through the guidebook and I know you're going to go over simplification. I have some comments on that. But how do we decide if it's harvest objective or limited entry with harvest objective. And why are some units one way or another?

**Darren DeBlois:** So the way it will look in the new guidebook is basically we'll have two tables. We'll have one table that are all harvest objective units and on some unit the harvest objective will be unlimited, those are predator management units. Then you'll have some units that have a limited entry season, it has a harvest objective that is set by the biologist, but they'll have season set on the front end that's limited entry. So it's not

different than our split, but we're trying to get rid of that as kind of a third option, and hopefully simplify things a little bit. Generally units that have limited entry seasons, there are different reasons why you put them in, but generally they're units that don't have a lot of depredation concern and can handle kind of an exclusive opportunity for a small group of people on the front end. And we don't have deer concerns or those kinds of things. That's generally how we determine if we're going to put a limited entry season on a unit. There might be other reasons, recently on the Paunsaugunt we tried different strategies, you know if you draw a limited entry tag you're forced to hunt that unit, you can't just sort of pick and choose to try to get some harvest in a specific unit. That might be another reason why we'd want to do that. I don't know if it worked very well in that particular instance, but it was worth a try. Those might be some reasons why we would want to do that there. It's an option for a district biologist if they want to do that.

**Verland King:** On Austin's first question you mentioned non-government organizations. Could you mention who that would be?

**Darren DeBlois:** Groups like SFW, Mule Deer Foundation, groups like that sometimes. Even local groups like the Cache is one where they had some local folks that were concerned and put some extra effort. They're not an official group, but they had a group of guys that were concerned, they'd seen a lot of cause specific mortality from mountain lions on the Cache and they wanted to try and take more lions; so they sort of organized. Those sorts of things have been happening kind of organically, depending on the unit and some of the interest, but certainly that's happened.

**Tammy Pearson:** I've got a question. Isn't most of that funding coming through the legislature for the BYU or Utah State studies?

**Darren DeBlois:** Usually it's Pitman Robertson money. So when you buy firearms or ammunition, that money goes to the Federal Government and they allocate it through the states depending on the number of hunters you have. So it's a grant back to us. So it's not Utah tax payer money unless you bought a gun or bullets, in that way it is because you do pay a tax on those purchases. Then if you've purchased a hunting license, those types of things. So those efforts are funded by sportsmen. Even people who don't hunt, but like the shooting sports.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Tammy, I'm not aware of any research that has been funded directly from the legislature, that's almost all internal funding, and then from our partners.

**Tammy Pearson:** I just love during the legislature there are a lot of individual bills and grant money done for specific studies, everything scientific is done through Utah State, BYU and that. But there already has to be some sort of proposal and ran up the latter from representatives and sometimes it's backed by SFW or whoever. So there is a lot of that stuff going on, I just didn't know if this was part of it.

**Darren DeBlois:** Those groups they contribute a fair amount from those conservation programs as well, to different research projects. I mean these collar ungulate studies cost a lot of money. But we're learning amazing things from it, and that's been funded through those sources.

**Austin Atkinson:** One more follow up to that. To your knowledge Darren, has the Humane Society, the Mountain Lion Project, some of those organizations that spoke at other RACs, have they contributed anything to the BYU study or anything to that extent?

**Darren DeBlois:** No.

**Craig Laub:** Mine has to do with the spot and stalk. What kind of success rate are you expecting on that? Because my experience, if you feed a cougar and then take a shot at it I think I can count on one hand how many times I've seen one in the hills.

**Darren DeBlois:** We sold just over 1,000 spot and stalk permits last year. This isn't something that people are expecting a high success rate on. I believe the last time I looked about seven people of those thousand managed to kill a cougar. Having said that, there are some western states that don't allow the use of dogs for cougar hunting. They have higher success rates than that, but 99% of mountain lions taken in the state are taken with the use of dogs. People might get good at it, is what I'm saying. But this first year it was pretty low, and we expected that.

**Gene Boardman:** On this spot and stalk, I'm a little perplexed. They buy a license and there is a time limit on the license. (yeah there is a season) The harvest objective has a timeline on it. (yeah) But many cougar predator management units are supposed to be year-round, now if everyone's license expires, how are they open year-round?

**Darren DeBlois:** They'll be open for a full calendar year. So there are a couple of things we're proposing. Under the current system, you'd buy a permit and it's valid from usually November 3<sup>rd</sup>-ish, usually the first week in November, and that's good for the entire year. But most people are hunting the winter. So it would be good theoretically into next fall into November. Our harvest objective units have year-round seasons. They run from November-November, but most of the harvest takes place during that winter. We were proposing to change that up a little bit and come back in December and then start a July-to-July schedule, so you'd buy your permit in July and then you're really getting a full year. Especially the prime time to be in the field without that license expiring. The reason that spot and stalk permit is the way it is, is the legislation specifically says that the Director needs to provide an opportunity for big game hunters to hunt mountain lions while they're hunting big game, so we opened that during our big game seasons for most the duration of the big game season. That wouldn't change, there would still be some that run August 1- the end of December.

**Brayden Richmond:** Lots of good questions. That's why we're here is to ask questions, so we don't want to rush it. So any additional questions? Alright, let's go ahead and open it to questions from the public.

**01:02:01 Questions and comments from the public**

**Brayden Richmond:** If there are no questions from the public, we'll get to comments. The first comment card I have is from Cory. Actually do you want to go over the...

**01:02:23 Electronic Public Comment Report (Informational) - Kevin Bunnell, SRO Regional Supervisor**

**Kevin Bunnell:** We did have some people comment on this, but in typical southern region fashion. 42.86% strongly disagreed, and 42.86% strongly agreed, and then we had 14% that somewhat disagreed. So not a big split. This is an issue is pretty polarizing, whatever side you're on you either agree or disagree and there is not a lot of middle ground.

**Brayden Richmond:** And how many total comments?

**Kevin Bunnell:** I think it was 15.

**Brayden Richmond:** So we actually got a fair amount. Alright, first comment from the public is Cory Huntsman. Just a reminder, if you're speaking for yourself it's a three minute, and if you're speaking as an organization it's five minutes.

**Cory Huntsman:** I am speaking for myself. I'm with the Utah Houndsmen Association, but I'll just be covering the new collared lion proposal, Dustin Clark will be doing the UHA proposal. First of all, thank you guys for your service on the RAC. I do appreciate this opportunity for public input. We did recently partner with the DWR and BYU on a new cougar study. The parameter of this study is six units within the central region; Wasatch, Strawberry, Wasatch Timp, Wasatch Cascade, Oquirrh Mountains East, Nebo, and Nebo face. Due to the lions unpredictable and ongoing behavior from the year from a data standpoint, it would be greatly beneficial to keep the same animal online for multiple years. With the current hunting pressure on lions, that might be a little tough. Unless we implement a temporary protection for the collared lions, just in those study areas. I'd like to propose that we prohibit killing collared lions on the six mentioned units for a three-year duration. That wouldn't include depredation or spot and stalk. We wouldn't want a sportsman to get in trouble if he shot a lion from a couple hundred yards away and didn't notice the collar. We certainly want to give the livestock producers the ability to protect their livelihood. The units that we're proposing the deer are actually doing pretty good, there isn't one of them that are in the predator management plan for deer. We didn't get the big winter kill off like they did further up north, and we're not hit quite as hard as you guys are down here with the drought. There are three units that are in predator management for big horn sheep but having GPS collars on the lions would only

benefit the sheep for depredation issues. One thing we would propose is that if they left the collared study area, if they left those six units, then they'd be fair game for sportsmen including with hounds. The other concern that has been brought up to us is would we be taking away opportunity from sportsmen. I called the six units, but it's technically seven units because we are going to try to collar some lions on the Salt Lake Wasatch Front Mountain Range, but there is not currently a hound season for that, so we didn't see the point in including that in the proposal. But so far we've collared six lions, five of those are females one tom. If we continue at that ratio, we're trying to get 30 lions collared, if we continue at that ratio we're only talking five toms spread out over six units. I really don't think that's taking a whole lot of opportunity from sportsmen. But from a data point it's really greatly beneficial. The last thing, we did run this through the Central RAC and it passed with an 11-1 vote. Then we went to the Northern RAC and it passed with an 8-1 vote. Do you guys have any questions for me?

**Verland King:** Darren just talked about how these cats move. It looks to me like they might mess up your study if they move out of your study area and get killed. I would think, and I'm a fan of more studies, I think this cougar deal is something we don't understand as far as the numbers and everything. I'd probably be in favor of trying not to kill any collared ones other than spot and stalk or depredation. That's my comment.

**Brayden Richmond:** Just to clarify, that's a comment, not a question right? I don't think we have any questions. Thanks Cory. Brian Hoover.

**Brian Hoover:** Thank you. Again, as Cory stated, thank you for your service on the RAC and to sportsmen and to wildlife of Utah. I'd like to expand that just a little bit for those online, and also those of you in the audience; we're all here for the same reason and that's the betterment of the wildlife here in the state. Thank you all for putting in the time to come down to put your input in and your feedback to the Board.

So I just want to stand up and expand on some of the items that Cory stated. I'm in 100% support of the study, and in the current cougar management plan it actually asks for additional study information. I'm just going to quote the current cougar management plan. It states under cougar research objectives, "Increase base understanding through continued research designed to address questions relative to cougar management in Utah". Coming right back to this gentlemen's statement that the support of the studies is huge for the understanding of what's going on within those populations and how they interact. So this study is literally in its emphasis and just being fully established with moving forward with BYU. Some of the items that the cougar management plan calls out that it would like to in order of priority understand where alternative population estimates, radio collaring cougars, prey switching in cougars, cougar habitat use, and predation behaviors. This study has the opportunity and has had discussions around all of those. I don't know that this study will answer all of those questions, but as it comes to fruition with Wes Alexander and BYU our intent is to hit as many of those different items as possible. In an effort to do nothing but give good solid data to those regional biologists, the RACs, and the Wildlife Board, in an effort to manage our wildlife here in Utah. Again, with Cory's recommendation I'd like to second that just with the statement that we're asking for no harvest within those six units. They all in the Central region. We



would actually love to see the whole state be a no harvest by use of dogs, but it wasn't felt that would be accepted throughout the state. I did want to put that out there as it has been a highly debated topic around the Hound Association, and ourselves. It actually was a first recommendation in the Northern RAC and in the Northern recommendation did fail. The second recommendation following the six units did succeed with the 8-1 vote. Any questions for me?

**Brayden Richmond:** Thank you Brian. And the last comment card I have is Dustin Clark. I did notice there are more members of the public here than that. If you want to comment please go ahead and fill out a comment card and we'll get to you. It's not too late if you want to make any comments.

**Dustin Clark:** I'm representing the Utah Houndsmen Association tonight. Again, thank you all for your time and your service and your care for the management of Utah wildlife. One of the first issues that the UHA wanted to propose was the removal of the public land's verbiage from the rule R567-10-21. Hopefully all of you have received our letter as far as what we wanted to propose so I don't have to read it to an extent. But we feel that this rule is in line with our view of responsible management and practices for our public wildlife resources on public lands. Under section one the depredating cougar can be removed within 96 hours on public land, but under section four a transient cougar can be removed from public lands for no other reason other than it moved onto public ground in a specific area. The UHA recommends and asks for the removal of public lands grazing and allotment verbiage. Specifically the clause and public land grazing out of this rule. The UHA does not ask for removal of private lands from the chronic depredation rule. Then as well as what Cory and Brian covered as far as dealing with collared cougars. I agree with this gentleman that this should be statewide. If we're going to put the time and money into these studies, why should we allow them to be killed when they're so beneficial to what we can accomplish as far as figuring out what's going on with these cougars, what's happening, what are they killing, what's going on with kill take over from bears and stuff like that. That's probably my personal opinion, I shouldn't put that in UHA, but also I'd like to not add the Beaver East unit to predator management designation. The mule deer data from 2020 shows that the adult deer in this unit are going into winter with poor body condition. This data is a sign of habitat issue and not depredation as a limiting factor. HB-125 does not apply unless the Division determines that predators are a significant factor on big game population. So we'd like to see that not go into predator management and see where it's at now. We'd also like for the DWR and whoever to establish clear criteria for when a unit enters predator management, and when it will be removed from predator management. Right now as far as we know and as far as we can find, there is no clear statements that say, the deer are doing this and the lions are doing this we're going to put it in predator management. There are just no clear criteria or perimeters that say this one is going to go in, or this one is going to go out. It's more of a recommendation or a hearsay from biologist or what people are seeing vs. kind of just set in stone things, such as we hit it let's pull it out, or it did this so we're going to put it in. Then also, we'd like to move the units that are in harvest objective now, we'd like to see them go into split season instead of harvest objective. We feel like it would force hunters that we need to go towards predator management units rather than just being able to hunt

where ever they would like. If those are split units that they'd have to draw a tag for first, that puts more pressure on the units that are unlimited and over the counter tags from people that are just looking to kill a cougar vs. looking to harvest a trophy. It just limits them on areas they can hunt, and it simplifies the proclamation to two types of hunts to unlimited and split units instead of unlimited, harvest objective, and split units or just limited units, which we have none right now. This change would remove nine units from harvest objective and has the potential to increase hunters targeting predator management units by 280. This change would still leave 31 units available for over-the-counter hunters. Any questions? Thank you for your time.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks, Dustin. Appreciate it. Before we move into the discussion for the RAC I just wanted to make a couple of comments. One we do have the biologists for these units online, so specifically the Houndsmen Association has addressed the Beaver unit, and Mike Wardle is the biologist for that unit. If you wanted to ask him questions he is online and can address them.

Second, I just want to thank you guys. That is a long way to come down here and we appreciate that. It's nice to be back in these public meetings where we have this opportunity, and we really appreciate you making the effort and coming down with your input.

How I'd like to see this go, let's open it up for general discussion for the RAC and then if we could on the motions I think all the motions that we'll have will be pertaining to the recommendations from the Houndsmen Association. Let's address those individually and then we'll pass the remainder as presented. Once we get to the point we want to look at motions let's kind of look at those individually.

Then the comment I want to make to start, I have a couple more comments, but the comment I'd like to make before we just open it up to everybody is the comment was made earlier and the question, but the comment was made, where do the funds come from to do these collar studies. They come from sportsmen. I think that's a great item to note. I think specifically on this recommendation from the Houndsmen Association on these six units with the collar study going on, not only did they put up the money for the collars, but my understanding is the houndsmen also went in and donated their time and efforts to collar those lions. That I believe is more expensive than the collars. Probably a significant amount. It's not just the cost of the collars, the houndsmen have really gone out of their way to be proactive and I think that deserves at minimum a comment and some recognition there. So again, I appreciate you guys being here.

With that I'll open it up to discussions from the RAC.

## **01:18:28      Discussion from the RAC**

**Austin Atkinson:** I wanted to talk about the collars for a second. Are there currently any unit or areas or species or any other game animals in Utah that we're aware of where we limit the take of collared animals?

**Darren DeBlois:** Right now, no. The rule allows for it. So the mechanism is if we determine that we needed to prohibit it then we would put something in the guidebook for specific units or the state or whatever. Our approach so far on all collared animals has

been to discourage it in our guidebooks, but not write a ticket I guess to sum it all up. But we do have collared animals taken across the state. I wouldn't say it's an overwhelming number, but when you're talking about a sample size of 30 compared to a couple hundred one can make a difference. And it is frustration to spend all the effort to walk your guts out to put a collar on a lion and have someone shoot it the next week. That's frustrating. I want to add too, these guys caught these six lions on dry ground this spring. They know what they're doing, that's tough to do. Anyway they're doing a good job.

**Austin Atkinson:** I think my comment about that, I'm big on the simplification of this and not being an every day houndsmen, the guidebook is complicated for me. I feel like this adds another level of complexity, but I personally feel like it's the right thing to do to just stop them from harvesting those collared lions. But it's with hounds only on a harvest objective permit. So we've added a little complex layer in the guidebook there, where it would be easier to add, with hounds statewide, right? As far as the guidebook or rules go in my mind. That's my comment on the collars.

**Nick Jorgensen:** I'd agree with Austin and the Houndsmen on collared animals. Let's leave them alone.

**Brayden Richmond:** You know if I can make a comment, I do like this proposal because it's limited to six units and three years. I don't know that I could get on board, I don't vote anyway unless it's a tie, but I don't know that I could get on board with an across-the-board limitation. There was a cougar a few years ago and I don't remember but 12 years comes to mind, that lived on the Stansbury Range I believe and you couldn't harvest it. That seems a little excessive to me. Generally I wouldn't agree with that part, but I definitely agree with this request.

**Chad Utley:** I guess I have a question on that. How long do the collars last? How long are they good for?

**Darren DeBlois:** Generally three years is a good rule of thumb. The more burden you put on the collar, the less life you get out of the battery. So it depends on how much data you're uploading. But they typically last about three years, so about what they're asking.

**Tammy Pearson:** I would agree with you also Brayden, and I have to commend the Houndsmen for putting their money where their mouth is, so to speak. I'm all about that. And I agree with the central region, I'm on board with that 100%. The statewide one I say we take it back to the committee when they redo the committee and talk about that. But I think the central region is a legitimate ask and it looks like a lot of time and effort went into it, and I don't want you guys to lose your investment.

**Chad Utley:** I guess I would be in support of a statewide one that was limited to three years, if that's the length of the collar, you'd get a good study. Have a whole bunch of data and re-assess at that point.

**Brayden Richmond:** But we're not putting all the collars on this year and pull them off in three years. It's an ongoing thing putting collars on. So four years from now there are going to be animal with collars on them.

**Chad Utley:** Well I understand that, and you're going to have collars that aren't working and collars that are just put on, but at least you'd have three-year moratorium on it where you could get a whole lot of data.

**Brayden Richmond:** That makes sense, I just wanted to make sure we were talking about apples to apples.

**Austin Atkinson:** As far as I understand, we do not have the authority to recommend the Beaver East be pulled out of predator management, that wouldn't be our thing. But I would like to hear from the biologist maybe, if he wants to tell us why we're headed there with Beaver East and where that's going.

**Mike Wardle:** On the Beaver East the reason for the recommendation to go into predator management came from collars we put out the last two years on mule deer. The Houndsmen Association is correct that body condition scores have been low. In 2019 they were really low, but this last year we were just below the statewide average. So we weren't as bad this year. But with the collars, the big thing has been the cause specific mortality this year that we've learned. Of the 33 that we've had killed in the last two years 58% of those have been lion kills. We're currently at 7% for fawn survival on the Beaver East which is really low. That's the basis for the recommendation, we're seeing a lot of lion take on the deer population and that has decreased dramatically in the last five years. We were at like 15,000 deer back in 2015 and currently our estimate is about 10,000. So we've seen a sharp decline, I don't see this as a silver bullet to save the mule deer, but hopefully it will give it a shot in the arm.

**Austin Atkinson:** Mt. Dutton as well, could you speak to that as to why we're not on a predator management plan there? We did receive comments about concern about the deer herd there and lack of deer. Could you speak to that?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Austin, that would be one of our other biologists. Kyle, if you want to speak to Dutton, please?

**Kyle Christensen:** Yeah, I can speak to that. The biggest problem we've seen on the Dutton is that we haven't meet the quota, so I didn't feel like a predator management plan was necessary. We only killed seven lions last year out of 14, so I didn't think it was really going to be beneficial to go into a predator management plan until we can see adequate take on the unit.

**Austin Atkinson:** Thank you. I think that's an important point that he didn't roll it right to predator management because we have a harvest and it didn't reach it.

**Tammy Pearson:** I'd also like to speak on the Beaver East unit. As a public official, you run into people at the grocery store and the gas station and anywhere else they can corner you. Predators are an issue on the Beaver units in general. I would not recommend pulling that out either.

**Austin Atkinson:** I've got a comment about the simplification. I would like to see the spot and stalk permit, which I understand is a director order. I've got a copy of the order here. I would like to see those season dates match. I understand the idea was to be over top of our fall season, but is there anyway we can make a recommendation to make that a July 1- June 30 to take into account shed hunters, people out in the winter recreating, spring, I know chances are slim right? But it's confusing to me, I buy both tags, I don't hunt cougars very often, which one is it because this one has a date and this one doesn't because you have to follow the dates that are on the table or call a hotline or go online. It's confusing and I'd like to see that match. Could we do that?

**Darren DeBlois:** I think, I mean obviously this discussion will make it back to the Board and I'm sure we could discuss it. I think the big sticking point here is the language in the legislation. For this specific issue it says during big game hunts. So that's why the Director set the dates where they are.. why we recommended to the director those be the dates. So speaking with out Attorney Generals office they felt like to be in compliance with the legislation dictates that that's where we need to be. So that's why it is the way it is.

**Brayden Richmond:** But the big game board would have authority to make the change if they chose, correct?

**Darren DeBlois:** Outside of the legislation, I don't want to speak out of school, but obviously they can recommend hunt structures how ever they want.

**Brayden Richmond:** I mean it would meet the requirements of this legislation and then it would give a little more as I would interpret it.

**Darren DeBlois:** I think it's a discussion item worth passing along.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think if we made a motion it would give the Board an opportunity to discuss it if we get to that point.

**Austin Atkinson:** Chair, I would like to hear some discussion from the other RAC members about the harvest objective units all having a limited entry. What it does, as far as I understand, is November-February is limited entry structure. They only give out as many tags as they can kill lions. And you can tell me if I'm wrong, but whatever lions don't get killed or tags that don't get filled will roll to an open harvest. So what it does is it blocks out the winter or that early season for limited entry guys and leaves a premium experience for them, if you will. Then it will roll to everybody else to come in, and the dates are different depending on the unit and it's complicated for me to figure out when they open and when they don't and how many is left. But is there something we can

do there? Do we like the limited entry? Are we hanging on to it because everybody has points? Or why do we have to keep splitting it? That's where I don't feel like I have a good handle on it.

**Darren DeBlois:** Can I make a comment? I don't want to short circuit the discussion. Just going back to the principal of giving ultimate decision-making power to our district biologists. I really like them to have the flexibility to decide if they'd like to have a limited entry season or not. There may be multiple reasons why or why not they'd want to do it. Currently half of those units have limited entry seasons, and half of them don't so it's ten and ten out of 20. That's my two cents, obviously. So have the discussion, that's just where we're coming from.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'll follow up real quick. You're going to change this though, so we're no longer going to apply for limited entry in October, right? Because you're going to bring it here in December, so we're going to apply in the spring to start?

**Darren DeBlois:** The numbers will be approved at the draw, and the draw timing would be pretty similar to what it is now, it would just we would be bringing recommendations a lot earlier for the following year. Does that make sense? So a lot of the draw stuff would be similar and those hunts wouldn't begin in limited entry until later, but what you might have is July 1 you set a quota to open, you'd set a limited entry window and we'd have to work through that. I'm actually drawing a blank on it right now, I'd have to look through my notes.

**Austin Atkinson:** On these dates, would the limited entry dates roll to July 1?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, thanks for jogging my brain. Yes, that's how it would work. They'd draw, but you'd be drawing the October before the next July. Does that make sense? So you'd know if you had your permit prior to the new year, but the season wouldn't start until July 1. Those would be limited entry from July 1 through February or March, whenever they typically are, and then they would open if there are any additional animals to be taken. So thanks, I needed a nudge.

**Brayden Richmond:** I wanted to make a comment along what you're talking about Austin, and I've made similar comments for years even prior to being on the RAC. I'd feel neglectful if I quit now. Let me preface this a little bit. There is a lot of discussion in the hunting community now that as you hunt from state to state and a lot of hunters are moving from state to state, it's so hard to keep yourself out of trouble from all the rules and regulations. As you hunt multiple states, trying to keep up on all the different rules as you move around is extremely difficult to the point where you're almost guaranteed to make a game violation somewhere sooner or later. The comment I'd have in that regard, and I've had it for years, is there is not a more complicated proclamation than the cougar proclamation of Utah. I mean I really appreciate that the Division has really made an effort the last couple of years to simplify it, I know that's a concerted effort, I know that's an attempt, but holy smokes it's a mess. So, I would just continue to encourage.. I don't know what we do. It's a double-edged sword because the Division is encouraged to

simplify it, and the public says we want this and this and this. Just a general comment. I appreciate the effort being made, but this is one tough proclamation.

**Gene Boardman:** I'd like to just ramble here a little bit. I agree, I struggle with trying to figure this proclamation out. I think that the legislature didn't help any with their jumping into this thing. I might as well say while I'm at it that I don't think we should have biology by ballot box and I don't want to see the legislature continue to pull this stuff. We look like Colorado west. While I'm rambling, I'd like to talk about porcupines.

**Brayden Richmond:** I'm not sure that's on the agenda, but we'll let it slide.

**Gene Boardman:** We're going to talk about porcupines. Most of you aren't old enough to know when there are porcupines, some of you probably haven't even seen a damn porcupine. But there were porcupines all over the place in my day, and in the name of conservation and by the encouragement of the Forrest Service and Fish and Game and everybody else, I and a lot of other people went out and did our sole duty to kill as many porcupines as we could, and we did one hell of a good job. I don't want to see the same thing happen to cougars. This thing could go a little too far, and I don't want to see that. I guess that will do for right now.

**Verland King:** I had a government trapper tell me that's why there were no porcupines there are too many cougars. That's what the young ones eat.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering, we've gone all over the place and I'm kind of a linear guy and my brains are starting to scramble. I'm wondering if we can take these and discuss them in order, or if its time for a motion in order of what the Houndsmen presented, starting with the collared cats. Then moving through those we can vote on and those we can make a recommendation on.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think we're about there, I think Verland was still making a comment. Or was that your comment?

**Chuck Chamberlain:** He pushed his button red..

**Brayden Richmond:** Oh did he, I'm sorry.

**Verland King:** I wanted to bring up this public land deal.

**Brayden Richmond:** I think you're right; I think it's time to start going a little more linear. I did feel like intentionally having some open discussion, but let's get it a little more linear. I think let's approach maybe the recommendations. And of those that we'd like to talk about. I would suggest that we start with the study on the six units I think that one might be pretty straight forward. We can jump to public lands and hit the other ones, but let's approach them one by one. Any more comments on the collard lions on the six units? And if there isn't more discussion we'd entertain a motion on that item, if we want to have motion. We can just accept as presented if that's what we choose.

**Austin Atkinson:** I'm make a motion that we prohibit the killing of collard lions in the six units designated in the study in the central region by use of hounds for three years.

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I recommend that we prohibit the killing of collard lions in the six units designated in the study in the Central Region by the use of hounds for three years.**

**Tammy Pearson:** Does that include the recommendation that the spot and stalk... we were bouncing back and forth with spot and stalk and predation is...

**Brayden Richmond:** Austin addressed it by "hounds", so that was part of the motion. And I think the motion is their recommendation as they wrote it essentially. It's a pretty well written recommendation. Any further discussion?

**Chad Utley:** I would like to amend that motion if I could, to include statewide no harvest of collared lions by hounds for a period of three years. I don't know if that is the appropriate time to do that.

**Kevin Bunnell:** To follow the process we have a motion and a second. You can make a motion to amend the motion and we would vote on the amendment if that passes then it alters the original motion. You would need to make a motion to amend and see if you get a second.

**Chad Utley:** I'll make a motion to amend.

**The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Nick Jorgensen.**

**AMENDED MOTION: I recommend that we prohibit the killing of collared lions statewide by the use of hounds for three years.**

**Verland King:** The problem with that is, and the comment I made earlier is yeah there are going to be some lions that leave the six areas and have the opportunity to be taken. The problem I see right now is those collars aren't going to fall off in three years. They're not going to turn purple and you won't know, and that three-year time period makes it so it won't work.

**Kevin Bunnell:** You could just remove the prohibition, make it so it's no longer prohibited after three years. We'd just change the regulation.

**Verland King:** Ok, I still have some reservations about that.

**Austin Atkinson:** Can we ask the question, do we have any collard cougars outside of those areas as part of other studies, and how many would that be, approximately?



**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, throughout the state in addition to the six in the area.. I'm doing the math in my head. I know we have 15 in the USU study, these six and that would be the Book Cliffs, the Manti, and the Cache. But I know the region has two. So 17. There may be more, depending on if we need to move an animal to keep an eye on it or that type of thing.

**Austin Atkinson:** Is it appropriate to ask the UHA, where they're present, their opinion of changing that to statewide?

**Brayden Richmond:** They already suggested that's what they would like when they were speaking.

**Austin Atkinson:** Completely in support of that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let's vote on the amended motion.

**Kevin Bunnell:** You're voting to know if you want the original motion to be limited to the six units, or statewide. If the amendment passes then we will go back and vote on the original motion, but it will be amended to be statewide.

**Craig Laub:** Already the DWR has a policy of discouraging taking collared animals, don't they?

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, in the proclamation it's asks you not to take collared animals, but it's not illegal. Kevin, let me ask, if we have a first and second on this and Austin is ok, could he change his initial motion to this so we don't have to have two motions and have that confusion, or do we want to vote on the amendment and then go back to the original motion? It seems confusing to vote on the amendment that's...

**Kevin Bunnell:** We could, if Austin and whoever seconded the original motion agrees to accept the amendment, we could avoid the first vote and then just vote on that. And then there could be a second motion if that fails.

**Brayden Richmond:** Cause the amendment is significantly different than the initial motion. It doesn't seem to make sense to go back and vote on the initial motion passes. But if that's how the process works, we'll follow the process.

**Kevin Bunnell:** That's how the process works.

**Brayden Richmond:** Let's just follow the process, I won't try to confuse it.

**Verland King:** Well it seems to me like they're already asked across the board not to kill a collard animal. It's recommended not to, it's not illegal. I always have problems with making stuff illegal where the law enforcement side of this deal comes in. I think it's better to not go statewide and have it be a recommendation that we don't kill a

collared animal. But not make it so it's a crime to do it. I just don't really have a problem getting the law enforcement side of DWR involved in it if somebody kills a collared animal they're probably going to try to destroy the collar and I don't know how good the pelt of an animal that's had a collar rubbing around its neck for years is anyway. That's my problem with it going state wide is I think the less we make things illegal, the better it is. I think a lot of people will.. if it's a big cat they'll probably kill it. If it isn't' the Houndsmen know the good they're getting out of the tracking, they'll try to talk their guy out of killing it. I think it's an honor system deal and I have a hard time making more laws for law enforcement to try to enforce when it's pretty hard for them to enforce some of the laws we ask them to do.

**Brayden Richmond:** Alright, I think we're ready to go to vote on this motion. So again, the amended motion is.. The amendment to the motion is to prohibit the harvesting for three years on any collared cougar in the state by hounds.

**The following motion was made by Chad Utley, seconded by Nick Jorgensen.**

**AMENDED MOTION: I recommend that we prohibit the killing of collared lions statewide by the use of hounds for three years.**

**Motion fails 3 in favor- 6 opposed**

**Brayden Richmond:** The amendment to the motion fails. Now we're back to the initial motion. Now we'll go back to the original motion made by Austin, seconded by Tammy that we would not harvest collared cougars on the six study units for a period of three years with use of hounds. Basically the Houndsmen motion, we'd use their word.

**The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I recommend that we prohibit the killing of collard lions in the six units designated in the study in the Central Region by the use of hounds for three years.**

**Motion passes unanimously**

**Brayden Richmond:** Now there are other items on the table. Verland you said you wanted to discuss the private lands one, we can hit that next.

**Kevin Bunnell:** To be clear on that, that's not part of our recommendation, Verland. So if we just went with the Divisions recommendation it wouldn't included that.

**Verland King:** Alright. That would be my discussion on it. There is a lot of depredation that goes on on public lands, on grazing allotments, and I think it needs to stay like that. So that's my comment. Whether there is more discussion.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** If we take that out, would that mean that we couldn't kill any depredating animals on public lands, that's what it looks like. Right now it says we can issue depredation permits to take care on specified private lands with public land grazing alignments with chronic depredation. It seems like this way if we take that out,

then suddenly we can only take problem animals off of private lands, and that makes me a little bit nervous. I'm wondering if I'm seeing that right or if I have that wrong?

**Darren DeBlois:** The proposal from the Houndsmen Association would be outside of the 96-hour period where there is an active.. so their concern is about take on chronic situations, so maybe the sheep aren't even on the mountain. It's important that the RAC realizes that the rule language is taken directly from code, so we don't have authority, the legislature would have to change that, but it's important to remember in form of rule change, that wouldn't be possible. We'd have to have legislative changes in order to change that or to remove that language from the rule.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** Just to be clear, (inaudible).. legislature took this thing out then we wouldn't have a prolonged period.

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, we don't do it very often, but we do sometimes have producers that are having considerable losses year after year after year by lions and we do in some cases issue depredation permits outside the season when the sheep are on the mountain. A lot of times Wildlife Services will start on a kill and they're able to catch the lion, and they'll remove the lion. We want to solve those problems. Sometimes they're not successful and we have the opportunity for our biologist to work with producers to give them permits so later in the season when hunting is a little more favorable to go out and try to remove a particular lion. Bearing in mind that lions move around a lot. So we really like our biologist to have the flexibility to figure out what makes sense and let them solve the problem. Kevin?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Darren, just to clarify what you said at the beginning. The 96-hour portion is in state code, and that changed from 72 hours to 96 hours with the same legislation that directed us to implement predator management plans for big game species. The chronic portion of this is not in code.

**Darren DeBlois:** It is in code.

**Kevin Bunnell:** The chronic portion is in code as well? Ok.

**Darren DeBlois:** It's a different code section. This is word for word what the legislature.. and they did amend the 96 hours the same time they passed the HB-125.

**Kevin Bunnell:** I didn't realize the chronic portion was in code.

**Darren DeBlois:** And it did change, Kevin, it didn't used to be that way.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So really this is outside of our purview or the Boards, is what it sounds like to me.

**Brayden Richmond:** Any other discussions on additional motions that want to be made.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Do you want a review of what the different options were? In addition to what we already dealt with and if we're going to allow the take of collard lions; there was a request to move harvest objective units to split units, and I think that came from the Houndsmen Association. There was a motion to keep the Beaver East unit out of predator management, but again that came through the legislation and probably isn't under the purview of the RAC or the Board if I'm understanding correctly. (right)

So really the only thing outstanding is the request to move all harvest objective units under the split hunt strategy instead of harvest objective.

**Chuck Chamberlain:** I thought there was one more proposal about having a clear criterion for moving plans in and out. That's out of our purview too, isn't it?

**Kevin Bunnell:** The predator management policy which is what sets those guidelines. That did go in front of the Board, so there could be a recommendation from the RAC to the Wildlife Board to reopen the predator management policy to clarify the objectives. I do have that one here too, Chuck, thanks for the reminder.

**Brayden Richmond:** There are two outstanding inputs from the public if we want to address them; we don't have to address them, that's up to the RAC.

**Verland King:** I make a motion that we accept the cougar recommendations and rule changes as presented.

**The following motion was made by Verland King, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I recommend that we accept the remainder of the Divisions proposals are presented.**

**Brayden Richmond:** I just want to make one comment on this one additional discussion. This has been a little bit of an interesting RAC for me. Typically the comments you get from the public, and the emails and the messages you get are all things that are in opposition. People want to be heard, you know I don't want this, or I don't like this; very rarely do you get many comments that say they support the recommendations. Most people if they don't have something they want changed, they don't comment. I don't know what the rest of the RACs saw, but I personally saw, probably 4-1 the comments I got were please support the Divisions recommendations. It's very unique and I don't think I've seen that before in the RAC. Including this afternoon, I've been getting texts all afternoon saying please support the Division recommendations. So that's been an interesting thing to me. That's a lot of support.

**Austin Atkinson:** So can I move to make an amendment on this motion? To adjust the spot and stalk season dates to match harvest objective. That would be my amendment.

**The following amendment on the motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Chad Utley.**

**AMENDED MOTION: I recommend that we adjust the spot and stalk season dates to match harvest objective season dates.**

**Tammy Pearson:** I was just going to say I'm not sure that we can do that, can we? Recommend season date changes?

**Brayden Richmond:** I'm still of the opinion that the Board can. That's my opinion, I know it may differ, but I think they would still meet the mandates that is required by the legislation that seasons would happen during the hunting season and then it would be in addition to that. They didn't limit it saying you can only do spot and stalk during the big game seasons, they said you will have an opportunity. So I don't see this in opposition to the legislation, is my two cents.

**Tammy Pearson:** In my opinion, my cougar tag that I've been carrying and renewing every year is a spot and stalk.

**Brayden Richmond:** The other comment to that is, man the success rate on that is so low. Why wouldn't we want more people putting that in their pocket and collecting that revenue. It doesn't make any sense to limit that.

**Gene Boardman:** I'm all for this spot and stalk. It's an opportunity for the public to get out and do some hunting. I'm all for it. I think that it should be a year-round thing and I believe that the Board did set the dates for that. I think the Board has the authority to extend the dates for that. If we're going to do this cougar management year-round, we ought to do the spot and stalk year-round.

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, we have an amendment to the motion to align the spot and stalk dates with the harvest objective dates. Let's go ahead and vote on that.

**AMENDED MOTION: I recommend that we adjust the spot and stalk season dates to match harvest objective season dates.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, we have a unanimous vote on the amendment to the motion. Now let's go back to the initial motion, to accept the remainder as presented.

**The following motion was made by Verland King, seconded by Tammy Pearson.**

**MOTION: I recommend that we accept the remainder of the Divisions proposals are presented.**

**Motion passes 8 in favor, 1 opposed**

**Brayden Richmond:** Gene I wanted to give you the chance to voice your opposition there if you want to.

**Gene Boardman:** My opposition is with the predator management situation and no true criteria or no plan to get units out of predator management. I think that part is the legislature's fault, but as long as there is no plan I'm not voting for this as presented.

**Brayden Richmond:** Thanks Gene well said. I appreciate it. Well that concludes the agenda items for tonight's meeting. Again I appreciate everybody being here, it's good to be back in person, I appreciate the Houndsmen traveling; thank you for that effort.

The next RAC meeting is set for September 7<sup>th</sup> in Beaver. I will not be here, so hopefully Riley is here. If not someone else will...

**Kevin Bunnell:** It's not in Beaver. So, let me give some clarification there. Now that we're going hybrid with this system, we're limited to locations where we have the technology and the bandwidth to set this meeting up. So right now we have this building, we have the DNR building in Richfield that we can set up. We've also talked with SUU and Snow College again here in Cedar and in Richfield for our bigger meetings. They can accommodate the technology that we need. So I guess what I'm saying is we're limited to Cedar City or Richfield under our current scenario.

**Brayden Richmond:** Do the other regions move their meetings around as much as we do? Is that a southern region thing?

**Kevin Bunnell:** No, they don't move them at all. And that's really just because we're by far the largest region. So we've tried to accommodate travel; Verland shouldn't have to travel the furthest every time, just most of the time.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, that's my question. My personal thought is I think some consistency would be good. I really want to see more public input. It's really hard for the public to stay up to date. I think the more consistence we could add, I would be supportive of just doing them here.

**Kevin Bunnell:** So, we vote on it every year in December, and set our schedule. Right now, Phil help me, our next meeting... (inaudible) They alternate between here and Richfield. I will send the RAC a schedule that essentially I made a lateral decision about where they're going to be. Rotating back and forth between Cedar and Richfield. If you feel strongly that more need to be in Richfield, or more need to be in Cedar, you're welcome to let me know.

**Austin Atkinson:** Quick question on that, Kevin. As we transition into this hybrid, is there a chance for the public to participate and comment remotely.

**Kevin Bunnell:** No, not yet. Right now we're limiting to the.. well they can comment prior to online, so that option is there. But in terms of commenting during the meeting, that right now is limited to in person. The Board agreed to that as presented.

**Brayden Richmond:** Yeah, they discussed that in the Board meeting.

**Tammy Pearson:** I would say some of those bigger meetings, Richfield, if it's in that auditorium you'd have a lot more seating for the public.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Same thing, we have a similar venue here at SUU. For our bigger meetings we'll be at one of the two colleges, either at SUU or Snow College in Richfield.

**Brayden Richmond:** I'm more concerned about Verland driving than Kevin. I say we do them all in Richfield.

**Kevin Bunnell:** What about Chad and Nick? They're going farther than I am.

**Brayden Richmond:** Ok, back to moving every time. Where ever we land is fine.

**Gene Boardman:** I feel that the two big meeting, November and April I believe they are, should be centered as much as possible. So I believe Cedar.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Ok, like I said we'll vote on this. We'll set up a schedule in our December RAC meeting, and we'll decide on where our schedule and locations for the next year.

**Tammy Pearson:** So right now, September will be?

**Kevin Bunnell:** Let me look at my calendar, Tammy. Right now we have September 7<sup>th</sup> for Richfield. Our November meeting is Cedar City, December in Richfield. We just alternated one to the other. If you'd rather have them all here, I'm fine with that. Verland may feel otherwise. Right now we have four left, we'll do two in Cedar and two in Richfield. Unless somebody feels strongly about that we'll stick to that so you can see both venues and what kind of public participation we get whether we're in Cedar or Richfield. Let's split them evenly right now, that would be my proposal. Then if we get information over the next four meetings we'll make a change in December.

**Brayden Richmond:** Do we want to tackle the time? That's been an ongoing...

**Kevin Bunnell:** No, I like to keep Stacy on her toes.

**Brayden Richmond:** So, leave it at 7:00 next time. Richfield at 7:00.

**Kevin Bunnell:** We should discuss that.

**Brayden Richmond:** Right now the proposal is we have Richmond at 7 pm, on September 7<sup>th</sup>.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Is everyone ok with 7? We've been earlier this year. Can we just set 6 for the standard for the Southern Region, and I can tell Stacy that they're all going to be as 6 o'clock?

**Brayden Richmond:** I like that, personally. Alright, 6 o'clock will be the standard time for the Southern Region, and we'll continue to move all over the place.

**Kevin Bunnell:** Not all over the place, but we'll continue to move between Cedar City and Richfield.

**Brayden Richmond:** Sounds good. Thank you. I don't think there is anything else, with that we'll adjourn. Thank you everyone.

**02:06:56 Meeting adjourned at 8:06 pm.**



**Southeast Region RAC Meeting  
Video Conference  
August 4, 2021**

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/FH6nAFmZMnQ>

**Wednesday, August 4, 2021, 6:30 pm**

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure  
- RAC ViceChair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes  
- RAC ViceChair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update  
- DWR Regional Supervisor
4. Regional Update  
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022  
- Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator
6. Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022  
- Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator

Video Conference  
August 4, 2021  
**SUMMARY OF MOTIONS**

**1. Approval of Agenda & Minutes**

The following motion was made by Eric Luke, seconded by Darren Olson and passed unanimously, 12/12.

**MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes as presented.**

**2. Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022**

The following motion was made by Erik Luke and was seconded by Scoot Flannery, and passed, 10/2.

**MOTION: The DWR consider setting a system that allows public trappers to participate in harvesting beavers in areas closed to trapping, rather than hiring professional trappers.**

The following motion was made by Steven Duke and seconded by Scoot Flannery, and passed, 11/01.

**MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations and presented.**

**3. Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022**

The following motion was made by Erik Luke, and seconded by Sunshine Brosi, and passed unanimously, 12/12.

**MOTION: Adopt the Utah Houndsman Association proposal to prohibit the take of collared cougars on units not in predator management.**

The following motion was made by Erik Luke, and seconded by Darren Olsen and passed, 10/1. One RAC member left early.

**MOTION: Ask the director to consider changing the Beaver East Unit from a predator management unit, but keep the quota high enough to meet the recommendations made by the district biologist.**

The following motion was made by Brad Richman, and seconded by Dana Truman. The motion passed unanimously, 12/12.

**MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

SER RAC Meeting  
August 4, 2021

**Southeast Region RAC Meeting**

August 4, 2021  
Online Attendance

**RAC Members Present**

**Kent Johnson, Vice Chairman**  
**Lynn Sitterud**  
**Scot Flannery**  
**Steven Duke**  
**Kirk Player**  
**Dana Truman**  
**Eric Luke**  
**Brad Richman**  
**Sunshine Brosi**  
**Justin Ivins**  
**Joe Shopko**  
**Todd Thorne**

18:30:00	RAC Vice chair Kent Johnson called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members to indicate who attended the broadcast.
18:32:18	<p><b>1) Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)</b></p> <p>The following motion was made by Eric Luke, and seconded by Darren Olson and passed unanimously, 12/12.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes for the Southeast Region RAC meeting.</b></p>
18:33:00	<p><b>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</b></p> <p>Chris Wood updated the RAC with Wildlife Board decisions.</p>
18:35:00	<p><b>4) DWR Update (Informational)</b></p> <p>Chris Wood updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
18:43:00	<p><b>5) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022 (Action)</b></p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a></p>
18:52:00	<p><b>Public Comments</b></p> <p>Chris Wood stated there were many online comments from the public. Comments from the Utah Trappers Association.</p>
19:00:00	<p><b>RAC Questions</b></p> <p>The RAC members asked about for clarification about bobcats and their populations.</p>
19:03:30	<p><b>RAC Discussion</b></p> <p>Eric Luke had a comment.</p>
19:11:00	<p>The following motion was made by Erik Luke and was seconded by Scoot Flannery, and passed, 10/2.</p> <p><b>MOTION: The DWR consider setting a system that allows public trappers to participate in harvesting beavers in areas closed to trapping, rather than hiring professional trappers.</b></p>
19:42:00 19:46:00	<p>The following motion was made by Steven Duke and seconded by Scoot Flannery, and passed, 11/01.</p> <p><b>MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations and presented.</b></p>
19:15:00	<p><b>6) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (Action)</b></p>

	A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: <a href="https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html">https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</a>
<b>19:15:00</b>	Darren DeBloois offered a clarification of predator management in the state of Utah.
<b>19:23:00</b>	<b>RAC Questions</b> The RAC members asked about what authority the RAC and wildlife board have when it comes to predator management
<b>19:28:00</b>	<b>Questions from the Public</b> Brett Gyman: “Do we have harvest numbers for 2021” Cody Webster: “Which would have priority for predator management: deer or sheep?”
<b>19:34:00</b>	<b>Public Comments</b> Brett Gyman: Houndsman Association – don’t do unlimited Cody Webster: We need to prioritize sheep and stop picking on lions
<b>19:49:00</b>	<b>RAC Discussion</b> The RAC members wanted clarification on Brett Gyman’s comments. How important are collared lions?
<b>19:49:00</b>	The following motion was made by Erik Luke, and seconded by Sunshine, and passed unanimously, 12/12.  <b>MOTION: Adopt the Utah Houndsman Association proposal to prohibit the take of collared cougars on units not in predator management.</b>
<b>20:02:00</b>	The following motion was made by Erik Luke, and seconded by Darren Olsen and passed, 10/1. One RAC member left early.  <b>MOTION: Ask the director to consider changing the Beaver East Unit from a predator management unit, but keeping the quota high enough to meet the recommendations made by the district biologist.</b>
	Brad Richman made the motion and Dana Truman seconded. The motion passed unanimously, 12/12.  <b>MOTION: To accept the remainder of the recommendations as presented by the DWR.</b>
<b>20:07:00</b>	The following motion was made by Kent Johnson, and seconded by Brad Richman and passed unanimously, 12/12.  <b>MOTION: To adjourn the meeting.</b>
<b>20:08:00</b>	Meeting adjourned.

**Northeastern Regional Advisory Council Meeting  
August 5, 2021  
6:30 p.m.**

**Attendance**

**RAC MEMBERS**

Brett Prevedel	Dan Abeyta
Daniel Davis	Dusty Carpetner
Conroy Reed	Dick Bess

**Division Personnel**

Miles Hanberg	Dax Mangus
Darrin DeBloois	Anthony Christianson
Rose Fedelleck	Tory Mathis
Amy Vande Voort	

**Wildlife Board Members**

Randy Dearth

**Summary of Motions:**

2) Approval of Agenda

-RAC Chair

(Action)

MOTION: To Approve Agenda- Dan Abeyta

2nd Daniel Davis

Passed Unanimously.

MOTION: To approve Minutes-Daniel Davis

2nd Dan Abeyta

Passed Unanimously

5) Furbearer and Bobcat Recommendations 2021-2022

- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator

(Action)

MOTION: To approve as proposed by DWR. -Dan Abeyta

2nd Daniel Davis

Passed Unanimously

6) Cougar Recommendations and Rule Amendment 2021-  
2022

(Action)

- Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinators

MOTION: To prohibit the take of collared  
Mountain Lions statewide by hounds. -Dick Bess  
2nd Daniel Davis  
Passed Unanimously

MOTION: To approve remainder of  
recommendations as presented by the Division. -Dan  
Abeyta

2nd Dick Bess  
Passed Unanimously

Adjourned 8:02 pm

**00:00:01      1) Welcome**

Chairman Brett Prevedel called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures, and had the Board and RAC Members introduce themselves.  
(Audio starts at 1:17)

**00:02:06      2) Approval of Agenda (Action)**

**The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Daniel Davis.**

**MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda and minutes as presented.  
Motion passed unanimously.**

**The following motion was made by Daniel Davis, seconded by Dan Abeyta.**

**MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes from the last meeting as presented.  
Motion passed unanimously.**

**00:03:57      3) Wildlife Board Meeting Update by Dan Abeyta**

**Dan Abeyta:** Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to go ahead and just give a quick summary of what was discussed at the last Wildlife Board meeting; and that was I think back on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of June, so it's been a little while.

The Directors update consisted of some discussion about some concerns we all know about and that's the drought we're in and the impacts of the drought on fisheries and wildlife. So he talked a little bit about that, in particular about the Sevier River Drainage, he talked about the drought impacts down there. Also talked about the impacts from the drought on wildlife and talked about guzzlers and the importance of getting water to those guzzlers. There was some discussion there. He also talked about the fire closures that the state went into effect to

prevent any wildfire starts. He mentioned the ongoing study down in the Book Cliffs with the captures of fawn deer and the elk calves and that ongoing study with BYU University. He also mentioned that there are a couple of new Wildlife Board members, one from the central region, and one from the northern region. That would be Gary Nielson from the central region, and Bryce Thurgood representing the northern region. That was kind of the summary for Director Reynolds update.

There were just a couple of agenda items. The two that we talked about on the waterfowl hunting and I think the DWR proposal was to prohibit guided waterfowl hunting on state waterfowl management areas. So that was kind of broken down into the three different motions there and those motions are as follows, or what passed anyway. The first motion was that the Division would establish a process for a special use permit for these guides to operate on state waterfowl management areas. This is primarily out around the Great Salt Lake, and that motion passed unanimously. So now the guides will have to go through a process to get a special use permit to do that. There was also a motion that the state form a working group moving forward with the same topic, as far as guiding on state waterfowl management areas, felt like the overall proposal to restrict guiding.. there hadn't been enough legwork upfront to pass that. So there's a motion to form a working group and kind of work through that process and then come back through the Wildlife RAC and Board process and see if we can flush some of the details out on that process. That will be done. There was a vote on that and it passed unanimously. Then the remainder of the waterfowl proposal did pass, and there were a few little minor details on that. That was that motion.

The next agenda item dealt with the electronics meeting rule. That's kind of what we're seeing tonight, where people can join online or they can come in person. The motion was made to accept the Divisions proposal as presented and that passed unanimously as well.

There were a couple of other agenda items on that meeting, in particular, conservation permit lists; switching from a one year to a three-year process, voted on and passed unanimously. Another agenda item was the CWMU advisement committee vacancies. As those were proposed they were voted on and passed unanimously as well. The Parker Sage Grouse hunt area was proposed by the Division to close that, and that motion passed unanimously as well. And we have a new Wildlife Board Chairman, that's Kevin Albrecht out of the southeast region, and a new Vice Chair to Kevin, and that's our own Randy Dearth who is here tonight.

That pretty much sums it up there, Brett.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thanks Dan. And with that I would like to take the opportunity to welcome Randy from the Wildlife Board here with us tonight. Thanks for attending Randy. And one other little brief item just to update the RAC members on. We dealt with the LOA tags and that process and it was fairly controversial, so a committee was formed at the state level with myself, Randy, and Dax Mangus from the northeast region are participating on that. We've been meeting for about three months. And Heidi from the Mule Deer Foundation, excuse me. And we've been meeting for about 2-3 months every 2-3 weeks, and we're getting to the point where we're about to make recommendations to the



Wildlife Board. I just wanted to let the RAC know that that did take place. I think next month or the month after you'll see the details and I guess be able to discuss it at that point when it goes to the Wildlife Board. With that I'll turn the time over to Miles with a regional update

**00:10:08      4) Regional Update (Informational)**  
**Miles Hanberg, NERO Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Good evening everyone. It's a busy time of year for us, so I have a few updates on what's going on. First of all, just want to mention to the RAC members that there is the RAC and Board training that is coming up on August 25<sup>th</sup>, I think most of you should have received an email about that. That will be out at Eccles Wildlife Center out in Farmington, or you could attend online on the virtual format as well. In that email there is a registration link, and those that chose to attend in person there is an option for reimbursement for travel as well. Just a quick reminder on that.

Just to give you a rundown on some of the major things that are going on in our sections this summer. Our aquatics section, we've been really concerned about drought. It's been a statewide issue where we've really taken a look at our fisheries and come up with ways to mitigate some of these impacts from drought. Fortunately in this region we're not facing the severe impacts that they are on the Sevier River Drainage, and some of those in southern Utah. Where some of those will be completely dry. A lot of the Reservoirs have dead pools or conservation pools that will still sustain fish. So the approach that this region took for most of that is to reduce some of our stocking rates in some of our Reservoirs to mitigate potential losses. But I think we'll do it pretty well by the way it looks. That's kind of been the approach here. A lot of those fish were redirected to other waters and some of our region, those places included Flaming Gorge Reservoir, Starvation, and some of the bigger waterbodies that can hold fish longer. I think that we'll come through the drought this year pretty well on most reservoirs here. Our aquatics staff are busy getting ready to complete some more rotenone work up on the North Slope. This will be continuation of some of the work on the Carter Creek Drainage. There are a couple of additional streams that will be treated this fall in preparation for future Colorado River Cutthroat Trout restorations. That work will be going on over the next couple of months. Our aquatics crews did survey Reader Creek that has been previously treated. They did a survey up there and the Colorado Cutthroat looked really good and healthy in there and they didn't encounter any Brook Trout. So it looks like that project was a good success for Colorado Cutthroat Trout. One of the things that we've been watching, and there have been a lot of rumors and information going on out there, has been the release of water from Flaming Gorge Dam. The Bureau Reclamation will be releasing 125,000 feet, they're actually in process in doing that now from Flaming Gorge, and that will go to Lake Powell to try to keep a buffer above the power plant infrastructure. Right now it's looking like that could drop the reservoir about 4-6 feet by winter, and there could be additional releases planned in the late winter and into next spring. One of the things we're really watching, is a lot of the Kokanee in Flaming Gorge are in lake spawners. So when they spawn in late October-November you want to have as stable water levels as possible until those

fryers actually hatch from the eggs. Anyhow, it's a tough water situation that the Colorado River is facing for sure. We were able to stock a number of 3–5-inch walleye in Red Fleet. These are sterile walleye and they were actually spawned from Starvation Reservoir this year. Those fish look really good and will hopefully give the walleye in Red Fleet a little boost.

Let's talk a little more about wildlife. Some of our wildlife big game work. Again, we're documenting low fawn survival on the Book Cliffs this year with the study from BYU. A number of those fawns tend to tip over for no apparent reason. We think it could be heat exhaustion on those really hot days when fawns were being born, there were several that died within a week there. With necropsies there was nothing really found. So, unfortunately we're still experiencing low fawn survival in the Book Cliffs. You know we're also dealing with a lot of depredation issues in the region. This drought has really forced a lot of pronghorn as well as elk into some of our agricultural lands, so that has been a big challenge that our staff has been trying to work through as well. Fortunately bears have been kind of quiet this year. I thought it was going to be big bear year, given the drought, but they've been minding their business this year. Maybe people have been keeping things clean, I don't know which. Fortunately we haven't had to deal with many bears this year, so that's good.

Our habitat section have been working on building what they're calling a mega-guzzler out in the Book Cliffs. It's going to be about 10,000 gallons of storage capacity when it's finished. The tanks are in and actually the big thunderstorms we had last week have put about a foot of water in those tanks I understand, without the collection apron. That apron will be done the next couple of weeks. In addition we're looking at building some additional pronghorn guzzlers out in the Pleasant Valley area to try to keep pronghorn away from some of the ag fields where they get into some depredation problems. Then we've also been working with some local conservation groups in hauling some water to these pronghorns to give them something to drink to keep them away from the fields as well. Fortunately it's been a really mild wildfire in our region. I think there was one out in that Snake John area out on BLM land. For the most part it's been pretty quiet in this region. But we've been doing some reclamation work from fires over the last couple of years this fall as well.

Just a quick update on outreach stuff, there was a hummingbird banding viewing event last Saturday at the Red Canyon Lodge. Nearly 100 hummingbirds were captured and banded up there and the public got to view that as all four species in this area were present in that. That was a neat event for the folks that attended. There will be a monarch butterfly tagging event at Dinosaur National Monument on August 14<sup>th</sup> if anybody wants to participate that. Anthony is the guy over her that can help you out with that. Monarch butterfly numbers have really sharply declined in the last few years, so it's a species that's getting a lot of attention throughout the west right now. Dedicated hunter projects and work is in full swing right now as people try to get that completed before hunting season begins. The last thing I'll mention was yesterday was the final ceremony for the "Fishing with the Fox" contest with a bunch of prize drawings for the tagged fish. Over 200 of the 500 tagged fish were caught for that contest. That's a pretty impressive tag return rate, and I'm glad that people had the opportunity to come

out and participate in some fishing. That's a fun event that is partnered with the local radio station.

I think that's all the updates I have for the region today, but I'd be happy to take any questions, if there are.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thanks Miles. Does anyone on the RAC have any questions? Ok, we'll roll right into the agenda actions items. Darren DeBloois is here and you're the popular one today, as you have the first two items. If you wouldn't mind, Darren, with this process the presentations were online and that's the goal for people to look at the presentations and not take up the time in the RAC meetings to redo the presentation. But Darren is here to summarize the proposal. That's what I'd like you to do, is just do a brief summary of the furbearer and bobcat harvest recommendations. And then we'll open it up. The process will be, we'll have questions from the public, then question from the RAC, then comments from the public, and comments from the RAC, and then we'll vote on the item. The public that's online you will not have the opportunity to ask questions live. We will address the online questions also in the process. So Darren if you'll take a moment.

**00:20:04      5) Furbearer and Bobcat Harvest Recommendations for 2021-2022  
(Action) - Darren DeBloois, Mammals Coordinator**

Presentations could be viewed at

<http://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

**Darren DeBloois:** Yes I'll just briefly summarize the furbearer recommendations. We're just recommending a change in season dates in accordance with the calendar. For bobcats we have three metrics, we look at juveniles in the harvest, females in the harvest and adult survival and those metrics are looking better. We're proposing the plan for bobcats based on that perspective. If this occurs, then you do that essentially. We're recommending removing the cap on tags going back to 6 tags per individual. Then adding another week on to the front end of the season. That's still a week shorter than it would be on the base line, but we always take or add to the front end of the season for bobcat. So for furbearer, that's pretty much it in a nut shell.

**Brett Prevedel:** And what was the tag limit before, four?

**Darren DeBloois:** It was four so we're going back to six.

**Brett Prevedel:** And it has been six in the past?

**Darren DeBloois:** It has. In fact, the baseline has been six, I think we might have dropped to five for a little while, but it's been pretty much six since this plan was enacted. Kind of back to where we were when we started.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, thank you. I'll now ask the public if you have any questions. If you do have a question, how do you want to do this Mike? Do you

have a microphone? Ok you'll come to the podium and state your name, and ask your question, if you have any. Are there any questions from the public on furbearer or bobcat?

**00:21:55 Questions from the public/RAC, Comments from the public**

**00:22:30 Electronic Public Comment Report (Informational)  
Miles Hanberg, NERO Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** We only had three commenters on the furbearer proposal. They were split with one strongly agreed, one somewhat agreed, and the other somewhat disagreed. I think the main concern from one person was they were concerned about potential over harvest on bobcats. Other people wanted to see more bobcats in the population. A pretty insignificant amount of comments. Of the three they were a little bit across the spectrum on what their opinion was.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Comments from the RAC?

**00:23:16 Comments from RAC Members**

**Brett Prevedel:** I've been here for a little while, so I guess I'll comment. Back when we had a cap, Leslie was the biologist at the time and we had a cap of 2,500 or 2,000 or something like that, and it was proposed to raise it to 9,000 and it was pretty substantial and everyone was concerned, and she commented that it probably won't change the harvest very much because there is only a certain number of people who know how to catch bobcats. That was the case, the harvest didn't dramatically go up when we increased it, so I'm assuming that this time around you're not expecting much harvest change?

**Darren DeBlois:** No, it seems like harvest typically doesn't impact population levels at all. It's other things like small mammal population and even pelt price. We don't anticipate.. we've sold the last few years with six per person and unlimited permits available. It's about 8,000 people that buy a permit. A little bit more than the cap, but I don't anticipate a problem.

**Brett Prevedel:** So you haven't even hit the cap on the total number.

**Darren DeBlois:** With the cap we've hit it and we've sold them all. But before we had a cap we were at about 8,000 and the cap was for 6,400 so we'd expect to see something like maybe a couple thousand more people with permits. But the harvest changes more in terms of more with what the pelt price is doing, more than anything.

**Dan Abeyta:** You may have mentioned this Darren or Brett, and I may have missed it. But is there currently a cap for bobcats then?

There is. Just the last two years we saw what looked like low birth rates, low juveniles in the harvest. Two years ago I think we had all three metrics

outside the harvest, last year I think we had two outside. This year two are inside and one is right on the bubble.

**Dan Abeyta:** That cap is what?

**Darren DeBlois:** It was over 6,400, close to that.

Any other questions or comments from anyone? Ok, with that I'll ask for a motion on the furbearer and bobcat harvest recommendations for 2021-22.

#### **00:26:23 RAC Discussion/Division Clarification and Motions**

**The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Daniel Davis.**

**MOTION: To accept the Divisions proposals as presented  
Motion passed unanimously**

#### **00:26:59 6) Cougar Recommendations and Rule R657-10 revisions for 2021-2022 (Action) - Darren DeBlois, Mammals Coordinator**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<http://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

**Darren DeBlois:** Just a quick summary, and I'll add a little bit on predator management if that's alright. Having gone through four RACs there seems to be a little bit of confusion on that, so I'll elaborate on that a little bit, if that's ok.

So first of all, we had some items on the agenda that were informational at the very beginning. As you are probably aware, or maybe not if you're new, the legislature recently passed legislation that requires the Director to take immediate action if we determine that predators could be limiting ungulate populations throughout the state. And we do that on a unit-by-unit basis. What we did in the presentation is show which units fall under those scenarios. The way that predator management plans are implanted is according to policy, and that policy came around last year and was approved by the Board. The think that I think has been confusing is sometimes it's difficult for the public to know why a unit is going into predator management or not. So I want to just take a second and kind of explain. I'll focus on mule deer and mountain lions since tonight we're talking about cougars, and mule deer seem to be the one.. bighorn as well but to a little lesser extent. First of all, there really is one fairly obvious scenario when we'd want to put a unit in predator management, and that is if you detect cause specific mortality especially toward adults. It could be for young as well attributed to a predator, in this case cougars. We're using our collared deer data for that information. Many of our units have collared deer as apart of BYUs ongoing study and we do have cause specific mortality. So for some units we'll look directly at that. If we have a high percentage of adults being taken by mountain

lions, that might be a reason why we recommend a predator management plan. What the predator management plan does, its goal is to reduce predator densities on that unit over a given amount of time. We leave a lot of these decisions to our regional biologists and managers. We feel like they're the ones best suited to understand what's going on on the ground. We put a lot of weight on their recommendations for those plans. The second field that might place a mule deer unit under predator management would be a short-term habitat change, drought, hard winter that causes a steep decline in mule deer numbers and brings that population significantly below what the range in normal years would be capable of supporting. A lot of the units that we see in the predator management right now kind of fall into that category from the drought that we've had, and we've had some hard winters too and have seen a lot of mule deer populations decline. We did recently big game, I believe last fall, correct me if I'm wrong. We re-evaluated our mule deer population objectives just to make sure those are where they needed to be. In light of that analysis we look at where our mule deer population with regards to our management objective. The concern when you see a population drop like that, is the mule deer population supports a certain number of predators typically. When you see a large reduction in that population the predator numbers don't tend to decline with the mule deer, they'll tend to hang on for some amount of time. Some studies suggest even as long as eight years, there is still enough deer to maintain that population. Eventually it will decline. What we're trying to do is to reduce the density of predators under a shorter window so we can bring those populations more into alignment. Then as conditions improve and mule deer start to come back that they don't have a top-down pressure on the population from predators. Hopefully that will help with our discussion today. I know we'll talk more about it.

As far as summary, back to what we're taking about. We did make some recommendations to try and simplify the guidebook. As far as reconceptualizing our hunt structure, we're kind of getting rid of the split unit terminology, but we'll still have it in concept. Where we'd have limited entry unit on some seasons. The cougar guide book is complicated and some of it has to be complicated because we like to give different opportunities and choices, but we're trying to pull that together and tighten it up, so some of the presentation dealt with that. As mentioned, we are proposing some rule changes, a little bit of house cleaning, but most of the rule changes coincide with the legislature that passed making sure that our rule aligns with the legislation and policy.

And also our cougar plan we're recommending some tweaks to that for the same reason. We did convene an internal committee to look at the cougar management plan and decided to bring in some outside folks and revamp the plan. We felt like this time the targets in the plan are sufficient, but we did need to make accommodations for the legislative changes. So we're recommending that this year. We anticipate putting a committee together as the plan sunsets sometime in 2025 around that timeframe.

The only other thing we have to add is we did catch an error that was in the presentation, I just wanted to make everyone aware of. On the season dates for the pursuit season for the La Sals, San Juan Mountains, and the Book Cliffs units the use of hounds closes on.. the original presentation said the 14<sup>th</sup> of April, you actually can't use hounds from that point forward. So the date is actually the 13<sup>th</sup>

of April would be the last day a person could use hounds. Just a minor oversight that is important. So that would be part of our proposal, so as you vote tonight I don't think you'd have to consider that separately.

Other than that I'd be happy to answer questions.

**Brett Prevedel:** And then just a summary of the units that went into predator management? There was a significant adjustment towards that, wasn't it?

**Darren DeBloois:** Not this year, but last year quite a few. So we have 53 cougar management units in the state, and 33 are under predator management currently. Two of those we're recommending this year. Actually not recommending, the Director has already established predator management plans on those units. So 20 are under the plan guidelines and half of those have a limited entry season prior to opening up to the general public harvest objective. The other 10 of the 20 just have a harvest objective and they're open year-round.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. I'll ask for questions from the public. Any questions from the public?

**00:35:31 Questions from the public and RAC member**

**Brett Prevedel:** No questions. Miles would you address the comments from the online?

**00:35:34 Electronic Public Comment Report (Informational)  
Miles Hanberg, NERO Regional Supervisor**

**Miles Hanberg:** Yes, the online comments again it was just three commenters for this region. For the cougars one person strongly agreed and two strongly disagreed. One person felt like he's encountered lots of cougar kills. He refers to the Strawberry/Fruitland area. The other talked about having many many lion hunters, not a lot of mature lions in the Book Cliffs. The last persons comment was from the Mountain Lion Foundation and their concern was that they didn't want to add the Beaver East into predator management status and was also very concerned about hunters being able to kill any collared cougar, stating that can impact studies and research when those collared lions are harvested. That's kind of a summary of what those comments were.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Darren, maybe I'll just jump in here. The collared lion prohibit.. there were several comments that came in. Some didn't come in through the official channels. Utah Houndsmen sent in a letter, a few of them. What's been happening with that issue? And the recommendation is to make it illegal to kill a collared lion.

**Darren DeBloois:** Right, I don't want to steal Matt's thunder, because I know that he'll address that in a comment. Do you want to wait until then, Brett? Ok, we'll do that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Let's just go to comments from the public.

**00:37:42**      **Comments from the public**

**Matt Farnsworth:** Thank you guys for having me out. Matt Farnsworth, Utah Houndsmen Association (UHA). Dusty, I apologize, did you get my letter? I don't know that your email was on the updated RAC. Ok, I'll try to cover everything and I will send you a copy as soon as I can.

So we had a couple of suggestions moving forward. Over the last four RACs we've learned a lot about our suggestions and where there has been some confusion. So hopefully I can clarify that and end with a bang.

The first suggestion is removing the public land grazing allotment from the depredation rule. There is a lot of confusion on that. Keep the 96-hour and Wildlife Service options for livestock owners that are running on public land grazing allotments. The way the current rule is written, months after the sheep have left the mountain, if it's a chronic depredation situation the Division can issue tags that are targeting potential transient lions that are moving through months after the last kill has happened. We'd like to see that removed.

As far as the collar study, I'll talk a little about it. It's targeting six-seven units in the central region. One of those units doesn't allow hunting by hounds, so we've left it out of our proposal. The six units in the central region to study and verify some of the USU study in the Book Cliffs scavenging. Lots of different ways it can go in the future. None of those units are in predator management, all of those units are doing fairly well on deer populations. We're requesting that those units do not allow the harvest of collared lions only by houndsmen, we wouldn't want to penalize a sportsman with a spot and stalk tag, that from 300 yards didn't see the collar. Absolutely doesn't affect depredation in anyway. If there is a livestock owner that needs to deal with a problem that deals with their livelihood. But for houndsmen on those six units, restrict the harvest of collared lions. Right now there are six lions that are collared. The plan at the end of the study is to have around 30. The current ratio is five females to one tom, so we're not anticipating a big impact to the sportsmen with cougar tags on those six units. We didn't want to leave it open ended to run forever, so we are recommending that it expire at the end of the cougar management plan, which is in three years. That also coincides with the average life of the radio collars that have been placed on these lions. That would also give the group that puts the new cougar management plan together the option of extending that or waiving it as it. Currently the cougar management plan allows for this change, and it's also written in the cougar take rules, and has been written in the past on studies that don't do with cause specific mortality in cougars. It's written, it's familiar, here in the recent past. It would really help out with what some of these predators are doing on the Wasatch Front. Just as a note that proposal has passed at every RAC that we've been to so far. Again, all the units within the central region.

As far as the Beaver East goes, we have that in our recommendation. The deer going into winter have a poor condition that suggests more of a habitat issue than a depredation issue. The Division has talked a little about the predator management today, and the habitat potentially bringing the deer number down and



lions holding them down from the top. The original house bill that is law doesn't address that. It's very specific about when the Division takes action, and potential habitat issues because of drought isn't included in that. I don't know if that's something you guys could take action on, but it's something we wanted to bring through the public process just as an awareness issue.

On that note, we would like to go through the public process to request the Division publish a clear criteria of when a unit goes into predator management and when it comes out. So it's similar to the bobcat plan where there are triggers, if this happens then it will go in. If these matrixes are hit then it comes out. Right now it's less up to discussion and we'd like to see more of a clear "if this then this". I know there is a policy right now, it went through the Wildlife Board, but I think with you guys prodding we might be able to get it back in front of the Wildlife Board to establish that clear criteria.

The last proposal, there has been a little confusion on it. Currently there are nine units that are harvest objective only. In your region you have one, it's the South Slope and those sub units across there. What we're proposing with that last proposal is all the units that are harvest objective that are not the limited entry terminology that they're going to now, and are not in predator management, we move from harvest objective to that limited entry quote unquote split season. That would force hunters to apply for the unit they want; I'll use your unit here the South Slope for the example. Establish or keep the quota as is, establish that as a limited entry unit. It would force the hunters to draw that tag to focus there. It would give them the first part of the season which would allow for a more trophy type atmosphere for a hunt. If at the midpoint of the season they haven't reached the Divisions goals of harvest, it would open up to a harvest objective and anyone else could come in. that would be a benefit as well for hunters that don't draw that tag and predator management forcing more hunters to those areas hopefully help with the take that the Division wants off those areas. It would also simplify the guidebook being one complete hunt section. It would involve 9 hunt units total, one of them in this region. Are there any questions I can answer for you guys, off of that letter?

**Brett Prevedel:** I'm not sure how many lions are collared around the state outside of those six units. But it's the same issue, it costs a lot of money, you loose data when you lose a collared lion and you have to start over. So, why is the recommendation limited to the six units.

**Matt Farnsworth:** Outside of those six units, my understanding over the course of the RACs we've established there are about 12-15 lions that are collared. Not in those six units. The reason we didn't present it, that was the original proposal statewide, no lions with collars. That didn't pass our Board, and we didn't feel like it would pass the RACs because the units that have those lions being in predator management and the Division wanting them removed whether they have the collar or not.

From a scientific background, I will say depending on what the study is, if it's a cause specific mortality study the hunter harvest is part of that cause mortality and may be valuable data as well. Those are the reasons it did not pass our Board. Thank you for your time.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you Matt. Any other comments from the public? Darren, what's the DWRs thoughts on these collared lions?

**Darren DeBlois:** Our strategy so far has been to ask in the guidebook that people not take collared animals. That includes anything that is wearing a collar currently. But Matt's right, it takes a lot of time and effort that goes into putting these collars on and if they're taken a week after you put the collar on, it can be frustrating. The history on it, we have had a few lions... I know one on the Book Cliffs collared a male, that was one that was taken pretty quickly. For the most part it looks like people are avoiding taking collared lions. The other thing I'd point out is lion studies typically have lower sample sizes so one lion can be a lot more important. What we could do in practice, if we had a lion taken under the current system there would be no citation issued and we'd use that collar to put back out on another animal. We'd encore the time and effort cost a second time.

**Brett Prevedel:** We've already went over the comment cards. Are there any comments from the RAC?

**00:47:59**      **Comments from the public**

**Dan Abeyta:** I've got a question, Darren. Were there four amendments that Matt made? Total of six? Ok. How did the other RACs throughout the state perceive this and how did they vote on these six amendments that were presented?

**Darren DeBlois:** As Matt mentioned, the collar proposal for those six specified units restricting the use of hounds to take those animals have passed on all four so far.

The public land depredation language in the rule is actually in code, so that really is not something that the Board or RAC can change, it would require legislative change; but certainly open it up if the RAC wants to talk about it, just FYI on that.

I went through a little bit on the predator management stuff. The language in the code, what it does is directs the Division Director that whenever an ungulate population is not meeting it's objective and the Division can determine that predators are a significant cause of that then the Director should take immediate action and then the policy is where we define what I talked about earlier. That's how that comes together. I'm a little bit, by default and purpose, we wanted to give our district biologist some sideboards and some conceptual restraints on when the units should be recommended for predator management or not. I do get a little bit nervous about putting hard triggers, because some units can be different than others. We do have some good professional people and I trust our district biologist and regional managers to make sound decisions. By design, that's how we wrote the policy and that's why.

The final thing of adding a limited entry to all harvest objective units. My only concern there is it takes some flexibility away from our district biologist. There are different situations and strategies there where we may want straight harvest objective. If we're having depredation issues for example, we might want

a landowner to just buy a tag over the counter and just go hunting rather than having to draw a tag. It certainly could be done, but they'd have to go through a few extra steps to obtain a permit from us. I understand where Matt is coming from, but I'd prefer to let our district biologist to decide if they want limited entry seasons or not.

I think that's it.

**Brett Prevedel:** It appears to me that if the collar issue, if we just make it illegal on six units and recommended that you don't shoot one on the other units, you're creating yourself another... You've mentioned about trying to make the rules less complicated and you can shoot one over here, but you can't shoot one here. Plus it's the same issue. It's expensive and you're trying to gather data, so my personal take on it is if we do recommend making it illegal to take a collared lion, I think it ought to be state wide. I'm still a little confused about the.. I mean the harvest objective offers a lot of opportunity for houndsmen to have all those units and be able to use one tag and move between units. I always viewed it as a real nice thing because they have a lot more opportunity to spread out, they have a lot more opportunities to not compete for certain lions, so I'm kind of surprised by that. I'd like you to maybe address that a little more, Matt.

**Matt Farnsworth:** This isn't totally to the Divisions benefit to simplifying and getting that take where its' needed. Currently there are 33 units in the state, unlimited year-round, over the counter, that creates a lot of opportunity. You have a number (inaudible) 20 bonus points that they've occurred that would like a quality hunt they can use those bonus points on, where they're not dealing with year-round, 365 unlimited harvest. And this would give them nine more options where we could use our double-digit number of points that we have occurred over the last couple of years to have the quality and less stress of, we have to kill one right now before it snows, or somebody else is going to come in and kill it before we get the chance. Provide that opportunity for our members.

**Brett Prevedel:** You're specifically talking about all the South Slope units?

**Matt Farnsworth:** No. It's the South Slope, I'm not sure exactly, it's South Slope/Vernal/Bonanza. It's the only unit in your region.

**Brett Prevedel:** Not the South Slope Yellowstone? So fairly limited area. Thank you.

**Daniel Davis:** If I could speak to that also, a little bit Brett. So, not only along with that, but each hunter is legal to obtain two harvest permits as well. So when you have those harvest objective units or even the predator management units, hunters can take up to two cougars a year with combination with a limited entry permit, spot and stock, and so forth. That approval went through last year or the year before. So hunters can obtain two tags and harvest up to two animals a year. The original idea with having the hunt structures like we do is to direct focused harvest as well. When everything is wide open now you don't have the

direct harvest in the predator management areas like you would like to see and the intention of going to predator management. So it give more opportunity for people go all over the state instead of those focused areas where needed and more focused harvest. So the harvest objective allows that quality opportunity but then the end of the season the opportunity to reach that objective of harvest by the end of the season. Which again that can be done by folks who harvested one in the predator management unit and come up there when the harvest objective opens. Excuse me, the split unit opened to that harvest objective portion of the season. So that's just some take back to history to years ago when the hunt units were set and things were classified that way. I just wanted to give a little more clarification on that.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Are there any other comments from the RAC?

**Daniel Davis:** Yes, I have one more question for Darren, if I may, Mr. Chairman? On the rule 657-1021, Darren, does that allow a grazer an opportunity to harvest a lion in those public lands any time of year whether the livestock are present or not?

**Darren DeBlois:** If they are issued a permit by the Division. Our objectives are always going to be to address a problem. WE leave it to our district biologist to determine what's the likelihood that the lion that's been eating sheep all summer and the summer before is still in the area or not. Typically, we don't do this very often, we've done it a fair amount in the northern region, some in the southern region, I don't believe the northeastern region has issued a depredation tag, I'm seeing heads shaking. It's an option and a tool and it's specifically used for chronic situations. You know three months after the lions been eating sheep, is it still there or not? The district biologist might be in a better place to know what the likelihood of that is. So it's a tool, but we also use restraint. Those would all have to be approved through the manager and regional supervisor as well. So those type of things typically they're limited in time and space, so they have a sunset, they're good for a certain period of time, and often times they're limited to the area where the depredation occurred, so we draw a boundary around where those are valid in order to avoid them going and hunting the whole mountain. So that's how we do it in practice.

**Daniel Davis:** So Darren, just to clarify that sounds to me like it's more the depredation permit where they have up to 96-hours to harvest a targeted animal, but the way this rule reads, it would allow them short answer basically anytime of the year, livestock present or not. Which could be arguable if it's a ranging lion that move through the area and really isn't there in the winter time or the summer time grazing areas. Not to get confused with the livestock depredation, correct?

**Darren DeBlois:** This permit is a depredation permit. It can be used for chronic losses outside of when the animals are on the mountain. The 96-hour provision, they don't even have to tell us. If they have sheep losses they can go

take care of the lion and typically they're working with Wildlife services and they'll start tracking from the kill and they're pretty good about getting the one that killed the sheep. Then they need to report it if they take a lion. So we may not even be aware of it within that 96-hour window, and that starts every time a lion kills something. So why the sheep are on the mountain typically they're using that 96-hour rule. This is just for circumstances where we're allowing them to take some lions outside.. maybe it's a week after they left the mountain and they weren't able to capture the lion that was hitting them all summer, we can issue them a permit. Wildlife Services, they don't work after the livestock leave the mountain, they're done after that. So this would give us a tool we can help producers with. But there is some digression there and we rely on our folks to do that.

**Daniel Davis:** Thank you Darren. So that was I was trying to get to a point is when the animals are on the landscape, and as we've seen through some of these studies and the cluster points and things of that nature, there are some overlying regional areas with some of those lions and the way they move and predators as a whole. I mean these rules are pretty well in conjunction with bears as well. That was the issue that the Houndsmen were looking at when they got into this. Through some discussion and questions that I had was the thought one week later, that could be a roaming lion that came through one week after the animals were out of the allotment. I mean we're talking fence lines, grazing pastures, and big areas that these animals cover. That was one of the concerns that they've got protection through the depredation rules for 96-hours with those animals present. The scary part is those animals aren't there and now you really don't know if the focused animal is the intended animal. Or excuse me, one that is deserving of such unfortunate outcome on their behalf. I just wanted to make those comments and get a clear picture for the rest of the members to understand what that proposal meant.

Then speaking of the collar study, and maybe this question is meant for the Division. There was some question about the remainder of the units. Even though they're in predator management for deer, as Matt mentioned they were worried about the issues with the perception and things of that nature; but with a pretty low collar count we're not talking about a lot of lions in those areas. But how long is that study to remain in effect? I get periodic updates from Utah State that kind of give some information. But if those collars have a life span on them, are they being monitored by somebody in the Division? Or how does that process work once the study is completed with collars deployed?

**Darren DeBlois:** All of that data is scoured and compiled and tracked in our Wildlife tracker application. So as long as the collars are live, we'll track those animals. As far as the study goes, they just finished their third capture season, so they're wrapping up on a lot of the field work. They are working kill sites this summer and if we do have any kittens born they'll attempt to capture and collar those. By fall USU will be done with the data collection and they'll start in to the data analysis section. So we will have collared lions from the study on the landscape, but USU will be done with that portion. We're still interested in what they're doing and how they're moving and that's all really good data to

have. We're less concerned about if one of those lions is taken by a hunter in the Manti, the Book Cliffs or the Cache. That's a little less critical for the study. Again, just discouraging people seems to work pretty well although we have lost a small percentage of those to hunters.

**Daniel Davis:** The reason I ask as well, and maybe Clint or Dax perhaps, but with the most recent update from the neonate study and not having a cause specific mortality for some of those fawns and the affects of drought not only on the ungulates and the predators and how that affects their movements. Is there benefit to continue or establish as much information from both sides of that as well? Or again more of a discouragement for harvest?

**Darren DeBlois:** I'll let Dax or Clint talk specifically about the Book Cliffs. I would just say we're going to be continuing to collar animal such as bears and lions. We have an interest and there are various reasons why we'd want to do it and we have the option, but we don't want to let these collars short circuit our management. So management questions will always be first but then if we can obtain our management goals and keep lions on the air, great. Depredation is a great example the Houndsmen talked about. If we have a collared lion in sheep herds, we're going to remove that lion even though it's wearing a collar because we don't want to pay for all of those sheep.

**Daniel Davis:** It's pretty easy to see. And by the recommendation that doesn't protect the lion in a depredation or spot and stalk instance. That would not be an issue at that point, it would actually be easier to identify the perpetrator, as Matt would put it.

**Darren DeBlois:** We detected that on the Cache. We actually set down with the producers and said we know where this lion is, we know it's killed sheep. IF you want today we'll go get it, but if you're interested we can leave it on the air and see if we can determine how many sheep does this lion kill and eat that you don't find. We did that for one summer there. There are options and we can work on a landscape level and a district level for some of that stuff. That summer was about 3-1. They were finding one for about every three that they didn't find.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. Darren, while you're there, the proposed revision that we're voting on 657-10 is.

**Darren DeBlois:** So, if we're talking about the depredation stuff, oh the revisions. It doesn't include what the Houndsmen are talking about. So it's mainly housekeeping. It's getting rid of the split concept and redefining how we set up limited entry hunting. The section that the Houndsmen are talking about is taken directly from code. Again, it's not really something the Board or RAC can change. The language about public depredation tags. Is that what you were asking me, Brett? (yeah) Yeah, so currently that language is in code and that's how it is in the rule.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. If there are no further discussion, we can split this item a little bit, if there are some motions that deviate from the Divisions recommendation. Be happy to take them individually. Then we can approve the remainder as a block. Is there any desire to make motions? I'd entertain a motion now for anything other than the Divisions recommendation.

**Daniel Davis:** Mr. Chair, could I ask a question to the rest of the RAC by chance? Would anyone be willing to speak to some of this? Potentially avoid redundant or unnecessary motions that fail a second or don't get support. Or do we just move forward and just make the motions and go through everything.

**Brett Prevedel:** Is there any desire to make any a motion on the collars for the six units or a state wide basis?

**Dick Bess:** I would like to make a motion to do statewide no kill collared lions by houndsmen.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, we have a motion from Dick to prohibit take collared lions with hounds statewide. Do we have a second?

**The following motion was made by Dick Bess, seconded by Daniel Davis.**

**MOTION: I move to prohibit the take of collared Mountain Lions statewide by hounds**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Brett Prevedel:** I think we'll have to just go with motions, Daniel, just to answer your question. It's hard to communicate with remote and present at the same time. So if you have a desire to make a motion, go ahead.

**Daniel Davis:** Most definitely. I would like to make a motion to return those nine harvest objective units to the limited entry split season harvest structure to ensure focus on the predator management units.

**Brett Prevedel:** Did you follow that, Darren?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yeah, I'm just double checking. I'm pretty sure there are ten units that don't currently have limited entry on.

**Brett Prevedel:** So these are the units that are not on predator management, is that correct, Daniel?

**Daniel Davis:** That is correct, Mr. Chair.

**Darren DeBlois:** There are ten units that don't currently have a limited entry on them.

**Brett Prevedel:** That are harvest objective, that are not in predator management. (correct) And in the region, what units does that affect here?

**Darren DeBlois:** It would just be the South Slope. Oh sorry Dax, go ahead.

**Dax Mangus:** I'm the regional wildlife program manager, and I might speak to this unit in our region specifically just to give a little additional information. So the SS/Bonanza/Vernal/Diamond that unit actually does qualify to be in predator management because of our deer population. But we did not recommend putting in predator management because we already had the harvest objective strategy for lion hunting on that unit, and we had not been hitting the quota. To make that formal recommendation to put it into predator management would not have changed anything with regard to how we were already hunting lions on the unit. It does meet the criteria to be in predator management but we did not formally put it into predator management for deer because we already had the harvest strategies moved to had we put it into predator management. So, from our perspective since we did that, if we went back and retroactively changed the cougar harvest strategy, that would be a little concerning to us and we would regret not having made the recommendation to formally put it into predator management. But when we did make that recommendation it's because it wasn't going to change anything. Just for clarification.

**Darren DeBlois:** The only thing I'd add to that is probably what would happen if this did change to include a limited entry season we'd recommend a predator management for that unit.

**Brett Prevedel:** The Book Cliffs are already in predator management, and SS Yellowstone is already predator management? Ok.

**Darren DeBlois:** I don't want to short circuit the discussion, but just so everyone is aware of where we would be coming from. This is what I was talking about, really having the flexibility that we could do something like this and choose a different strategy if we needed to.

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes, and I hear what Matt and Daniel are saying, wanting to have an area to have a quality hunt, so I hear both sides.

**Daniel Davis:** Mr. Chair it's not just quality. It's directing predator harvest focus to predator management units specifically. If I could ask a clarifying question from Dax, did the Vernal/SS receive a change in the deer population objective? Or what are those numbers? How do they look in relation to predator management?

**Brett Prevedel:** They're looking that up right now to see what the objective status is.



**Dax Mangus:** We did recently lower the objective on those units, and it still qualifies on the lower objective that went through last fall when we redid unit deer management plans. We lowered the objective on that unit. I'd have to look the exact numbers up. We did lower it based on more recent performance and assessment of the unit, and it still qualified.

**Daniel Davis:** Ok, that was really the reasoning for my question.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, did we have a motion on the table? Daniel, repeat your motion please.

**Daniel Davis:** It was to establish the remaining units in the harvest objective strategy to a split harvest/limited entry management strategy.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, do we have a second on that motion? Ok, hearing none that motion fails for lack of a second. Are there any other motions that are deviations from the recommendation from the Division?

**Daniel Davis:** Yeah, I would like to address item four that the UHA presented in regard to.. excuse me that would be number three, the Beaver East as predator management. Concerns there, not specifically to that unit, however we have poor body conditions we can only forecast and take a guess. I would hate and not feel well knowing that we're kind of jumping the gun. We don't know what kind of winter we're going to encounter. We don't know the survivability of the adults. And a predator management plan is for three years. I feel like it's a preemptive approach. We do have the ability to address that if the winter is deemed to be significant and lead to a higher mortality. Under HB-125 it gives the Director those opportunities and the Division the full discretion to enact that when it's needed. I personally have a hard time seeing and acting that as a forecast. Kind of in speculation. I make a motion to not add Beaver East predator management depredation.

**Brett Prevedel:** We have a motion to exclude Beaver East from predator management. Is it proposed to be in predator management or is it currently in predator management?

**Darren DeBlois:** It's currently in predator management. The plans are Director action. That's not an action item on the agenda. Southeastern region made a recommendation to the Board along those lines, so that's how they handled it. But predator management is included as an informational, just so people know.

**Brett Prevedel:** It's not proposed to go, it is currently.

**Darren DeBlois:** Recently, yeah.

**Brett Prevedel:** It's already enacted. Ok. It's still a valid motion that we could make the recommendation to the Director to remove Beaver East from predator management. Is that accurate Daniel, does that summarize your motion?

**Daniel Davis:** Under predator management, maybe some clarification to my motion so I can be clear on this and maybe understand myself. Just because it's in predator management, Darren, does that automatically institute an unlimited harvest strategy, or can management strategies be applied even though it's predator management?

**Darren DeBlois:** It does, but typically we want to keep predator management units for three years. But having said, because we need time to see an affect. Having said that we review every predator management plan twice annually. In July after we've seen what kind of winter we've had and see real data on what our populations have done after the winter. It also gives us the chance to look at drought and see what's going on right in the summer. The other time we review would be in December just after we get body condition scores, so we're looking at how those animals look as they go into winter, and again in July. A plan could be enacted anytime, generally those two times of year if district biologist and management feel like it's necessary. But they could also come out under the same review process. Conceivably it wouldn't necessarily have to be three years. Most of the time we're going to be looking at that time frame. Conceivably if facts on the ground change, new research, whatever, they could be brought out before the end of that period. Daniel, hopefully that kind of clarifies the process of what we're doing.

**Daniel Davis:** It does, in understanding that being under predator management plan gives it a higher level of focus if you will rather than one that is not. I guess the main part of my question is, is it a requirement that the hunt strategy or harvest strategy for the predator management goes unlimited. Or is there an opportunity for the Division that I wasn't clear on the rule on that. And if by default there is no discretion it falls into the unlimited harvest?

**Darren DeBlois:** It's unlimited according to policy. I'm trying to remember what the legislation says. I don't think the legislation says that in policy. That's how we would address it. So if we had a unit where we were interested in a high quota and not necessarily unlimited that would remain harvest objective. Potentially qualifying for predator management. I don't know if that would necessarily happen, but if it goes predator management then it's unlimited.

**Daniel Davis:** By policy?

**Darren DeBlois:** By policy.

**Daniel Davis:** So in other words the Wildlife Board has the discretion for wildlife strategy irregardless of recommendations or what have you. It's not in house rule. And that's really what this address. And I want to speak to that a little because a lot of these initial harvest when these units go from a limited harvest

strategy and then get opened. There's an abundance of harvest that take place. And those older predators I think we're going to see some of that from the studies that have been done. Where it tends to spike the population of those animals and that's where I'm very cautious as well. I'd lean to not want trigger something like that and get us on that path. I'd rather err on the side of caution for a year and see where we end up next year with the digression that the Director has all the authority to increase quotas and things of that nature.

Mr. Chair if I may, I'd like to restate my motion or strike my motion and make a new one.

**Brett Prevedel:** Yes, go ahead.

**Daniel Davis:** My new motion would be that the Beaver East unit be managed in a harvest objective strategy rather than an unlimited with an increase of five lions more than the previous years harvest strategy.

**Brett Prevedel:** Repeat that, I'm trying to get it in my notes. Go ahead.

**Daniel Davis:** That the Beaver East hunt strategy be harvest objective with a five lion increase from the previous year harvest strategy. Instead of unlimited.

**Brett Prevedel:** I guess the conflicts with that is it would have to be removed from predator management to achieve that, right Darren?

**Daniel Davis:** No, it doesn't.

**Darren DeBlois:** If we change it to harvest objective, then yes it would have to be removed from the predator management plan. But I'd suggest the RAC go ahead and vote on it.

**Brett Prevedel:** It's clear what you're asking, Daniel. So we have a motion to change the Beaver East to harvest objective with a five harvest increase on the quota. Do I have a second?

**Dick Bess:** Before I comment, can I ask if the RAC that's over the Beaver, did they discuss this?

**Darren DeBlois:** Yes, it did come up under the same proposal that the Houndsmen Association made tonight. They voted to leave it. Well they didn't vote to move it forward to the Board at all. They discussed it, and I pointed out that it wasn't really an action item, but they were welcome, certainly within their purview to discuss it and make recommendations to the Board and they chose not to do anything further.

**Daniel Davis:** The southeast region did.

**Darren DeBlois:** Just to clarify, southern region is where this unit is located. We did have district biologists available at that meeting to explain why it was in predator management. I think that probably helped in that discussion. But yes, the southeast region last night did vote to recommend the Board and the Director to remove it from predator management.

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you. So Dick to answer your question the region that it is in did not make the motion, but the southeast region did make a similar motion to Daniels.

**Dick Bess:** Ok, thank you. That is what I was wondering.

**Brett Prevedel:** So we have a motion on the table, we're looking for a second on the Beaver East. Do we have one? Hearing none, we will move on. Are there any other deviations or are we ready to approve the remainder as presented? Speak now if there are any deviations. Alright, I will entertain a motion for the remainder of the action item cougar recommendations.

**Dan Abeyta:** I make a motion that we accept the remainder of the Divisions cougar recommendations as it's been presented here.

**The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Dick Bess.**

**MOTION: I move to accept the remainder of the Divisions proposal as presented.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Brett Prevedel:** Thank you, that wraps up our action items and we will now move to Strawberry River WMA habitat management plan. Tory Mathis is here. It was online and I hope everyone looked at it. Tory would you please just be available for questions, and if there is anything you'd want to summarize. I thought reading the document I thought it was really well done, and you've done a lot of work up there.

**1:28:12        7) NER Strawberry River WMA Habitat Management Plan –  
(Informational) Tory Mathis, NER Habitat Manager**

Presentations could be viewed at  
<http://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html>

**Tory Mathis:** Thank you. This is a fairly routine update of a management plan for our Strawberry River WMA, except what may not be entirely routine we want to change the boundaries. We want to lump the Strawberry River WMA and the Timber Canyon WMA into one property. Included with that would be all the lands that are going to be transferred to the DWR from the Bureau of Reclamation and the Mitigation Commission. So it makes one large continuous block that we want to manage as one WMA instead of separate parcels. When all is said and done the goals are simply to promote and protect and enhance fish and wildlife

habitat and opportunities for people to use that habitat for recreation. Fishing would be one of the primary uses but hunting also. Any questions I would gladly answer.

**Brett Prevedel:** I noticed there are some fragmented pieces like the Petrus property and a few that... are they providing any value, or did you just kind of end up with them?

**Tory Mathis:** We kind of ended up with them through a number of different transfers and purchases and they kind of fit best with that Strawberry River property to manage all as one piece. It's not necessarily unusual for our WMAs to have fragmented parcels scattered around. That happens fairly regularly.

(unknown): Those fragmented pieces are surrounded by tribal lands too and block up some big pieces of that.

**Dan Abeyta:** Tory, I've got a question. As the work continues, it's a big project obviously. Is there any discussion to return that fishery, the Strawberry River, to a native Colorado River Cutthroat Trout fishery? Before it was primarily a Brown Trout fishery.

**Tory Mathis:** I don't know if there have been a lot of discussions of returning it to native only. I think there are probably going to remain some of those non-native fish, the brown trout, that survived some of the flood events below the Solider Creek Dam. Some of those fish stayed in the river, and I don't believe there are any plans on removing them. But the Division has restocked Colorado River Cutthroat Trout and that is the priority to maintain in that system.

**Brett Prevedel:** Ok, are there any other questions for Tory? If not this is not a voting item, it is informational. We appreciate all your work up there; you've had your hands full with the sediment.

**Tory Mathis:** And there's more to do. Thank you.

**Brett Prevedel:** That concludes our public RAC agenda. We have an internal task with the RAC members. I guess those that are public or DWR, you need not stay on the thing, but we need to discuss some RAC leadership issues. So the RAC members, please stay on. The rest of you, thank you for attending. I think we'd take a motion to adjourn at this point, and this will conclude our RAC meeting. I'll take a motion to adjourn.

**Dan Abeyta:** I'll make a motion that we adjourn.

**The following motion was made by Dan Abeyta, seconded by Dick Bess.**

**MOTION: I move to adjourn the meeting.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**01:33:20 Meeting adjourned at 8:03 pm.**



## State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX  
*Governor*

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON  
*Lieutenant Governor*

## Department of Natural Resources

BRIAN C. STEED  
*Executive Director*

### Division of Wildlife Resources

J. RORY REYNOLDS  
*Division Director*

August 11, 2021

Rory Reynolds, Director, Division of Wildlife Resources  
Kevin Albrecht, Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board  
Randy Dearth, Vice Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board  
Utah Wildlife Board Members

RE: 2021 Expo Permit Internal Audit – Rule R657-55

Dear Director Reynolds and Wildlife Board Members,

In accordance with Rule R657-55, an audit of the Expo Permit program has been conducted. This audit is attached for your review and the results will be presented at the Utah Wildlife Board Meeting on August 26, 2021.

If you have any questions please contact me at 801-538-7437.

Sincerely,

Kenny Johnson  
Administrative Services Chief  
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources



## **Internal Audit of the 2021 Expo Permit Program**

Dated August 11, 2021

### **Background**

The Western Hunting and Conservation Expo was held virtually from February 11 – 14, 2021. In accordance with Administrative Rule R657-55, an annual audit of the Expo permit program has been conducted. This audit was not performed using generally accepted auditing standards, but is an internal audit designed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Administrative Services Section to ensure compliance with applicable rules and contractual obligations.

This audit report covers the 2021 Expo performance specifically, and uses historical data from the outset of the Expo permit program for some comparative items, as well as to ensure compliance with applicable rules and contractual terms.

### **Overview**

As has been the case each year, the focus of this audit is to assist the Division and the Wildlife Board to ensure contract compliance. Our report focuses on verifying that data is protected and secure, and that the drawing procedure used is random for the permits being issued. Additionally, we reviewed data regarding the number of applicants, success rates, and programming code related to drawing procedures and issuance of permits. We reviewed revenue amounts retained by the contractor for use on Division-approved projects. We also reviewed the remainder of the revenue, which is to be used to benefit Utah conservation initiatives. In addition to verifying revenue totals, we look to verify that the funds designated for Division-approved projects, as well as the funds designated for other conservation initiatives, are kept separate from other funds in Federally insured bank accounts. Finally, we seek to verify that funds are appropriately spent on Division-approved projects, or are used to benefit Utah conservation initiatives, as required.

### **Review of handling personal and sensitive data**

The Division considers the handling of personal data and information a top priority. Because the contractor conducting the draw is allowed limited access to DWR data for populating the hunt applications, we require adherence to protocols that will safeguard this data.

The contractor has two process components regarding sensitive and confidential data from the applicants. For these purposes, sensitive and confidential data is defined as social security number, driver's license information, height, weight, gender, and hair/eye color.

Typically the first process component is the handling of sensitive information given by applicants at the Expo to apply in the drawing manually. This is done on a paper form completed by the applicant. Once completed and submitted, these forms are cross-shredded on



site. No paper applications are retained by the contractor. Because the 2021 Expo was virtual, there were no paper applications in 2021; all were electronic.

The second process component is the handling of electronic data that is used in the electronic application process. Certain data elements are used during the application process for customer lookups into the Division database. This data transmission is through a secure socket layer using 128 bit encryption. Once the customer information is retrieved, no sensitive information is stored in the contractor database. The contractor cannot retrieve SSN or DL from the database at any time, only enter it as needed.

The Division monitored the processes of data collection and input, securing of personal and confidential data received, and performance of the actual draw process. The contractor completed a third party system scan prior to the application period going live, and has provided a current Payment Card Industry (PCI) self-assessment questionnaire and attestation.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2021 for securing personal data. The PCI questionnaire and attestation were provided prior to applications going live.

### **Review of the drawing process**

Division of Wildlife/Department of Technology Services personnel completed an extensive review of the draw processes used by GraySky Technologies, the subcontractor selected by SFW to conduct the Expo permit drawing. The Division is represented by technical experts from the Utah Department of Government Operations, who review the following:

- 1) The process of the draw is reviewed for its soundness.
- 2) The database structure is reviewed to make sure that a customer can't flood a certain hunt by making multiple entries for that hunt.
- 3) A review of the code is conducted to make sure that there is no chance that a seeded record could exist in the database prior to the assignment of random numbers. This is done to ensure that the result table is empty and no records can be inserted independently of the drawing code. This ensures that a record with an abnormally low random number isn't placed in the table thereby guaranteeing a permit to that record.
- 4) The code is reviewed to ensure that all records are treated equally in the process that assigns random numbers to the entries. Care is given to make sure that when the random numbers are being assigned, no records are identified to get a number other than a random number which is generated by the system.
- 5) The code is then reviewed for inserts that may occur after the drawing to make sure that a secured opportunity record is not placed in the result table after the assignment of random numbers takes place.

This was an exhaustive and thorough review; no compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2021.

## **Conducting the Draw**

The actual drawing was conducted at the Division Office in Salt Lake City on February 16, 2021. Attendees were limited following CDC guidelines for group gatherings. We had essential staff from the Division, technical representatives from the Department of Government Operations, GraySky Technologies, and SFW present in person. We had other division staff connect remotely via Google. The draw was then conducted by GraySky Technologies where the following occurred:

- 1) An impromptu passphrase was given to the GraySky representative and was witnessed as typed into the code prior to beginning the draw process. Later this same passphrase was verified by all in attendance to display on the result page to ensure the code reviewed by the Division was the actual code used during the draw.
- 2) The draw was then run assigning random numbers to applicants hunt choice entries and then sorted in descending order.
- 3) The results of the draw were printed and immediately given to a Division representative to ensure that there were no edits to the results table.
- 4) This list was then given to the Division Law Enforcement and Licensing sections to validate eligibility before any results were posted.
- 5) Since 2019 applicants selected through the draw to receive multiple permits are contacted by the Division and asked to select a single permit. The unclaimed permits are issued to alternates.

The passphrase was witnessed being added to the code, and the same passphrase was verified at the conclusion of the draw. Results were instantly printed and the process to validate began immediately.

Two applicants were informed of multiple species drawn and had to choose only one of the permits. There were no successful applicants who were deemed ineligible for a permit.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2021.

## **Note about Random Drawings**

In any truly random drawing there always seems to be a few “lucky” individuals. Random is not an assurance that an event will be spread evenly across a population, or distributed equally among participants. Statistically when randomness is discussed it is always possible to view the final result and pick out certain trends. The key to these trends is that results cannot be predicted prior to the event or drawing. This is the very essence of randomness.

There were no abnormalities observed in the 2021 drawing.

**Draw Related Information**

The Division reviewed data from the Expo regarding attendance, application numbers, and success rates. The required attendance of 10,000 people was waived by temporary rule in 2021, out of an abundance of caution regarding the various issues surrounding the pandemic. There were 21,680 unique applicants in 2021, which was an increase of about 20% over 2020. The majority of that growth not surprisingly was in nonresident applicants and applications. Residents increased by 473 applicants and 26,358 applications. Nonresidents increased by 3,262 applicants and 91,236 applications.

As the 2021 Expo was held virtually, there was no in-person attendance in 2021.

**Applicant data for years 2007-2021 is as follows:**

Year	Applicants	Applications	Resident	Nonresident	Gross Revenue@ \$5 per app
2007	10,527	205,462	163,054	42,408	\$ 1,027,310
2008	8,745	138,988	116,465	22,523	\$ 694,940
2009	9,927	169,988	139,748	29,375	\$ 845,970
2010	9,700	165,866	139,920	25,946	\$ 847,285
2011	12,154	196,360	170,539	25,821	\$ 981,800
2012	13,388	207,870	179,077	28,793	\$ 1,039,350
2013	14,043	197,312	173,192	24,120	\$ 986,560
2014	14,148	206,506	178,250	28,256	\$ 1,032,530
2015	14,910	228,530	192,420	36,110	\$ 1,142,650
2016	15,507	233,210	195,973	37,237	\$ 1,166,050
2017	16,127	247,148	204,016	43,132	\$ 1,235,740
2018	17,399	280,472	230,155	50,317	\$ 1,402,360
2019	17,320	292,785	232,143	60,642	\$ 1,463,925
2020	17,945	306,612	236,661	69,951	\$ 1,533,060
2021	21,680	424,206	263,019	161,187	\$ 2,121,030

**Resident versus Nonresident Success**

Data was reviewed comparing the number of resident applications to nonresident applications. Beginning in 2021, we no longer set aside 5 permits specifically for non-residents. Success rates are as follows: 62.1% of the applications were Utah residents who drew 121 permits or 60.5% of the total. 37.9% of applications were nonresidents who drew 79 permits or 39.5% of the total.

As anticipated participation was up compared to 2020. Given the open format with no attendance requirement in 2021, unique applicants increased by 3,735 and applications were up 117,594. Overall, non-residents tended to apply for more hunts than residents.

### **Draw Probability Statistics**

The Expo offers a limited number of permits annually and attracts exponentially more applicants who compete for them through a secure and random draw process. It should be noted that this dynamic implies a statistically low probability of obtaining a permit. While the draw odds are not a controllable variable or concern of the Division, we appreciate and acknowledge the expediency with which this information is made available to the public.

### **License Sales**

The Division requires that anyone applying for a permit at the Expo have a valid hunting or combination license at the time of application. To ensure compliance, the computer programming will not allow applicants to apply without a valid license in the system. For the Expo in 2021, there were no combination or hunting licenses sold on site.

There were no compliance issues with license sales in 2021.

### **Application Revenue**

For the 2021 expo permit draw, the Expo accepted applications from December 2020 through the end of the Expo, which was held from February 11 – 14, 2021. The draw processed 424,206 applications, generating \$2,121,030.00 in gross application revenue.

### **Use of Application Revenue for Division-Approved Wildlife Projects**

The retained portion of application revenue allowable for use on Division-approved projects is \$1.50 per application, or \$636,309.00 in 2021. This revenue was rounded up one dollar voluntarily by the groups and split 50/50 between SFW and MDF, with each organization receiving \$318,155.00. This initial deposit was verified in a federally insured bank account for both MDF and SFW. These funds will need to be spent on Division-approved projects, or transferred to the Division by August 1, 2023.

The Division tracks all funds spent on Division- approved projects or transferred to the Division to be able to report actual numbers each year. To meet the contractual obligation in 2021 all project revenue collected in 2019 must be spent or transferred to the division before August 1, 2021. The 2019 funds have been spent entirely as shown in the table below, with more project detail in attachment 1.

**Table 1 - Revenue and Expenditures Division-Approved Projects**

Org	Carry Over Project Revenue	New Project Revenue 2021	Total Project Revenue Available	Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	Projects Billed in FY22	Remaining Funds Adjusted Bank Balance
MDF	\$126,535.50	\$318,155.00	\$444,690.50	\$30,000.00	\$370,362.60	\$44,327.90
SFW	\$213,706.19	\$318,155.00	\$531,861.19	\$145,322.11	\$128,868.00	\$257,671.08
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$340,241.69</i>	<i>\$636,310.00</i>	<i>\$976,551.69</i>	<i>\$175,322.11</i>	<i>\$499,230.60</i>	<i>\$301,998.98</i>

SFW

Carry Over Revenue for Division-Approved Projects	\$213,706.19
New Project Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2021	\$318,155.00
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	(\$145,322.11)
Projects Paid to DWR but not Cleared	<u>(\$128,868.00)</u>
Remaining Funds Adjusted Bank Statement Balance	\$257,671.08

MDF

Carry Over Revenue for Division-Approved Projects	\$126,535.50
New Project Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2021	\$318,155.00
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	(\$30,000.00)
Projects Paid to DWR but not Cleared	<u>(\$370,362.60)</u>
Remaining Funds Adjusted Bank Statement Balance	\$44,327.90

**Use of Application Revenue for Contractor-Approved Conservation Initiatives**

The retained portion of application revenue allowable for support of contractor-approved policies, programs, projects, and personnel that support conservation initiatives in Utah is \$3.50 per application, or \$1,484,721.00 in 2021. Of these funds, \$294,437.29 were spent by SFW on expenses directly related to advertising expo permits, accepting expo permit applications, credit card fees, and conducting the actual expo permit draw, all in concert with the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo. The remaining \$1,190,283.71 of these funds were split 50/50 between MDF and SFW, with each organization receiving \$595,141.86. Bank records and project expenditures were reviewed. SFW has \$741,911.98 remaining of 2020-2021 revenue for Utah conservation initiatives. MDF has \$1,053,980.55 remaining of 2019-2021 revenue for Utah conservation initiatives. A list of these conservation initiatives for both groups can be found in Attachment 2. The deposit and required balance were verified in a federally-insured bank account held separate from other funds for both SFW and MDF. See attachment 2 for additional expenditure detail.

**Table 2 - Revenue and Expenditures Contractor-Approved Projects**

Org	Carry Over Project Revenue	New Project Revenue 2021	Total Project Revenue Available	Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	Remaining Funds Verified Bank Balance
MDF	\$550,115.95	\$595,141.86	\$1,145,257.81	\$91,277.26	\$1,053,980.55
SFW	\$379,399.69	\$595,141.86	\$974,541.55	\$232,629.57	\$741,911.98
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$929,515.64</i>	<i>\$1,190,283.72</i>	<i>\$2,119,799.36</i>	<i>\$323,906.83</i>	<i>\$1,795,892.53</i>

**SFW**

Carry Over Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	\$379,399.69
New Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives 2021	\$595,141.86
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	<u>(\$232,629.57)</u>
Remaining Funds Verified Bank Statement Balance	\$741,911.98

**MDF**

Carry Over Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	\$550,115.95
New Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives 2021	\$595,141.86
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	<u>(\$91,277.26)</u>
Remaining Funds Verified Bank Statement Balance	\$1,053,980.55

## Conclusions

The measures in place to ensure that data is secure and that any unauthorized external access is prevented served to safeguard information once again in 2021. Third party penetration scans were completed which enhance system security. PCI self-assessments were completed and signed prior to the application system going live. With data being under constant threat, creating processes and systems that are up to the challenge of securing information remains critical. We believe that the measures set in place by SFW, MDF, and GraySky ensured data was properly secured. Our review of the programming code satisfied the Division that the drawing was conducted in a random, transparent, and consistent manner.

We saw an uptick in applications in 2021 in part due to the accommodations we made given the uncertainty of the pandemic. We look forward to returning to in-person Expos in the future.

Additional oversight and program requirements in recent years have increased the Expo's positive impact on the ground statewide. Project revenues for both Division-approved projects and contractor approved projects were verified by bank statements, and expenses were supported with the appropriate documentation. These process enhancements make reporting the balances and expenditures transparent.

Revenue from expo permit application fees has continued to fund numerous efforts that benefit wildlife habitat, wildlife species, and hunters in Utah. This funding is an important component of the conservation work that has improved our state's wildlife populations and made Utah an outstanding place to hunt. We look forward to more beneficial work into the future.

We would like to thank Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife and the Mule Deer Foundation for their time, prompt responses, and their willingness to provide the information requested for the preparation of the audit. Their information was clearly presented and very much appreciated. If there are questions regarding this report, please contact me at 801-550-8349.

Kenneth Johnson  
Administrative Services Chief  
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

cc: Rory Reynolds, Interim Director  
Kevin Albrecht, Board Chair  
Randy Dearth, Vice Chair  
Utah Wildlife Board Members  
Troy Justensen, Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife  
Joel Pedersen, Mule Deer Foundation

### Attachments:

1. How Revenue has been spent Division-Approved Projects
2. How Revenue has been spent Contractor-Approved Projects
3. Draw Process Roll Sheet
4. Current Expo Rule R657-55

# Attachment 1



## How revenue from each year has been spent

### Division Approved Projects Mule Deer Foundation

2019 Revenue \$ 219,588.75

#### Project Expenses with 2019 Funds

5034 FY20 DeerFawn/Adult Survival and Condition (continued from 2018)	2020	\$	11,717.82
4734 Miller Creek Watershed Restoration 2.0	2020	\$	30,000.00
4837 North End La Sal (Brush Hole Phase 4)	2020	\$	10,000.00
4836 South Bookcliffs Phase 7 (Nash)	2020	\$	20,000.00
4860 Shingle Mill Phase 1	2020	\$	10,000.00
4840 Cold Springs WMA Conifer Removal Aspen Regeneration Phase VI	2020	\$	5,000.00
4882 La Sal/Abajo Prescribed Fire FY20	2020	\$	10,000.00
5012 Mahogany Point Sage Grouse Habitat Improvement	2020	\$	5,000.00
4777 Monroe Mountain Aspen Ecosystems Restoration Project Phase 4	2020	\$	15,000.00
4993 Powell District Mud Springs phase II	2020	\$	10,000.00
4818 Indian Peaks WMA Mule Deer Habitat Improvement Project	2020	\$	15,000.00
4625 Red Canyon Habitat Restoration Project Phase I	2020	\$	10,000.00
4881 Cedar Mtn (Mormon Peak Phase I) Habitat Protection	2020	\$	15,000.00
4815 Cedar Mountain (Durfee)	2020	\$	15,000.00
4958 Sevy Bench Habitat Improvement Project	2020	\$	20,000.00
4990 Parowan Front Braffits Creek (continued in 2020)	2020	\$	17,870.93
		\$	<u>219,588.75</u>

#### All 2019 Funds Expended

2020 Revenue \$ 229,959.00

#### Project Expenses with 2020 Funds

4990 Parowan Front Braffits Creek (continued from 2019)	2020	\$	3,129.07
5122 Parley's Canyon Watershed Restoration Project	2021	\$	2,000.00
5173 Paunsaugunt-Petrified Wash Wildlife Drinkers	2021	\$	2,150.00
5175 Stansbury Mountains Watershed Restoration Project	2021	\$	10,000.00
5179 Circle Springs Guzzler Replacement	2021	\$	4,750.00
5262 East Willow BDAs and Guzzlers	2021	\$	10,000.00
5279 Central Region Shrub Restoration Project FY 2021	2021	\$	44,620.00
5324 Northern Region Browse and Water Enhancements	2021	\$	15,000.00
5330 Marshall Draw WMA Spring Developments	2021	\$	10,500.00
5406 Utah Wildlife Migration Initiative	2021	\$	25,000.00
4934 Southeastern Upland Game Guzzler Phase III	2021	\$	1,500.00
5500 Bear River Watershed Conservation Coordinator	2021	\$	30,000.00
4552 Boulder Mountain Landscape Health Improvement Project NEPA Request	2022	\$	25,000.00
5461 Gregory Basin wildlife friendly fence Phase II	2022	\$	566.72
5748 Church Hills Pipeline and Water Enhancement Project	2022	\$	7,500.00
5551 Parley's Canyon Watershed Restoration Phase 2	2022	\$	5,000.00
5552 Ephraim Watershed Restoration Phase 3	2022	\$	20,000.00
5558 Thistle Creek Watershed Restoration Phase 2	2022	\$	13,243.21
		\$	<u>229,959.00</u>

#### All 2020 Funds Expended

2021 Revenue \$ 318,155.00

#### Project Expenses with 2021 Funds

5558 Thistle Creek Watershed Restoration Phase 2	2022	\$	13,243.21
5561 North Sheeprocks Watershed Restoration Phase 2	2022	\$	15,000.00
5568 Manti-La Sal Healthy Forest Restoration	2022	\$	15,000.00
5580 Sanpete Face NEPA Analysis (Formerly Skyline West)	2022	\$	15,000.00
5581 Upper Provo Watershed Restoration Phase 6	2022	\$	20,000.00
5613 Richard Mountain Fire Seeding	2022	\$	10,000.00
5621 Mill Hollow Aspen Restoration Phase II	2022	\$	15,000.00
5636 Petty Mountain Restoration Project	2022	\$	10,000.00

5647 Strawberry Ridge Vegetation Project - Stand Exams	2022	\$	10,000.00
5687 Bookcliffs East Water Developments Phase 2	2022	\$	8,412.50
5690 Bookcliffs West Water Developments Phase 2	2022	\$	2,671.87
5692 USFS Guzzlers	2022	\$	15,000.00
5699 Bull Pen water development	2022	\$	2,000.00
5722 Sevier plateau guzzlers	2022	\$	5,000.00
5727 East Fork Fire Seeding FY2022	2022	\$	10,000.00
5736 Northern Region Browse Scalping	2022	\$	35,000.00
5779 Fremont River Ranger District Ponds	2022	\$	7,500.00
5794 Utah Wildlife Migration Initiative	2022	\$	64,999.52
			<u>\$ 273,827.10</u>

Remaining Balance	\$	44,327.90
-------------------	----	-----------

**Division Approved Projects Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife**

2019 Revenue	\$	219,588.75
2019 interest Revenue	\$	207.61
Total	\$	219,796.36

Project Expenses with 2019 Funds

4854 Ogden Bay WMA East Dike Restoration	2020	\$	34,000.00
4877 Upland Habitat Enhancement and Vegetation Management Salt Creek WMA FY20	2020		\$5,000.00
4894 Phragmites and Invasive Weed Control FY20	2020		\$5,000.00
5101 FY20 CA Quail Trap and Transplant	2020		\$6,500.00
4881 Cedar Mtn (Mormon Peak Phase I) Habitat Protection	2020		\$10,000.00
4815 Cedar Mountain (Durfee)	2020		\$10,000.00
5064 Willard Spur Waterfowl Management Area	2020		\$9,250.00
4553 Salt Creek Channel Cleaning Island Restoration	2020		\$23,625.00
4840 Cold Springs WMA Conifer Removal Aspen Regeneration Phase VI	2020		\$10,000.00
4816 UWC FS North Zone Juniper Lop and Scatter FY20	2020		\$9,819.86
4837 North End La Sal (Brush Hole Phase 4)	2020	\$	5,000.00
4975 Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Phase VI	2020		\$24,051.00
4934 Southeastern Upland Game Guzzler Phase III	2020		\$1,500.00
4799 Rabbit Gulch Winter Range Improvement Phase II	2020		\$20,790.00
4846 Raft River Aspen Restoration Project Phase I	2020		\$5,000.00
5030 FY20 Bighorn Sheep Captures	2020		\$19,531.50
5169 Predator Management Funding for Cache and box Elder Deer Units	2020		\$20,729.00
			<u>\$ 219,796.36</u>

**All 2019 Funds Expended**

2020 Revenue	\$	229,959.00
2020 interest Revenue	\$	281.11
Total	\$	230,240.11

Project Expenses with 2020 Funds

5169 Predator Management Funding for Cache and box Elder Deer Units	2020		\$4,271.00
5456 SLO Waterfowl Program Airboat	2020		\$11,590.94
5456 SLO Waterfowl Program Airboat	2020		\$15,069.25
5458 Taos Pueblo Dept of Natural Resources Donation	2020		\$37,500.00
5163 White Sage Well Project	2020		\$10,000.00
5158 Pheasants for Youth Pheasant Hunt - Pahvant	2020		\$9,997.50
5101 FY20 CA Quail Trap and Transplant	2020		\$3,250.00
5201 Bicknell Bottoms WMA Fence Reconstruction	2021		\$20,000.00
5299 Carp Control Northern WMA's FY21	2021		\$4,000.00
5328 Teal Lake Improvement Project	2021		\$3,079.00
5334 OBWMA Upland/Wetland enhancement FY21	2021		\$8,000.00
5350 Kevin Conway WMA Waterfowl Ponds (Phase 1)	2021		\$7,275.00
5451 FY21 CA Quail Trap and Transplant	2021		\$3,250.00
5328 Teal Lake Improvement Project	2021		\$12,500.00
5793 Purchase Pheasants for Youth Hunt FY22	2021		\$10,750.00
5813 Flat Canyon Land Purchase	2021		\$22,072.11
5504 Jensen Property Purchase	2021		\$47,635.31
			<u>\$230,240.11</u>

**All 2020 Funds Expended**

2021 Revenue \$ 318,155.00

Project Expenses with 2021 Funds

5504 Jensen Property Purchase	2021	\$52,364.69
5634 Mount Pleasant Twin Creek Habitat Improvement Project	2022 \$	6,885.00
5784 Quichapa Lake Hydrology and Vegetation Enhancement (Phase 2)	2022 \$	<u>1,234.23</u>
		\$60,483.92

Remaining Balance \$ 257,671.08
---------------------------------

# Attachment 2

## How revenue from each year has been spent

### Contractor Approved Projects Mule Deer Foundation

2019 Revenue \$ 351,033.82

#### Project Expenses with 2019 Funds

Sponsorship of Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Mid Winter Meetir	2020	\$	15,000.00
Burnt Beaver Thinning Project on North Slope of Unitahs	2020	\$	133,220.87
Corporate Support of National Deer Alliance	2020	\$	15,000.00
Natural Resources Results Consultation for Migration Corridor and CWD Related Issu	2021	\$	12,000.00
Purchase GPS Collars for Deer Migration Study in Uintah Mountains	2021	\$	47,632.25
Materials for Spencer Fork WMA Guzzler	2021	\$	16,645.01
		\$	<u>239,498.13</u>

Remaining Balance 2019 \$ 111,535.69

2020 Revenue \$ 347,303.00

Remaining Balance 2020 \$ 347,303.00

2021 Revenue \$ 595,141.86

Remaining Balance 2021 \$ 595,141.86

Total Remaining Balance \$ 1,053,980.55
---

### Contractor Approved Projects Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife

2019 Revenue \$ 351,033.82

2019 Interest Revenue \$ 851.14

Total \$ 351,884.96

#### Project Expenses with 2019 Funds

S. Sorensen Cache Predator Control for Fawn Study	2019	\$	5,700.00
Pheasant chick projects - chicks, construction, feed, heaters	2019	\$	20,595.22
Wheeler Machinery Trackloader	2019	\$	64,500.00
4958 Sevy Bench Habitat Improvement Project	2020	\$	20,000.00
4852 Ogden Bay WMA upland/wetland enhancement project FY20	2020	\$	6,875.00
4853 Harold Crane WMA South pond project PHASE 2	2020	\$	20,000.00
4980 Howard Slough WMA secondary road gravel project	2020	\$	6,000.00
4799 Rabbit Gulch Winter Range Improvement Phase II	2020	\$	5,000.00
Pheasant Hunt for Wheelchair Bound Hunters	2020	\$	1,350.00
Urban Fishery Pond Reconstruction in Juab County	2020	\$	25,000.00
Taos Pueblo Bighorn Sheep Transplant Sample Transport	2020	\$	1,717.50
Trap Throwers for Youth Shooting Program in Sevier County	2020	\$	11,465.00
Upland Game Program -purchase chicks and supplies for public land release	2020	\$	47,667.38
Youth Pheasant Hunt on Pahvant Management Unit	2020	\$	19,375.00
Chukar Purchase for release on Public Land	2020	\$	11,400.00
Predator Control in Cache County	2020	\$	7,850.00
Ogden Bay Upland Game Habitat Enhancement	2020	\$	10,615.00
Ogden Bay WMA Improvement Project	2020	\$	11,917.97
5349 Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Phase VII	2021		23,750.00
4846 Raft River Aspen Restoration Project Phase I	2020		5,000.00
5634 Mount Pleasant Twin Creek Habitat Improvement Project	2022		1,115.00
5685 Six Mile WMA In-House Bullhog Project - Phase 2	2022		10,000.00
Predator Management C&B Selman	2021		2,250.00
Cache Fawn Survival Study Coyote Removal	2021		5,000.00
Utah Cattle Association reward program	2021		2,000.00
KSL Outdoors Conservation Education	2021		5,741.89
		\$	<u>351,884.96</u>

**All 2019 Funds Expended**

2020 Revenue \$ 347,303.00  
 2020 Interest Revenue \$ 1,076.56  
 Remaining Balance 2020 \$ 348,379.56

Project Expenses with 2020 Funds

KSL Outdoors Conservation Education	2021	808.11
SFW Upland Game Program	2021	\$ 51,141.91
Heavy Equipment Maintenance	2021	\$ 24,311.72
Wheelchair Bound Pheasant Hunt	2021	1,200.00
SFW Chukars Release	2021	14,625.00
Predator Management Funding for Cache and Box Elder Deer Units	2021	25,000.00
Dump trailer for projects	2021	10,542.41
San Juan Pond Clearing	2021	1,200.00
Marvelous Xtreme Bull Madness- advertising and education	2021	5,000.00
Ideal Farms at Wasatch High School- FFA education and conservation	2021	10,000.00
Book cliffs Stray Livestock Management	2021	24,848.00
Trust Land Administration: for Gypsum and Aurora allotment	2021	539.78
VHF/UHF Collars	2021	32,392.51
		<u>\$ 201,609.44</u>

Remaining Balance 2020 \$ 146,770.12

2021 Revenue \$ 595,141.86  
 Remaining Balance 2021 \$ 595,141.86

Remaining Balance \$ 741,911.98
---------------------------------

# Attachment 3



On Tuesday, February 16, 2021 the electronic random drawing for the 200 Expo permits will take place at the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources located at 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah. These permits were awarded to the Western Hunting & Conservation Expo by the Utah Wildlife Board.

The following are witnesses of the drawing and were present during the entire process. Once the successful applicants have been drawn, all names will be given to the Division of Wildlife Resources Law Enforcement. The names will be checked for any compact violations and will be deemed eligible by the Division of Wildlife and the successful applicants will be notified by mail.

Start Time: 9:59

End Time: 10:08

PASSCODE: Snowy COVID Expo

PRINT NAME	ATTENDANCE	
Greg Evans	In-person	DWR
Rob Gray	In-person	Skytech
Chris Carling	In-person	SFW
Lindy Varney	In-person	DWR



PRINT NAME

ATTENDANCE

Kenny Johnson

Virtual

DWR

Mike Canning

Virtual

DWR

Phil Gray

Virtual

DWR

Ashley Green

Virtual

DWR

# Attachment 4

## **R657. Natural Resources, Wildlife Resources.**

### **R657-55. Wildlife Expo Permits.**

#### **R657-55-1. Purpose and Authority.**

(1) Under the authority of Sections 23-14-18 and 23-14-19 of the Utah Code, this rule provides the standards and requirements for issuing wildlife expo permits.

(2) Wildlife expo permits are authorized by the Wildlife Board and issued by the division to a qualified conservation organization for purposes of generating revenue to fund wildlife conservation activities in Utah and attracting and supporting a regional or national wildlife exposition in Utah.

(3) The selected conservation organization will conduct a random drawing at an exposition held in Utah to distribute the opportunity to receive wildlife expo permits.

(4) This rule is intended as authorization to issue one series of wildlife expo permits per year to a qualified conservation organization.

#### **R657-55-2. Definitions.**

(1) Terms used in this rule are defined in Section 23-13-2.

(2) In addition:

(a) "Conservation organization" means a 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3) tax exempt, nonprofit chartered institution, corporation, foundation, or association founded for the purpose of promoting wildlife conservation.

(b) "Special nonresident expo permit" means one wildlife expo permit for each once-in-a-lifetime species that is only available to a nonresident hunter legally eligible to hunt in Utah.

(c) "Wildlife exposition" means a multi-day event held within the state of Utah that is sponsored by one or more wildlife conservation organizations, acting through a single conservation organization, as their national or regional convention or event that is open to the general public and designed to draw nationwide attendance of more than 10,000 individuals. The wildlife exposition may include wildlife conservation fund raising activities, outdoor exhibits, retail marketing of outdoor products and services, public awareness programs, and other similar activities.

(d) "Wildlife exposition audit" means an annual review by the division of the conservation organization's processes used to handle applications for expo permits and conduct the drawing, the protocols associated with collecting and using client data, the revenue generated from expo permit application handling fees, and the expenditure of designated expo permit application handling fee revenue on division-approved projects.

(e) "Wildlife expo permit" means a permit which:

(i) is authorized by the Wildlife Board to be issued to successful applicants through a drawing or random selection process conducted at a Utah wildlife exposition; and

(ii) allows the permittee to hunt the designated species on the designated unit during the respective season for each species as authorized by the Wildlife Board.

(f) "Wildlife expo permit series" means a single package of permits to be determined by the Wildlife Board for:

(i) deer;

(ii) elk;

(iii) pronghorn;

(iv) moose;

(v) bison;

(vi) mountain goat;

(vii) desert bighorn sheep;

(viii) rocky mountain bighorn sheep;

(ix) wild turkey;

(x) cougar; or

(xi) black bear.

(g) "Secured opportunity" means the opportunity to receive a specified wildlife expo permit that is secured by an eligible applicant through the exposition drawing process.

(h) "Successful applicant" means an individual selected to receive a wildlife expo permit through the drawing process.

#### **R657-55-3. Wildlife Expo Permit Allocation.**

(1) The Wildlife Board may allocate wildlife expo permits after May 1 of the year preceding the wildlife exposition.

(2) Wildlife expo permits shall be issued as a single series to one conservation organization.

(3) The number of wildlife expo permits authorized by the Wildlife Board shall be based on:

(a) the species population trend, size, distribution, and long-term health;

(b) the hunting and viewing opportunity for the general public, both short and long term; and

(c) a percentage of the permits available to nonresidents in the annual big game drawings matched by a proportionate number of resident permits.

(4) Wildlife expo permits, including special nonresident expo permits, shall not exceed 200 total permits.

(5) Wildlife expo permits designated for the exposition each year shall be deducted from the number of public drawing permits.

**R657-55-4. Obtaining Authority to Distribute Wildlife Expo Permit Series.**

- (1)(a) Except as provided in Subsection (b), the wildlife expo permit series is issued for a period of five years.
- (b) The original five-year term may be renewed for an additional period not to exceed five years, provided:
  - (i) the conservation organization, Division of Purchasing and General Services procurement officer, Wildlife Board, and division mutually agree in writing to the renewal term; and
  - (ii) the procurement officer determines in writing pursuant to Section 63G-6a-1204(7) that the renewal term is in the division's best interest and places the writing in the conservation organization's procurement file.
- (2)(a) The wildlife expo permit series is available to eligible conservation organizations for distribution through a drawing or other random selection process held at a wildlife exposition in Utah open to the public.
- (b) The division may unilaterally discontinue or suspend issuing the wildlife expo permit series at:
  - (i) the conclusion of the original five-year contract term or renewal term described in Subsection (1) and prior to issuance of a contract under this rule; or
  - (ii) any time during the term of a contract when in the interest of wildlife conservation, management, or compliance with law.
- (3) Prior to expiration of a current wildlife exposition term or renewal term, the division may issue through the Division of Purchasing and General Services a request for proposal consistent with the Procurement Code in Title 63G, Chapter 6a of the Utah Code to solicit bids from conservation organizations desiring to distribute the wildlife expo permit series at a wildlife exposition.
- (4) The request for proposal will solicit information relevant to successfully conducting a wildlife exposition, competently distributing the expo permit series, protecting confidential personal information acquired in distributing permits, and generating revenue for wildlife conservation in Utah, including:
  - (a) the name, address and telephone number of the conservation organization;
  - (b) a description of the conservation organization's mission statement;
  - (c) documentation establishing the conservation organization meets the definitional criteria in R657-55-2(2)(a) and is eligible to submit a proposal;
  - (d) the name of the president or other individual responsible for the administrative operations of the conservation organization;
  - (e) a detailed business plan describing how the:
    - (i) proposed wildlife exposition will take place;
    - (ii) proposed wildlife exposition will satisfy the definitional criteria in R657-55-2(2)(c);
    - (iii) wildlife expo permit drawing procedures will be carried out; and
    - (iv) confidential personal information acquired in the drawing process will be safeguarded;
  - (f) the conservation organization and any partnering entities' ability, including past performance in marketing conservation permits under R657-41, to effectively plan and complete the wildlife exposition;
  - (g) the conservation organization's commitment to use expo permit handling fee revenue to benefit protected wildlife in Utah; and
  - (h) historical contributions of the conservation organization and any partnering entities to the conservation of wildlife in Utah.
- (5) Proposals submitted in response to a request for proposal under Subsection (4) will be processed, evaluated, and acted upon consistent with the procurement requirements set forth in Title 63G, Chapter 6a of the Utah Code.
- (6) The conservation organization receiving the wildlife expo permit series must:
  - (a) require each wildlife expo permit applicant to possess a current Utah hunting or combination license before applying for a wildlife expo permit;
  - (b) select successful applicants for wildlife expo permits by drawing or other random selection process in accordance with law, provisions of this rule, and orders of the Wildlife Board;
  - (c) allow applicants to apply for wildlife expo permits without purchasing admission to the wildlife exposition;
  - (d) notify the division of the successful applicant of each wildlife expo permit within 10 days of the applicant's selection;
  - (e) maintain records demonstrating that the drawing was conducted fairly; and
  - (f) submit to an annual wildlife exposition audit by a division appointed auditor.
- (7) The division shall issue the appropriate wildlife expo permit to the designated successful applicant after:
  - (a) completion of the random selection process;
  - (b) verification of the recipient being eligible for the permit; and
  - (c) payment of the appropriate permit fee is received by the division.
- (8) The division and the conservation organization receiving the wildlife expo permit series will enter into a contract with terms that include the relevant provisions in this rule, the request for proposal, and the conservation organization's proposal.
- (9) If the conservation organization awarded the wildlife expo permit series withdraws before the end of the 5-year period or any extension period under R657-55-4(1)(b), any remaining co-participant with the conservation organization may assume the contract and distribute the expo permit series consistent with the contract and this rule for the remaining years in the applicable period, provided:
  - (a) The original contracted conservation organization submits a certified letter to the head of the procurement unit, as defined in Section 63G-6a-103, and the division identifying that it will no longer be participating in the exposition;
  - (b) The co-participant conservation organization submits a request with the head of the procurement unit and the division for authorization to assume the remaining term of the contract ; and
  - (c) the head of the procurement unit, in consultation with the division and Wildlife Board, approves the application.
- (10) The division may suspend or terminate the conservation organization's authority to distribute wildlife expo permits at any time during the original five -year award term or any renewal period for:

- (a) violating any of the requirements set forth in this rule or the contract; or
- (b) failing to bring or organize a wildlife exposition in Utah, as described in the business plan under R657-55-4(4)(e), in any given year.

**R657-55-5. Wildlife Expo Permit Application Procedures.**

- (1) Any person legally eligible to hunt in Utah may apply for a wildlife expo permit, except that only a nonresident of Utah may apply for a special nonresident expo permit.
- (2) The handling fee assessed by the conservation organization to process applications shall be \$5 per application submitted.
- (3)(a) Except as provided in Subsections (3)(b) and (9), an applicant must validate their application in person at the wildlife exposition to be eligible to participate in the wildlife expo permit drawing.
  - (i) No person may submit an application in behalf of another.
  - (ii) A person may validate their wildlife expo permit application at the exposition without having to enter the exposition and pay the admission charge.
- (b) An applicant that is a member of the United States Armed Forces and unable to attend the wildlife exposition as a result of being deployed or mobilized in the interest of national defense or a national emergency is not required to validate their application in person; provided exposition administrators are furnished a copy of the written deployment or mobilization orders and the orders identify:
  - (i) the branch of the United States Armed forces from which the applicant is deployed or mobilized;
  - (ii) the location where the applicant is deployed or mobilized;
  - (iii) the date the applicant is required to report to duty; and
  - (iv) the nature and length of the applicant's deployment or mobilization.
- (c) The conservation organization shall maintain a record, including copies of military orders, of each applicant not required to validate their application in person pursuant to Subsection (3)(b), and submit to a division audit of these records as part of its annual audit under R657-55-4(8)(f) when requested by the division.
- (4) An applicant may apply for each individual hunt for which they are eligible.
- (5) An applicant may apply only once for each hunt, regardless of the number of permits for that hunt.
- (6) An applicant must submit an application for each desired hunt.
- (7) An applicant must possess a current Utah hunting or combination license in order to apply for a wildlife expo permit.
- (8) The conservation organization shall advertise, accept, and process applications for wildlife expo permits and conduct the drawing in compliance with this rule and other applicable laws.
- (9) Due to the serious public health threat posed by the COVID-19 pandemic and recommendations from the CDC, Utah, and local health departments to avoid public gatherings and to maintain social distancing, the 2021 exposition is modified as follows:
  - (a) a wildlife expo permit applicant will not be required to validate their application in-person at the expo permit drawing;
  - (b) the wildlife expo permit drawing may be conducted entirely in an electronic format, provided an in-person or electronic exposition is held;
  - (c) any exposition requirement in this rule and in contract related to holding an in-person exposition and meeting minimum in-person attendance objectives are waived.

**R657-55-6. Drawing Procedures.**

- (1) A random drawing or selection process must be conducted for each wildlife expo permit.
- (2) Preference and bonus points are neither awarded nor applied in the drawings.
- (3) Waiting periods do not apply, except any person who obtains a wildlife expo permit for a once-in-a-lifetime species is subject to the once-in-a-lifetime restrictions applicable to obtaining a subsequent permit for the same species through a division application and drawing process, as provided in R657-62 and the guide books of the Wildlife Board for taking big game.
- (4) No predetermined quotas or restrictions shall be imposed in the application or selection process for wildlife expo permits between resident and nonresident applicants, except that special nonresident expo permits may only be awarded to a nonresident of Utah.
- (5) Drawings will be conducted within five days of the close of the exposition.
- (6) Applicants do not have to be present at the drawing to be awarded a wildlife expo permit.
- (7) The conservation organization shall identify all eligible alternates for each wildlife expo permit and provide the division with a finalized list. This list will be maintained by the conservation organization until all permits are issued.
- (8) The division shall contact successful applicants, and the conservation organization shall post the name of all successful applicants on a designated website.

**R657-55-7. Issuance of Permits.**

- (1) The division shall provide a wildlife expo permit to the successful applicant, as designated by the conservation organization.
- (2) The division must provide a wildlife expo permit to each successful applicant, except as otherwise provided in this rule.
- (3) The division shall provide each successful applicant a letter indicating the permit secured in the drawing, the appropriate fee owed the division, and the date the fee is due.
- (4)(a) Successful applicants must submit the permit fee payment in full to the division before receiving the permit.
- (b) Subject to the limitation in Subsection (8), the division will issue the designated wildlife expo permit to the successful applicant.
- (5) Residents will pay resident permit fees and nonresidents will pay nonresident permit fees.

- (6) Beginning in 2019, applicants are eligible to obtain only one expo permit each year, regardless of species.
- (7) If an applicant is selected for more than one expo permit, the division will contact the applicant to determine which permit the applicant selects.
  - (a) The applicant must select the permit of choice within 2 days of receiving notification.
  - (b) If the division is unable to contact the applicant within 2 days, the division will issue to the applicant the permit with the most difficult drawing odds based on drawing results from the division's big game drawing for the preceding year.
  - (c) Permits not issued to the applicant will go to the next person on the alternate drawing list for that permit, provided the person is legally eligible to receive the permit and does not have a secured opportunity for any other expo permit.
- (8) Any successful applicant who fails to satisfy the following requirements will be ineligible to receive the wildlife expo permit and the next drawing alternate for that permit will be selected:
  - (a) The applicant fails to remit the appropriate permit fee in full to the division by the date provided in Subsection (3);
  - (b) The applicant does not possess a valid Utah hunting or combination license at the time the expo permit application was submitted; or
  - (c) The applicant is legally ineligible to possess the permit.

**R657-55-8. Surrender or Transfer of Wildlife Expo Permits.**

- (1)(a) A person selected to receive a wildlife expo permit that is also successful in obtaining a Utah once-in-a-lifetime or limited entry permit for the same species in the same year or successful in obtaining a general permit for a male animal of the same species in the same year, may not possess both permits and must select the permit of choice.
  - (b) In the event a secured opportunity is surrendered before the permit is issued, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive the permit, provided the person is legally eligible to receive the permit and does not:
    - (i) have a secured opportunity for any other expo permit; or
    - (ii) possess any other expo permit valid in the same year.
  - (c) In the event the wildlife expo permit is surrendered, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive it, provided the person satisfies the eligibility requirements in Subsection (b).
  - (d) The permit fee on a surrendered expo permit may be refunded, as provided in Sections 23-19-38, 23-19-38.2, and R657-42-5.
- (2) A person selected by a conservation organization to receive a wildlife expo permit, may not sell or transfer the permit, or any rights thereunder to another person in accordance with Section 23-19-1.
- (3) If a person is successful in obtaining a wildlife expo permit but is legally ineligible to hunt in Utah, the next eligible applicant on the alternate drawing list for that permit will be selected to receive it, provided the person satisfies the eligibility requirements in Subsection (1)(b).

**R657-55-9. Using a Wildlife Expo Permit.**

- (1) A wildlife expo permit allows the recipient to:
  - (a) take only the species and sex printed on the permit;
  - (b) take the species only in the area and during the season specified on the permit; and
  - (c) take the species only with the weapon type specified on the permit.
- (2) The recipient of a wildlife expo permit is subject to all the provisions of Title 23, Wildlife Resources Code, and the rules and guidebooks of the Wildlife Board for taking and pursuing wildlife.

**R657-55-10. Wildlife Expo Permit -- Application Handling Fee Revenue.**

- (1)(a) All wildlife expo permit application handling fee revenue generated by the conservation organization under R657-55-5(2) will be deposited in a separate, federally insured account to prevent commingling with any other funds.
  - (b) Interest earned on the portion of application handling fee revenue retained by the conservation organization for administrative expenses under Subsection (2) may be retained and used by the conservation organization.
  - (c) Interest earned on the portion of application handling fee revenue committed to fund wildlife conservation projects under Subsection (3) shall be used by the conservation organization to fund approved wildlife conservation projects.
- (2) The conservation organization may retain up to \$3.50 of each \$5.00 application handling fee for administrative expenses, unless the conservation organization pledges a greater percentage of the application handling fee to wildlife conservation in:
  - (a) its response to the request for proposal; or
  - (b) the expo contract with the division.
- (3) The remaining balance of each \$5.00 application handling fee and accrued interest, less standard banking fees assessed on the account where the funding is deposited, will be used by the conservation organization to fund projects advancing wildlife interests in the state, subject to the following:
  - (a) project funding will not be committed to or expended on any project without first obtaining the division director's written approval;
  - (b) cash donations to the Wildlife Habitat Account created under Section 23-19-43 or Division Species Enhancement Funds are authorized projects that do not require the division director's approval; and
  - (c) application handling fee revenue dedicated to funding projects must be completely expended on approved projects or transferred to the division by August 1st, two years following the year in which the application handling fee revenue is collected.

(4) Application handling fee revenue committed to division-approved projects will be transferred by the conservation organization to the division within 60 days of being invoiced by the division.

(a) If the division-approved project to which funds are committed is completed under projected budget or canceled, funds committed to the project that are not used will be kept by the division and credited back to the conservation organization and made available for the group to use on other approved projects during the current or subsequent year.

(5) All records and receipts for projects under Subsection (3) must be retained by the conservation organization for a period not less than five years, and shall be produced to the division for inspection upon request.

(6) The conservation organization shall submit a report to the division and Wildlife Board each year by August 1st that accounts for and documents the following:

(a) gross revenue generated from collecting \$5 wildlife expo permit application handling fees;

(b) total amount of application handling fee revenue retained for administrative expenses; and

(c) total amount of application handling fee revenue set aside and dedicated to funding projects, including bank statements showing account balances.

(7) A partner organization that individually receives application handling fee revenue from the expo permit drawing pursuant to a co-participant contract with the conservation organization, is subject to the provisions in Subsections (1) through (6).

**KEY: wildlife, wildlife permits**

**Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Amendment: November 9, 2020**

**Notice of Continuation: April 6, 2020**

**Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 23-14-18; 23-14-19**



## State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX  
*Governor*

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON  
*Lieutenant Governor*

## Department of Natural Resources

BRIAN C. STEED  
*Executive Director*

### Division of Wildlife Resources

J. RORY REYNOLDS  
*Division Director*

## MEMORANDUM

Date: August 18, 2021  
To: Wildlife Board  
From: Justin M. Shannon, Chief of Wildlife  
Subject: Expo Permit Allocation

The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is recommending 200 hunting permits for the Hunt Expo (see attached tables for details). Proposed changes this year include:

### Discontinued Permits:

- Deer – Fillmore, Oak Creek (1 archery, 1 muzzleloader), San Juan, Elk Ridge (1 muzzleloader), and Book Cliffs (3 any weapon, 1 archery)
- Elk – Book Cliffs, Little Creek Roadless (1 any weapon)
- Pronghorn – South Slope Vernal (3 any weapon), West Desert, Snake Valley (2 any weapon), and Fillmore, Oak Creek South (1 any weapon)
- Bison – Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek South (1 hunters choice) and Book Cliffs (1 cow only)

### Replacements for Additional Permits:

- Deer – Cache, Crawford Mtn (1 muzzleloader), South Slope, Diamond Mtn (1 archery, 1 muzzleloader), Wasatch Mtns, East (1 late-season muzzleloader), Fillmore, Oak Creek (1 any weapon), and South Slope, Diamond Mtn (2 any weapon)
- Elk – Beaver, East (1 any weapon)
- Pronghorn – Fillmore, Oak Creek South (1 archery, 1 muzzleloader), San Rafael, North (1 archery, 1 muzzleloader), and Southwest Desert (1 archery, 1 muzzleloader)
- Bison – Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (1 hunter's choice and 1 cow only)

All other expo permits will remain the same as last year.





## 2022 Expo Permits by Species and Residency

		TOTAL PERMITS		
		Res	NonRes	Total
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>153</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>200</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Antlerless Elk	Central Mtns, Manti		Any Open Season and Unit Within Boundary	2	1	3
Antlerless Elk	Central Mtns, Nebo		Any Open Season and Unit Within Boundary	1	0	1
Antlerless Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes		Any Open Season and Unit Within Boundary	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>				<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Bison	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek		Hunter's Choice	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	BI6503	Hunter's Choice (early)	0	1	1
Bison	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek		Cow Only	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	BI6505	Cow Only (early)	1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Black Bear	Wasatch Mtns, West-Central	BR7120	Summer, Any Legal Weapon, No Dogs	1	1	2
Black Bear	La Sal	BR7008	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	1	2
Black Bear	Nine Mile	BR7211	Fall, Any Legal Weapon	1	0	1
Black Bear	Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	BR7215	Fall, Any Legal Weapon	1	0	1
Black Bear	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	BR7001	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	0	1
Black Bear	South Slope, Bonanza/Diamond Mtn/Vernal	BR7015	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mtns, Manti-North	BR7003	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	0	1
Black Bear	Central Mtns, Nebo	BR7005	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	0	1
Black Bear	San Juan	BR7014	Spring, Any Legal Weapon, No Bait	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, North	DB1017	Any Weapon	5	2	7
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, South	DB1018	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	DB1011	Archery	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	DB1025	Muzzleloader	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Cache, Crawford Mtn	DB1026	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Central Mtns Manti/San Rafeal	DB1079	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Fillmore, Oak Creek LE	DB1019	Any Weapon	2	0	2
Buck Deer	Henry Mtns	DB1003	Premium Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	DB1004	Premium Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	DB1001	Premium Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	DB1006	Premium Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Paunsaugunt	DB1010	Management Buck, Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Pine Valley	DB1034	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	San Juan, Elk Ridge	DB1022	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	DB1023	Any Weapon	3	0	3
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	DB1015	Archery	1	0	1
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	DB1038	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Wasatch Mtns, West	DB1087	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Deer	Wasatch Mtns, East	DB1041	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1

Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	DB1024	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	DB1016	Archery	1	1	2
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	DB1042	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Zion	DB1043	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>37</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>47</b>

Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	PERMITS		
				Res	NonRes	Total
Buck Pronghorn	Book Cliffs, South	PB5027	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden	PB5032	Any Weapon	3	0	3
Buck Pronghorn	Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden	PB5007	Archery	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Fillmore, Oak Creek South	PB5008	Archery	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Fillmore, Oak Creek South	PB5065	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Fillmore, Oak Creek South	PB5033	Any Weapon	2	0	2
Buck Pronghorn	Mt Dutton/Paunsaugunt	PB5331	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Nine Mile, Anthro-Myton Bench	PB5037	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Pine Valley	PB5042	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	PB5015	Archery	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	PB5056	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	San Rafael, North	PB5046	Any Weapon	3	1	4
Buck Pronghorn	Southwest Desert	PB5018	Archery	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Southwest Desert	PB5024	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Southwest Desert	PB5049	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Pronghorn	West Desert, Riverbed	PB5050	Any Weapon	1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>

Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	PERMITS		
				Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Elk	Beaver, East	EB3024	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	EB3027	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	EB3026	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	EB3001	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	EB3078	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, Meadowville	EB3032	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3036	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3037	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3005	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3083	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	EB3038	Any Weapon (early)	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	EB3039	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	EB3006	Archery	4	2	6
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Manti	EB3084	Muzzleloader	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Nebo	EB3007	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Central Mtns, Nebo	EB3040	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Fillmore, Pahvant	EB3043	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	EB3045	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	EB3009	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	EB3046	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	EB3050	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	EB3049	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Mt Dutton	EB3011	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	EB3015	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	EB3056	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Panguitch Lake	EB3057	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1

Bull Elk	Paunsaugunt	EB3058	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder	EB3148	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Boulder	EB3145	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	EB3063	Any Weapon (early)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	EB3065	Any Weapon (late)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	EB3018	Archery	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	EB3096	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert, South	EB3149	Any Weapon (early)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert, South	EB3152	Any Weapon (late)	1	1	2
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert, South	EB3146	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Southwest Desert, South	EB3155	Muzzleloader	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan Bull Elk	EB3019	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	San Juan Bull Elk	EB3066	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	EB3068	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3072	Any Weapon (early)	5	3	8
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3073	Any Weapon (late)	3	1	4
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3127	Any Weapon (mid)	2	1	3
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3022	Archery	4	2	6
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3100	Muzzleloader	3	2	5
Bull Elk	Wasatch Mtns	EB3124	Multi-Season	1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>69</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>91</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mtns/Central Mtns	MB6011		1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Kaiparowits, East	DS6601		0	1	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Kaiparowits, West	DS6603		1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Mountain Goat	Central Mtns, Nebo	GO6821	Hunter's Choice, Archery	1	0	1
Mountain Goat	North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas West	GO6808	Hunter's Choice	1	1	2
Mountain Goat	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	GO6817	Hunter's Choice	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Box Elder, Newfoundland Mtn	RS6703	(early)	1	0	1
Rocky Mtn. Bighorn Sheep	Fillmore, Oak Creek	RS6720	(early)	1	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Turkey	Northern Region	TK1005	Spring, Limited Entry	1	1	2
Turkey	Northeast Region	TK1004	Spring, Limited Entry	1	0	1
Turkey	Central Region	TK1003	Spring, Limited Entry	1	1	2
Turkey	Southern Region	TK1007	Spring, Limited Entry	1	0	1
Turkey	Southeast Region	TK1006	Spring, Limited Entry	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>



## State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX  
*Governor*

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON  
*Lieutenant Governor*

## Department of Natural Resources

BRIAN C. STEED  
*Executive Director*

### Division of Wildlife Resources

J. RORY REYNOLDS  
*Division Director*

### *MEMORANDUM*

Date: August 18, 2021  
To: Utah Wildlife Board  
From: Covy Jones, Big Game Coordinator  
SUBJECT: Overview of Additional 2021 Big Game Permit Recommendations

The attached tables summarize the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources recommended additional permits for antlerless elk, for the 2021 big game hunting season. These recommendations for additional permits are due to severe drought across much of the state. The increases in permits are designed to protect habitat and minimize conflicts.

#### Highlights:

- Antlerless elk:
  - We recommend increasing 1,052 permits in areas of concern across the state.
  - We recommend 1 new hunt on the La Sal, Delores Triangle with 50 permits.
  - We recommend adding 1,638 private lands only elk permits.



2021 Antlerless Elk Hunts							
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Hunt Information	NR_permits	Res_permits	Total_permits	Additional Drought Permits	Season_dates
EA1222	Beaver, East		15	135	150	15	11/20 - 12/11
EA1223	Beaver, East		10	90	100	10	12/18 - 01/01
EA1190	Beaver, North		12	108	120	20	01/01 - 01/31
EA1224	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Excludes tribal lands	10	90	100	30	10/09 - 10/21
EA1225	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South	Muzzleloader Only, excludes tribal lands	13	112	125	38	11/03 - 11/11
EA1004	Book Cliffs, Little Creek Roadless		3	27	30	9	10/09 - 10/21
EA1007	Box Elder, Grouse Creek		1	4	5	0	08/02 - 08/20 and 10/09 - 10/21
EA1008	Box Elder, Grouse Creek		1	4	5	0	10/23 - 10/31
EA1203	Box Elder, Pilot Mtn (early)		1	4	5	0	08/02 - 08/20
EA1204	Box Elder, Pilot Mtn (late)		1	4	5	0	10/02 - 11/01
EA1009	Cache, East		49	436	485	0	10/09 - 10/21
EA1010	Cache, Rich		7	63	70	0	08/02 - 08/20 and 10/09 - 10/31
EA1193	Cache, Rich		7	63	70	0	11/13 - 01/16
EA1011	Cache, Richards Hollow		5	40	45	0	11/13 - 12/31
EA1012	Cache, Richmond Hyde Park	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt	2	13	15	0	08/02 - 08/20
EA1194	Cache, Richmond Hyde Park	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt	2	13	15	0	11/13 - 12/10
EA1205	Cache, Richmond Hyde Park	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt	2	13	15	0	10/09 - 10/31
EA1206	Cache, Richmond Hyde Park	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt	2	13	15	0	12/11 - 01/16
EA1013	Central Mtns, Central Manti		1	9	10	5	10/09 - 10/21
EA1015	Central Mtns, Ferron Canyon		1	9	10	0	10/09 - 10/21
EA1017	Central Mtns, Gordon Creek-Price Canyon		1	9	10	0	11/24 - 01/31
EA1018	Central Mtns, Horn Mountain		1	4	5	0	11/27-12/31
EA1020	Central Mtns, Mohrland-Stump Flat		1	9	10	10	11/24 - 01/31
EA1022	Central Mtns, North Manti		15	135	150	30	10/09 - 10/21
EA1023	Central Mtns, South Manti		4	36	40	8	10/09 - 10/21
EA1025	Central Mtns, West Manti		7	63	70	14	11/19 - 01/31
EA1024	Central Mtns, South Manti		1	9	10	10	11/19 - 01/31
EA1207	Central Mtns, Moroni Hills		5	45	50	0	08/02 - 08/20
EA1226	Central Mtns, Moroni Hills		3	27	30	0	09/18 - 10/08
EA1021	Central Mtns, Nebo		8	67	75	10	10/09 - 10/21
EA1208	Central Mtns, Nebo		8	67	75	10	11/19 - 01/31
EA1026	Chalk Creek	Primarily Private Land	35	315	350	0	10/09 - 10/31 and 11/13 - 01/16
EA1236	East Canyon	New Hunt, Primarily Private Land, Limited Access	36	324	360	0	10/09 - 10/21 and 12/01 - 01/31
EA1227	Fillmore, Kanosh Valley	Infrequent Elk Herd in Hunt Unit, Private lands. Hunt	1	9	10	0	12/04 - 01/31
EA1209	Fillmore, Oak Creek		5	45	50	0	11/20 - 01/31
EA1030	Fillmore, Pahvant		3	22	25	25	11/20 - 12/11
EA1031	Fillmore, Pahvant		3	22	25	25	12/18 - 01/31
EA1033	Kamas		10	90	100	0	10/09 - 10/31 and 11/13 - 01/16
EA1034	Kamas, Francis		3	22	25	0	10/09 - 10/31 and 11/13 - 01/16
EA1035	Kamas, Oakley		10	90	100	0	10/09 - 10/31 and 11/13 - 01/16
EA1038	La Sal, La Sal Mtns		25	225	250	50	10/09 - 10/21
EA1039	La Sal, La Sal Mtns		25	225	250	0	11/17 - 01/31
EA1237	La Sal, La Sal Mtns, North	New Hunt	10	90	100	0	10/09 - 10/21 and 11/17 - 01/31
EA1040	Monroe, Koosharem Valley	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt, Infrequent Elk Herd	1	9	10	0	08/02-08/17 and 10/9 - 10/21
EA1238	Monroe, Rock Springs	New Hunt, Infrequent Elk Herd in Hunt Unit	2	18	20	0	08/02-08/17 and 10/9 - 10/21

2021 Antlerless Elk Hunts							
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Hunt Information	NR_permits	Res_permits	Total_permits	Additional Drought Permits	Season_dates
EA1228	Morgan-South Rich	Primarily Private Land, Limited Access	10	90	100	0	10/09-10/21 and 12/01-12/15
EA1229	Morgan-South Rich	Primarily Private Land, Limited Access	10	90	100	0	12/22 - 01/16
EA1044	Morgan-South Rich, South Rich	Primarily Private Land, Limited Access, Very difficult	5	45	50	0	10/09 - 10/21 and 12/01 - 01/16
EA1049	Mt Dutton, Deep Creek	No Vehicle Access	3	27	30	0	12/04 - 12/19
EA1186	Mt Dutton/Plateau		3	27	30	0	11/24-12/31
EA1052	Nine Mile, Avintaquin-West Anthro	Excludes Tribal Lands, Very Difficult, Low Success H	25	225	250	63	01/15 - 01/31
EA1054	Nine Mile, West Anthro	Excludes Tribal Lands, Very Difficult, Low Success H	25	225	250	63	12/11 - 12/31
EA1239	Nine Mile, Range Creek	Primarily Private Land, Limited Access	4	36	40	0	10/9 - 10/31
EA1239	Nine Mile, Range Creek	Primarily Private Land, Limited Access	4	36	40	10	11/24 -01/31
EA1055	North Slope, Greendale	Very Low Elk Numbers, Low Success Hunt	1	4	5	0	10/09 - 10/21
EA1056	North Slope, Greendale	Very Low Elk Numbers, Low Success Hunt	1	4	5	0	11/20 - 11/30
EA1058	North Slope, Henry's Fork-Burnt Fork		5	45	50	0	11/13 - 01/16
EA1196	North Slope, Summit		5	45	50	0	10/09 - 10/31
EA1060	North Slope, West Daggett	Muzzleloader Only	1	9	10	3	11/03 - 11/11
EA1061	North Slope, West Daggett	Muzzleloader Only	2	18	20	5	09/29 - 10/07
EA1063	Ogden		2	18	20	0	08/02-08/20 and 10/09-10/31
EA1064	Ogden		2	18	20	0	11/13 - 12/31
EA1069	Panguitch Lake	Public Land	8	67	75	10	11/27 - 12/05
EA1066	Panguitch Lake	Public Land	8	67	75	15	12/11 - 12/19
EA1067	Panguitch Lake	Public Land	8	67	75	15	12/25 - 01/02
EA1068	Panguitch Lake	Public Land	10	90	100	10	01/15 - 01/31
EA1241	Panguitch Lake	New Hunt	8	67	75	0	10/09 - 10/21
EA1073	Paunsaugunt	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt, Very Low Elk Num	5	45	50	0	11/27 - 01/31
EA1187	Paunsaugunt, Hatch Bench	Very Difficult, Low Success Hunt, Very Low Elk Num	3	22	25	0	12/04 - 01/31
EA1074	Pine Valley		2	18	20	0	10/09 - 10/31 and 11/12 - 01/16
EA1075	Plateau, Boulder East	Limited Vehicle Access	1	9	10	0	11/24 - 12/31
EA1076	Plateau, Boulder West		1	9	10	0	11/24 - 12/21
EA1077	Plateau, Boulder-Circle Cliffs	Infrequent Elk Herd in Hunt Unit, Limited Vehicle Acc	2	18	20	0	10/09 - 01/31
EA1078	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes		24	216	240	60	10/09 - 10/21
EA1079	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes East		8	72	80	10	11/24 - 12/31
EA1080	Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes West		8	72	80	10	11/24 - 12/31
EA1081	San Juan		13	112	125	25	10/09 - 10/21
EA1082	San Juan		13	112	125	25	11/17 - 01-31
EA1084	San Rafael, North		1	4	5	0	10/30 - 01/31
EA1101	Southwest Desert		10	90	100	0	11/22 - 12/30
EA1085	South Slope, Bonanza/Vernal	Archery Only, Excludes Tribal Lands	10	90	100	0	08/21 - 09/22
EA1087	South Slope, Bonanza/Vernal	Excludes Tribal Lands	10	90	100	25	10/09 - 10/21
EA1089	South Slope, Diamond Mtn		5	45	50	13	11/01 - 11/09
EA1090	South Slope, Diamond Mtn		5	45	50	13	11/13 - 11/21
EA1091	South Slope, Diamond Mtn		5	45	50	13	11/27 - 12/05
EA1242	South Slope, Buckskin Hills-Jensen		10	90	100	25	12/04 - 12/31
EA1243	South Slope, Buckskin Hills-Jensen		10	90	100	25	01/01 - 01/31
EA1094	South Slope, Mosby Mtn	Excludes tribal lands	8	72	80	20	11/13 - 12/26
EA1098	South Slope, Yellowstone	Excludes tribal lands	8	67	75	19	11/20 - 12/04
EA1099	South Slope, Yellowstone	Excludes tribal lands	8	67	75	19	12/11 - 12/31

2021 Antlerless Elk Hunts							
Hunt #	Hunt Name	Hunt Information	NR_permits	Res_permits	Total_permits	Additional Drought Permits	Season_dates
EA1100	South Slope, Yellowstone	Excludes tribal lands	8	67	75	19	01/15 - 01/31
EA1244	South Slope, Yellowstone		30	270	300	75	10/09 - 10/21
EA1245	South Slope, Yellowstone	Muzzleloader Only, Excludes Tribal Lands	10	90	100	25	11/03 - 11/11
EA1217	Wasatch Mtns, Avintaquin	Excludes Tribal Lands, Very Difficult, Low Success H	15	135	150	38	10/09 - 10/21
EA1110	Wasatch Mtns, Salt Lake		4	36	40	5	11/20 - 01/31
EA1111	Wasatch Mtns, Wallsburg		3	27	30	5	11/20 - 12/19
EA1112	Wasatch Mtns, Wallsburg		5	45	50	5	12/20 - 01/31
EA1113	Wasatch Mtns, West Heber		3	22	25	5	11/20 - 01/31
EA1114	Wasatch Mtns, West Timpanogos		3	27	30	5	11/20 - 01/31
EA1189	Wasatch Mtns, West-Central	Muzzleloader Only	40	360	400	25	11/03 - 11/11
EA1231	West Desert, Tintic Valley	Very Low Elk Numbers, Low Success Hunt	5	45	50	0	08/02 - 01/31
EA1116	Zion	Excludes Zion National Park, Primarily Private Land	10	90	100	10	10/09 - 10/31
EA1117	Zion	Excludes Zion National Park, Primarily Private Land	20	180	200	20	11/12 - 12/31
		<b>Total</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>7441</b>	<b>8285</b>	<b>1052</b>	
	New Hunt						
EA1037	La Sal, Dolores Triangle					50	12/13 - 1/31

**2021 ELK HERD STATUS AND ANTLERLESS PERMIT RECS**

Unit	Plan	Pop.	Pop.	2020	2021	2020	2021	Additional	2020	2021	Notes
	Population	Estimate	Estimate	Antlerless	Antlerless	Private Lands	Private Lands	Private Lands	Antlerless	Antlerless	
	Objective	post-2019	post-2020	Permits	Permits	Permits	Permits	Permits	Control	Control	
Box Elder	675	700	700	20	20	200	200	0			
Cache	2,300	2,700	3,000	730	730	320	320	0			
Ogden	2,000	1,600	1,750	40	40	190	220	0			
Morgan-South Rich	3,800	6,500	6,900	350	250	500	500	0	Y	Y	
East Canyon	1,800	2,300	2,800	600	360	250	500	0	Y	Y	
Chalk Creek	3,200	3,600	3,400	350	350	490	500	0	Y	Y	
Kamas	850	700	725	225	225	0	0	0			
North Slope, Summit	300	300	300	150	100	0	0	0			
North Slope, West Daggett	1,300	650	620	60	40	40	40	10			
North Slope, Three Corners	700	490	550	0	0	0	0	na			
South Slope, Yellowstone	5,000	7,400	7,400	150	625	2,000	2,000	500	Y	N	
South Slope, Diamond Mtn/Bonanza-Vernal <sup>^</sup>	3,000	4,200	4,000	750	630	450	650	163~			
Book Cliffs	7,500	5,500	5,500	150	255	0	0	na			
Nine Mile, Anthro	700	1,100	1,100	500	500	200	200	50			
Nine Mile, Range Creek	1,800	1,250	2,100	0	80	0	80	10			
San Rafael*	0	30	25	10	5	0	0	0			
La Sal	2,500	2,900	2,700	500	600	60	70	10			
San Juan*	1,300	1,300	1,450	150	250	50	50	0			
Henry Mtns	0	30	25	0	0	0	0	0	Y	Y	
Central Mtns, Manti	12,000	9,300	9,500	445	315	200	200	0			
Central Mtns, Nebo	1,450	1,900	1,850	230	230	100	100	0			
Wasatch Mtns, Currant Creek	3,200	1,850	3,000	0	0	2,000	2,000	500			
Wasatch Mtns, Avintaquin	1,800	1,900	1,900	100	150	400	400	100			
Wasatch Mtns, West	3,400	3,400	3,400	575	575	1,000	300	0			
Oquirrh-Stansbury	1,650	700	700	0	0	0	0	0			
West Desert*	350	400	200	75	50	75	75	0	Y	Y	
Southwest Desert	975	1,075	975	400	100	0	0	0			
Beaver	1,050	1,275	1,200	450	370	80	80	45			
Fillmore	1,600	1,350	1,400	80	110	0	0	50			
Monroe	1,000-1,400	1,100	1,150	10	30	0	0	0			
Mt Dutton	1,500-2,000	1,050	1,250	60	60	50	50	0			
Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes	5,000-5,900	4,750	5,100	110	400	0	0	120			
Plateau, Boulder/Kaiparowits	1,200-1,700	1,050	1,150	40	40	0	0	0			
Paunsaugunt	140	275	200	170	75	120	100	0			
Panguitch Lake	1,100-1,300	1,400	1,450	500	400	75	75	50			
Zion	300	475	800	60	300	340	100	30			
Pine Valley	50	50	50	20	20	0	0	0	Y	Y	
<b>STATEWIDE TOTALS</b>	<b>78,990</b>	<b>76,550</b>	<b>80,320</b>	<b>8,060</b>	<b>8,285</b>	<b>9,190</b>	<b>8,810</b>	<b>1,638</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	

\*Antlerless control permits are only on a portion of this unit

<sup>^</sup>Private lands only permits are 450 on Bonanza-Vernal and 200 on Diamond Mtn

~Additional 163 private lands permits are recommended on the Bonanza-Vernal