

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

August 25, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The meeting can be viewed live at <https://youtu.be/cMaCSwCEG60>

Revised August 19, 2022

Thursday, August 25, 2022 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– J. Shirley, DWR Director | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. Technology Update
– Sergeant Gabe Patterson, Technologies Committee co-chair | INFORMATIONAL |
| 6. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments
– Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Proposed Fee Schedule
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 8. Expo Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief
– Sarah Scott, Financial Manager | ACTION |
| 9. Expo Permit Allocation
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 10. Drought Permit Recommendations
– Dax Mangus, Wildlife Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. CWMU Advisory Committee
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 12. Other Business
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
August 25, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
The meeting can be viewed live at <https://youtu.be/cMaCSwCEG60>

Thursday, August 25, 2022 – 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– J. Shirley, DWR Director | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. Technology Update
– Sergeant Gabe Patterson, Technologies Committee co-chair | INFORMATIONAL |
| 6. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments
– Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Proposed Fee Schedule
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 8. Expo Permit Audit
– Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |
| 9. Expo Permit Allocation
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 10. Drought Permit Recommendations
– Dax Mangus, Wildlife Big Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 11. CWMU Advisory Committee
– Covy Jones, Wildlife Section Chief | ACTION |
| 12. Other Business
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Progress on changes to statute for the poaching of a swan

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into changing statute to reflect a 7-year waiting period for poaching a swan and have the division report back. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Wyatt Bubak
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of a 3-year season structure for Big Game seasons and hunter orange regulation reforms

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a 3-year season structure for big game season dates and the possibilities of hunter orange regulation reforms (including amount required, what other states allow etc.) This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood
Assigned to: Covy Jones and Wyatt Bubak
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee to form a structural process to address and outline issues relating to the use of hunting technologies. This committee should set a long term plan to address issues such as weapon success and restrictions, use of guides/scouts, use of range-finders and other technology, and any other issues that the committee deems necessary. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Wade Heaton
Assigned to: Derrick Ewell and Gabe Patterson
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of issuing 2 pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters

MOTION: I move that we direct the division through the action log, to look at issuing 2pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters. That in the four-year period, between 14-18, they would have the potential to be guaranteed at least one hunt for a 2pt. buck and that those tags would not take away from any of the other tag allotments but be in addition to the tags already issued. We would ask the division to look at the impact that it would have on licensing and the herds as well as future youth hunters. Kevin Albrecht included with the action log item that the addition of a survey be used to see what that need is.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Lindy Varney and Covy Jones
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a Youth Only dedicated hunter type program, for youth ages 12-17 that would allow yearly participation with a harvest restriction (2 deer in a 3-year period). This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood

Assigned to: Lindy Varney, Covy Jones and Bryan Christensen

Action: Under Study

Placed on Action Log: June 2, 2022

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting

June 2, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center

1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah

The Board Meeting will stream live at <https://youtu.be/8HW1PKRZ7p4>

AGENDA

Thursday, June 2, 2022, Board Meeting 9:00 am

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | ACTION |
| 3. Old Business/Action Log
– Randy Dearth, Vice-Chairman | CONTINGENT |
| 4. DWR Update
– J. Shirley, DWR Director | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. Conflict of Interest
– Kyle Maynard, Assistant Attorney General | INFORMATIONAL |
| 6. Upland Game Management Plan, Fall Turkey Permits and Air Rifle Recommendations
• Parker Mountain Sage-grouse hunt
– Heather Talley, Upland Game Coordinator | ACTION |
| 7. Landowner Rule Amendments – R657-43
– Chad Wilson, Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator | ACTION |
| 8. Other Business
– Kevin Albrecht, Chairman | CONTINGENT |

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.

Wildlife Board Motions

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

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Progress on changes to statute for the poaching of a swan

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into changing statute to reflect a 7-year waiting period for poaching a swan and have the division report back. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Wyatt Bubak
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of a 3-year season structure for Big Game seasons and hunter orange regulation reforms

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a 3-year season structure for big game season dates and the possibilities of hunter orange regulation reforms (including amount required, what other states allow etc.) This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood
Assigned to: Covy Jones and Wyatt Bubak
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: December 2, 2021

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to establish a Technology Effectiveness Committee to form a structural process to address and outline issues relating to the use of hunting technologies. This committee should set a long term plan to address issues such as weapon success and restrictions, use of guides/scouts, use of range- finders and other technology, and any other issues that the committee deems necessary. This is to be placed on the action log.

Motion made by: Wade Heaton
Assigned to: Derrick Ewell and Gabe Patterson
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

Fall 2022 – Target Date – Possibility of issuing 2 pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters

MOTION: I move that we direct the division through the action log, to look at issuing 2pt. or smaller buck deer tags to youth hunters. That in the four-year period, between 14-18, they would have the potential to be guaranteed at least one hunt for a 2pt. buck and that those tags would not take away from any of the other tag allotments but be in addition to the tags already issued. We would ask the division to look at the impact that it would have on licensing and the herds as well as future youth hunters. Kevin Albrecht included with the action log item that the addition of a survey be used to see what that need is.

Motion made by: Karl Hirst
Assigned to: Lindy Varney and Covy Jones
Action: Under Study
Placed on Action Log: January 4, 2022

Spring 2023 – Target Date – Youth Only deer permit program

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a Youth Only dedicated hunter type program for youth ages 12-17 that would allow yearly participation with a harvest restriction (2 deer in a 3-year period).

Motion made by: Bryce Thurgood

Assigned to: Lindy Varney, Covy Jones and Bryan Christensen

Action: Under Study

Placed on Action Log: June 2, 2022

DRAFT

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 2, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Summary of Motions

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

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

MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda.

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

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the April 28, 2022 Wildlife Board Meeting as submitted.

3) Upland Game Management Plan, Fall Turkey Permits and Air Rifle Recommendations (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood and died for lack of a seconded.

MOTION: I move that we allow only 1 either sex tag for the fall hunts and we remove the public land from the fall hunts and set quotas not to exceed 1500 for Northern, 600 for Central, 350 for Southern, and Southeastern as is.

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

MOTION: I move that we allow only 1 either sex tag for the fall hunts, remove public land from the fall hunts and set a maximum cap of 25% less than the amount sold last year for each region.

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

MOTION: I move that we recommend to the Legislature that we approve the list of hunts as presented, and that we recommend the legislature put forth a relatively significant state tax before this list can be implemented and they could be hunted and that we want to incentivize, through this tax, the industry to go to Pittman-Robertson but that if this tax is not implemented there can be no hunting with air guns.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remaining recommendations as presented by the division.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Parker Mountain Sage grouse hunt as presented.

4) Landowner Rule Amendments – R657-43 (**Action**)

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

MOTION: I move that we remove the section of rule requiring the loss of preference points from rule R657-43.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed 5-1 with one abstention. Wade Heaton abstained.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Landowner Permit Rule Amendments as revised and presented to the Wildlife Board today, and allow the division, the LOA committee and the Landowner Associations to bring back any recommended changes to the August/September RAC and Board meetings. IF no changes are brought forward then the rule will stand as presented today.

5) Other Business (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Randy Dearth, and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the division to look into a Youth Only dedicated hunter type program, for youth ages 12-17 that would allow yearly participation with a harvest restriction (2 deer in a 3-year period). This is to be placed on the Action Log.

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 2, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
Attendance

Wildlife Board

Kevin Albrecht – Chair	Karl Hirst
Randy Dearth – Vice-Chair	Bret Selman
J. Shirley – Executive Secretary	Wade Heaton
	Gary Nielson
	Bryce Thurgood

RAC Chairs

Central – Ben Lowder/Brock McMillan
Southern – Brayden Richmond
Southeastern – Kent Johnson
Northeastern – Brett Prevedel
Northern – Justin Oliver

Division Personnel

Mike Canning	Mike Christensen	Jim Christensen
Ashley Green	Staci Coons	Rusty Robinson
Kenny Johnson	Paige Wiren	Avery Cook
Chris Wood	Kyle Maynard	Jason Nichols
Jason Vernon	Charles Lyons	Brian Dennis
Miles Hanberg	Heather Talley	Trevor Doman
Ben Nadolski	Blair Stringham	
Kevin Bunnell	Lindy Varney	
Covy Jones	Chad Wilson	
Wyatt Bubak	Dax	

Public Present

Robert Ott	Dale Christianson	Troy Justensen
Jim Drollinger	Mark Chivers	Marc Bingham
Dave Chivers	Bart Haslem	Maria Windham
Randy Searle	Andy Monroe	Brandon Zandel
Waylon Pritchett	Jordon Madison	Kevin Norman
Tanner Carlson	Chuck Carpenter	Ben Lowder
Chris Robinson	Wade Garrett	Daniel Kroger

Utah Wildlife Board Meeting
June 2, 2022, Eccles Wildlife Education Center
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington, Utah
<https://youtu.be/8HW1PKRZ7p4>

- 00:02:03** Chairman Albrecht called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reminded them that the meeting is streaming live, and reviewed the public comment process. Board members introduced themselves. Bret Selman later joined the meeting virtually.
- 00:03:30** **1) Approval of Agenda (Action)**
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.
- 00:03:50** **2) Approval of Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.
MOTION: I move that we approve the minutes of the April 28, 2022 Wildlife Board Meeting.
- 00:04:06** **3) Old Business/Action Log (Contingent)**
There was no old business to report.
- 00:04:39** **4) DWR Update (Informational)**
Director J. Shirley gave Administrative Services, Habitat, Law Enforcement Outreach, Wildlife and Aquatic section updates.
- 00:13:58** **5) Conflict of Interest (Informational)**
Assistant Attorney General Kyle Maynard presented conflict of interest information.
- 00:19:43** **Board Questions**
There were no questions from the Board or RAC Chairs.
- 00:20:01** **6) Upland Game Management Plan, Fall Turkey Permits and Air Rifle Recommendations (Action)**
Upland Game Coordinator Heather Talley gave an overview of the video presentation that was posted on the Division's website and shared what was discussed in the different RAC meetings. She also showed historic spring and fall turkey harvest data.
- 00:23:19** **Board Questions**
The board asked about historic harvest data, and if and how the fall turkey hunt has affected statewide turkey populations. They asked if the Division would support

limiting the fall turkey hunt to private land given drought conditions, and why the northeastern region does not have a fall turkey hunt. The Board asked if a hen hunt could negatively impact already low turkey populations, and how hard it is to relocate a turkey. Chairman Albrecht reminded the audience that only public comments, not questions, are heard at a board meeting.

00:37:43 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

00:38:46 RAC Recommendations

All RACs passed the permit recommendations with varying stipulations.

00:46:03 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

00:59:58 RAC Summaries

Chairman Albrecht gave a summary of all the RAC motions.

01:01:13 Board Discussion/Questions

The Board supported the Division's maintaining control over managing nuisance turkey hunts, and discussed the number of tags an individual could purchase as well as hunt success rate. The Board asked how the Division viewed the idea of limiting the fall hunt to private lands only. The Board commented that it would support presenting a private lands only hunt to the upland game committee, and suggested reducing fall turkey permit numbers in lieu of the drought and/or capping the number of permits sold in certain regions. The Board asked about the volume of nuisance turkey complaints as well as the number of control permits issued, and suggested reducing the total number of permits an individual could buy to one per person.

Bret Selman joined the meeting.

The Board further suggested that by restricting the fall turkey hunt to private land only, and also limiting permit purchases to one per person, the total number of allocated permits would not have to be reduced.

The Board expressed hesitancy about creating a conservation stamp for air guns. Chairman Albrecht noted that the Board's decision on the air gun issue will be closely watched by other intermountain west states.

The Board voiced that air guns should have some kind of tax assessed on them, preferably the Pittman-Robertson tax, and discussed other taxation options.

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood and failed for a lack of a second.

MOTION: I move that we allow only 1 either sex tag for the fall hunts, and we remove the public land from the fall hunts and set quotas not to exceed 1500 for Northern, 600 for Central, 350 for Southern, and leave the Southeastern as is.

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

MOTION: I move that we allow only 1 either sex tag for the fall hunts, remove public land from the fall hunts, and set a maximum cap of 25% less than the amount sold last year for each region.

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

MOTION: I move that we recommend to the Legislature that we approve the list of hunts as presented, and that we recommend the legislature put forth a relatively significant state tax before this list can be implemented and they could be hunted and that we want to incentivize, through this tax, the industry to go to Pittman-Roberts but that if this tax is not implemented there can be no hunting with air guns.

The following motion was made by Randy Dearth, seconded by Gary Nielson and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the remaining recommendations as presented by the Division.

01:35:29 Parker Mountain Sage-grouse hunt

Heather Talley gave a presentation on the Division's recommendations for the Parker Mountain Sage-grouse hunt.

01:41:20 Board RAC Questions/Discussion

There were no questions from the Board or the RAC Chairs.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Parker Mountain Sage-grouse hunt as presented.

01:42:57 7) Landowner Rule Amendments (Action)

Private Lands/Public Wildlife Coordinator Chad Wilson gave a history of the need for the rule amendments, explained the reasons that a committee was formed to address this issue and reviewed the language that was added to the amendments after the agenda item was voted on at the RAC meetings. He gave a summary of the main issues that arose during the RAC meetings, and explained the three proposed LOA program options.

02:02:09 Board/RAC Questions

The Board asked how many acres and number of LOA members are enrolled in the LOA program statewide; asked how many people would lose preference points if s/he drew an LOA permit, and why the Division supports the loss of preference points.

The RACs asked about the impact of CWMU participants potentially leaving that program and instead joining the LOA program. The RACs asked if individuals left

LOAs, could the Division end up having to pay depredation costs to those same landowners.

02:11:07 Public Comments

Director Shirley summarized the public comments received online.

02:13:49 RAC Recommendations

The Central, Northern and Southeastern RACs passed the amendments with stipulations. The Southern RAC rejected the proposal; and the Northeastern RAC tabled the vote on this agenda item.

02:22:16 Public Comments

Public comments were accepted at this time.

04:05:31 Lunch Break

04:47:00 Division Clarification

The Division gave clarification on the public comments at this time, and the Board asked about the frequency of guided hunts on CWMUs.

04:54:18 RAC Summaries

Chairman Albrecht gave a summary of all the RAC motions.

04:55:43 Board Questions/Discussion

The board expressed a strong opinion about both public access to private LOA land as well as the need for a straightforward formula for allocating permit numbers to LOAs. The Board commented on the agreed upon formula that will be used to calculate LOA permit numbers should this agenda item be approved. The history, purpose and fairness of the LOA program was discussed, as well as the expressed need for a program restructuring. The value of private lands in wildlife conservation was also discussed. The Board commented that the proposed changes to the rule are a good start and that the landowner rule potentially could also continue to be modified in the future.

The Board questioned if it would be wise to make changes that could cause current LOA members to leave the program.

The Board asked the Division to explain a CWMU option for the Diamond Mountain LOA.

05:18:46 Technical difficulties

05:20:49 The Board asked the Division to explain a CWMU option for the Diamond Mountain LOA.

The Board noted that there are Division programs other than the LOA program in which landowners could participate.

The Board asked if another committee, or the LOA, presented a better idea on how

to calculate land usage, could changes to the LOA rule be revisited at another time. The Board also expressed the concern that, in the future, there would be hesitation to revisit rule changes.

Board member Wade Heaton stated that he did not have a conflict of interest as regards this agenda item.

The Board expressed appreciation for the relationships between landowners and the Division as well as CWMU participants and the public who hunt on CWMUs.

The Board articulated support for the efforts the Division made with regard to forming and managing the LOA committee and meetings, and noted that the public access component to the rule has been in the rule since it was created. The Board also said that the proposed rule amendments were the product of a balanced and productive committee. The Board further acknowledged that communication about and during the term of the committee could have been more effective.

The Board suggested that more committee work could be done on this issue before voting on it during this meeting. The Board also suggested the idea of giving the LOAs a set amount of time to come up with amendments to the LOA rule that satisfy their concerns and that would go through the RAC and Board process.

The Board expressed concern about making the wrong decision on this agenda item, and also voiced that a decision should be made at this meeting.

The Board argued against the terms of the general season landowner permit rules. The Board asked how many people who applied for general season landowner permits did not receive one. The Board suggested making general season landowner permits transferrable, and also noted that the committee had discussed the idea general season landowner vouchers, but that there was no collective support for that idea. The Board then opined that it is not a committee's role to act as policy makers.

The Board proposed the idea of mandatory LOA training and that LOAs must have an advisory committee or be a part of the CWMU committee.

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

MOTION: I move that we remove the section of rule requiring the loss of preference points from rule R657-43.

The following motion was made by Karl Hirst, seconded by Bryce Thurgood and passed 5-1 with one abstention. Wade Heaton recused himself.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Landowner Permit Rule Amendments as revised and presented to the Wildlife Board today, and allow the division, the LOA committee and the Landowner Associations to bring back any recommended changes to the August/September RAC and Board meetings. IF no changes are brought forward then the rule will stand as presented today.

06:16:57 8) Other Business (Contingent)

The following motion was made by Bryce Thurgood, seconded by Randy Dearth and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we ask the Division to look into a Youth Only dedicated hunter type program, for youth ages 12-17 that would allow yearly participation with a harvest restriction (2 deer in a 3-year period). This is to be placed on the Action Log.

06:21:45 Meeting adjourned.

DRAFT

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
July/August 2022
Summary of Motions**

- 1) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments (**Action**)
- CR **MOTION: Accept rule as presented with the addition of including guides and outfitters in the rule for special use permits.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- NR **MOTION: I move that we accept R657-28 Land Use Rule Amendments as presented.**
PASSED: 11-1
- SR **MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendations as presented.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- SER **MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendations as presented.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- NER **MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the addition of adding outfitters and guides to the special use examples.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- 2) Proposed Fee Schedule (**Action**)
- CR **MOTION: Recommend the increase for the Dedicated Hunter fee to increase from \$20 to \$25 per hour purchased, increase the nonresident hunting license from \$72 to \$120 and match the combo license to match the ratio of the hunting license increase.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- MOTION: Approve the balance of the proposal as presented.**
PASSED: Unanimous
- MOTION: Recommendation to the Division that there is more consistency among the tag fees (e.g. crane, swan, doe deer, cow elk, doe pronghorn, etc.).**
PASSED: Unanimous
- NR **MOTION: I move that we accept Proposed Fee Schedule as presented.**
PASSED: 10-2
- SR **MOTION: I move that we create a non-resident youth general season elk and deer permit fee that matches the resident deer and elk prices.**
PASSED: Unanimous

MOTION: I move that we keep the cost of cougar spot-and-stalk permits at \$30 and do not increase the cougar pursuit permit, keeping it at \$30.

PASSED: 7-2

MOTION: I move that we re-instate the one day fishing license for a \$5 fee.

PASSED: 6-3

SER

MOTION: To make the non-resident youth combination license, general seasons deer permit, and general season elk fees the same price resident youth fees.

PASSED: 7-1

MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.

PASSED: Unanimous

NER

MOTION: To allow Dedicated Hunters to buy out the first 16 hours at \$30.00 hour, to buy out the remaining 16 hours would be \$40.00 hour with a direction to the Division to work with other agencies to provide more Dedicated Hunter projects.

PASSED: 6-1

MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.

PASSED: Unanimous

Central Region RAC Meeting

Video Conference

July 26, 2022

The meeting streamed live at <https://youtu.be/ZjLWe2QZW18>

Tuesday July 26, 2022 6:00 pm

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 1. Approval of Agenda
– Brock McMillan, RAC chair | ACTION |
| 2. Approval of Minutes
– Brock McMillan, RAC chair | ACTION |
| 3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update
– Brock McMillan, RAC chair | INFORMATIONAL |
| 4. Regional Update
– Jason Vernon, Regional Supervisor | INFORMATIONAL |
| 5. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments
- Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. Proposed Fee Schedule
- Kenny Johnson, Administrative Service Section Chief Coordinator | ACTION |

Details of the specific recommendations can be found at 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 26, 2022
Springville, Utah
Summary of Motions

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve to approve the agenda as presented.

2) Approval of May 10, 2022 RAC Meeting Minutes

The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the May 10th Central Region RAC meeting as transcribed.

3) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Accept rule as presented with the addition of including guides and outfitters in the rule for special use permits.

4) Proposed Fee Schedule

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

MOTION: Recommend the increase for the Dedicated Hunter fee to increase from \$20 to \$25 per hour purchased, increase the nonresident hunting license from \$72 to \$120 and match the combo license to match the ratio of the hunting license increase.

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Josh Lenart and failed 3 in favor and 6 opposed (Josh, Ben, Danny).

MOTION: Reduce resident multi season elk permit cost to 3 times the proposed single season rate (\$168).

The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Luke Decker and passed unanimously.

MOTION: Approve the balance of the proposal as presented.

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

MOTION: Recommendation to the Division that there is more consistency among the tag fees (e.g. crane, swan, doe deer, cow elk, doe pronghorn, etc.).

Central Region RAC Meeting
July 26, 2022

RAC Members

Attending

Brock McMillan – RAC Chair
Chase Crandall – online
Eric Reid
Josh Lenart
Ken Strong
Luke Decker
Jim Shuler
Michael Christensen
Ben Lowder
Danny Potts – online
AJ Mower – online
Steve Lund

Excused

Scott Jensen

Wildlife Board

Karl Hirst

DWR Personnel

Jason Vernon
Matt Briggs
Scott Root
Eric Edgley
Chelsea Duke
Mark Farmer
Kenny Johnson
Mike Christensen

Total public: 1

Public invited to join online: <https://youtu.be/ZjLWe2QZWI8>

Central Region RAC Meeting
 July 26, 2022
 Springville, Utah
<https://youtu.be/ZjLWe2QZWI8>

06:25:50	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.
06:28:50	<p>1) Approval of Agenda (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.</p>
06:28:50	<p>2) Approval of Minutes (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Ken Strong, seconded by Jim Shuler and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To approve the April 5th Central Region RAC minutes as transcribed.</p>
06:29:40	<p>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</p> <p>RAC Chair Brock McMillan updated the RAC.</p>
06:32:40	<p>4) DWR Update (Informational)</p> <p>Jason Vernon updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
06:46:13	<p>5) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</p>
06:46:27	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>RAC members asked questions about class one e-bikes, e-bikes that can be converted between classes, the legality of using e-bikes on WMAs, and how the law will be enforced. RAC members also questioned if consideration was given to include similar regulations in areas where WMAs are adjacent to other regulated land such as Forest Service property. Other questions included to possibility of adding guiding to the special use permit section of the rule.</p> <p>Public Questions</p> <p>None</p>
06:54:20	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <p>None</p>

<p>06:55:45</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC members discussed the use of electric bikes on WMAs. The use of e-bikes by people otherwise unable to access areas was also discussed. Concerns were expressed about the increased use of e-bikes and additional disturbance to wildlife.</p>
<p>07:05:20</p>	<p>R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION</p> <p>The following motion was made by Josh Lenart, seconded by Danny Potts and passed unanimously</p> <p>MOTION: Accept rule as presented with the addition of including guides and outfitters in the rule for special use permits.</p>
<p>07:11:05</p>	<p>6) Proposed Fee Schedule</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</p>
<p>07:11:17</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>RAC members asked for reasoning behind the multi-season general season fee increase which makes it more than three times a single season general elk permit. Questions were also asked about the dedicated hunter hours fee doubling, non-resident fees, over age 65 fee increase, and the basis behind the various fee increases.</p> <p>Public Questions</p> <p>None</p>
<p>07:36:17</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Jason Vernon summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <p>John Bair – SFW – Nobody likes to raise fees, nobody loves to have these conversations but it is necessary. Sportsmen pay the bill and we’ve got to keep our wildlife funded. We do support it. But, on behalf of my dad, \$200 for multi-season elk is too much.</p>
<p>07:38:57</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>The RAC members discussed the multi-season elk fee increase and supported the fee increasing to three time the one season general elk fee. Dedicated hunter hours buyout increase too high but can understand incentive to complete, projects instead. Non-resident hunting license fee increase too low especially when compared to surrounding states. Some support for \$200 multi-season general elk to possibly limit hunters. Dedicated hunter fee increase too high, it is hard to do find projects and increasing to \$40 per hour is insult to injury. Some support for limiting fee increases for non-resident hunters. Support for requesting additional general fund money, wildlife viewers should help support wildlife management. Recommendation that doe pronghorn fee be equal to</p>

	<p>doe deer fee. Support for increased non-resident fees. Concerns about increased fees for seniors. Support for increasing dedicated hunter fee to \$25 per hour, projects are difficult to find. Suggestion for first time user to obtain a free fishing license. Fee increases seem to be random, why is increase not a percentage across all licenses? Support for the majority of fee increases. \$6 increase in minimal. Need to make it clear that non-resident fees were very recently increased. Non-residents do bring in money to communities but there is a cost for other things (search and rescue).</p>
<p>08:02:00</p>	<p>Proposed Fee Schedule</p> <p style="text-align: center;">MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Mike Christensen, seconded by Ken Strong and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: Recommend the increase for the Dedicated Hunter fee to increase from \$20 to \$25 per hour purchased, increase the nonresident hunting license from \$72 to \$120 and match the combo license to match the ratio of the hunting license increase.</p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Josh Lenart and failed 3 in favor and 6 opposed</p> <p>In Favor: Josh Lenart, Ben Lowder, Danny Potts</p> <p>Opposed: Eric Reid, Ken Strong, Luke Decker, Steve Lund, Michael Christensen, AJ Mower</p> <p>MOTION: Reduce resident multi season elk permit cost to 3 times the proposed single season rate (\$168).</p> <p>The following motion was made by Ben Lowder, seconded by Luke Decker and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: Approve the balance of the proposal as presented.</p> <p>The following motion was made by Brock McMillan, seconded by Mike Christensen and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: Recommendation to the Division that there is more consistency among the tag fees (e.g. crane, swan, doe deer, cow elk, doe pronghorn, etc.).</p>
<p>08:40:40</p>	<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>

Regional Advisory Council Meeting

July 27, 2022

The meeting will stream live at https://youtu.be/v_QbMXc9sSs

1. Welcome, RAC Introductions and RAC Procedure
- RAC Chair
2. Approval of Agenda and Minutes **ACTION**
- RAC Chair
3. Wildlife Board Meeting Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- RAC Chair
4. Regional Update **INFORMATIONAL**
- DWR Regional Supervisor
5. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments **ACTION**
- Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator
6. Proposed Fee Schedule **ACTION**
- Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief

**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 26th, 6:00 PM
Wildlife Resources Conference Room
1115 N. Main Street, Springville
<https://youtu.be/ZjLWe2QZWI8>

SER RAC – Aug 3rd, 6:30 PM
John Wesley Powel Museum
1765 E. Main St., Green River
<https://youtu.be/lm4u2irJQiI>

NR RAC – July 27, 6:00 PM
Weber County Commission Chambers
2380 Washington Blvd. Suite #240, Ogden
https://youtu.be/v_QbMXc9sSs

NER RAC – Aug 4th, 6:30 PM
Wildlife Resources NER Office 318
318 North Vernal Ave., Vernal
<https://youtu.be/md2pG3J7QzY>

SR RAC – Aug 2nd, 6:00 PM
DNR Cedar City Complex
646 N. Main St., Cedar City
<https://youtu.be/H1G-OSCctUE>

Board Meeting – Aug 25th, 9:00 AM
Eccles Wildlife Education Center,
1157 South Waterfowl Way, Farmington
<https://youtu.be/cMaCSwCEG60>

**Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Summary of Motions**

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

The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

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

2) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Brad Buchanan and passed. For: 11 Against: 1 Casey Snider - Need to go further in prioritizing properties for wildlife.

MOTION: I move that we accept R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments as presented.

3) Proposed Fee Schedule (**Action**)

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Matt Klar and passed. For: 10 Against: 2. Junior Goring -Timing is wrong. Darren Parry - Price folks out from being able to go. Struggling to make ends meet.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented.

Northern Regional Advisory Council Meeting

July 27, 2022

Attendance

RAC Members

Mike Laughter – Chair
Kevin McLeod – Vice-Chair
Ben Nadolski – Exec Secretary

Ryan Brown
Brad Buchanan
Jaimi Butler
Paul Case
David Earl
Junior Goring

Randy Hutchison
Matt Klar
Darren Parry
Casey Snider
Nikki Wayment

Board Member
Bryce Thurgood

RAC Excused
Emily Jenco
Justin Oliver

Division Personnel

Jodie Anderson
Kenny Johnson
Chelsea Duke
David Beveridge
Hailey Blair
Daniel Olson
Randall McBride

Mike Christensen
Paul Gedge
J Shirley
Devin Christensen
Eric Edgley

Regional Advisory County Meeting

July 27, 2022

Attendance

- 00:22:17** **1)** Chairman Mike Laughter called the meeting to order, welcomed the audience, reviewed the meeting procedures.
- 00:26:17** **2) Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)**
The following motion was made by Matt Klar, seconded by Randy Hutchison and passed unanimously.

MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes.
- 00:26:50** **3) Update from past Wildlife Board Meeting by Ben Nadolski**
Links on website to view.
- 00:30:19** **4) Regional Update - Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor (Informational)**
-Law Enforcement- Promotion of Brock Thornley to Sergeant. Wildfire Support. Hosting NAWEOA in 2023. WMA Enforcement. Help with prisoner relocation, K9 helping agencies find guns with restricted persons. Hire new officers.
-Outreach- Shooting/camping issues at the Millville- Providence WMA. Combined Law Enforcement communication effort making a difference. Fewer camping or shooting issues. Beginning Kayak Fishing Clinic East Canyon. Nine members of Kayak Fishing Club provided instruction.
-NRO Impact Biologist Melissa Early.
-Cinnamon Creek WMA Ribbon Cutting 6-8pm on Aug 5. Road and fence repairs, baseline range trend survey.
-Wildlife Section- Pre-season elk and pronghorn counts. Big Game Depredation Counts. Bat Misting Surveys. Chukar Camera surveys. CWMU renewal applications. Increase nuisance calls on bats and rattlesnakes.
-Reservoir Habitat- Deep water habitat improvement projects at Andy Adams and Echo Reservoirs. Treat overabundant lily pads at Glassman Pond.
-Native Fish and Mollusks- Bluehead Sucker population surveys on the Weber River. Emergency transfer of least chub from Pilot Pond. New populations of winged floaters mussels in Ogden Bay and Salt Creek WMAs. SF Junction Creek diversion rebuild and fish passage.
-Great Salt Lake- Historic low lake elevation continues to be set daily. Current elevation 4189.8 feet. Region wide shorebird survey.
-Waterfowl- Successful phragmites burns at Ogden Bay and Salt Creek WMAs. Planted food plots and shrubs at Farmington Bay, Ogden Bay and Salt Creek. Annual phragmites project Aug 8 – Sept 9.
-RAC Member Opportunities- Stream electrofishing surveys. Elk and pronghorn classifications. Shorebird surveys. Phragmites.

00:42:31 Questions from RAC Members

Randy Hutchison asked when the chukar survey will be completed. Ben responded he would need to check the calendar.

00:42:55 5) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments (Action)

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

00:43:38 Questions from RAC Members

Making it clearer to the public how the Division processes permits, easements and property rights. Provisions with E-bikes on all Division lands. Activities on WMAs that aren't wildlife centered and unlawful use. Special use permits for guides and outfitters.

01:04:36 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor

7 responses. 2 (29%) strongly agree, 1 (14%) somewhat agree, 3 (43%) neither agree nor disagree, 1 (14%) somewhat disagree, 0 (0%) strongly disagree.

No extra comments added to this item.

01:05:32 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Have strong signage. Not sure there is a place for camping on WMAs. There is not a one size fits all.

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Brad Buchanan and passed For: 11 Against: 1: Casey Snider - Need to go further in prioritizing properties for wildlife.

MOTION: I move we accept R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments as presented.

01:09:39 6) Proposed Fee Schedule (Action)

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

01:11:25 Questions from RAC Members

Email responses comparing Utah's licensing fees to other surrounding states. More than a 10% increase with the Dedicated Hunter program from \$20 to \$40 to buy out hours. Increase on the multi-season elk tag. Employee cost of living increases. Commercial Hunting Areas and why there was not a fee increase. PR dollars and what they are based on. Increased fees for resident swan and sandhill crane permits. Difference between a hunting and a pursuit permit for cougars and bears. Public Comment mentioned not needing to increase fees if a different vendor was used for the expos.

01:26:46 Electronic/Public Comment Report by Ben Nadolski, Regional Supervisor

19 responses. 3 (16%) strongly agree, 2 (11%) somewhat agree, 3 (16%) neither agree nor disagree, 2 (11%) somewhat disagree, 9 (47%) strongly disagree.

The public is concerned about increased fees. People are seeing increases in the cost of goods through

inflation. Increases taking place through taxation and local governments. Division needs to look more at non-resident fees. Dedicated Hunter hourly payout rate increase.

Chris Carling – SFW - Supports the Fee Schedule as presented.

01:28:58 RAC discussion/Division Clarification and Motions

Sliding scales or special permits for students or civic employees.

The following motion was made by Randy Hutchison, seconded by Matt Klar and passed. For: 10
Against: 2. Junior Goring - Wrong timing for a fee increase. Darren Parry - Price folks out from being able to go. Struggling to make ends meet.

MOTION: I move that we accept the Proposed Fee Schedule as presented.

01:33:19 Meeting adjourned. Motion to Adjourn: Made by Brad Buchanan, seconded by Randy Hutchison.

Southern Regional RAC Meeting

August 2, 2022

RAC Members

Attending

Brayden Richmond

Gene Boardman

Craig Laub

Riley Roberts

Chad Utley (virtual)

Austin Atkinson

Bart Battista

Verland King

Tammy Pearson

Chuck Chamberlain

Dan Fletcher (virtual)

Absent

Wildlife Board

Wade Heaton

DWR Personnel

Kevin Bunnell

Alyssa Jackson (virtual)

Adam Kavalunas

Chelsea Duke

Kody Jones

Hailey Blair

Gary Bezzant

Justin Shirley

Donny Hunter

Kenny Johnson

Riley Peck

Public invited to join online: <https://youtu.be/H1G-OSCctUE>

Southern Region RAC Meeting

August 2, 2022

Cedar City, Utah

<https://youtu.be/H1G-OSCctUE>

06:00:45	RAC Chair Brayden Richmond called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations or public comments taken during the meeting.
06:01:15	1) Approval Of Agenda and Minutes (Action) The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Tammy Pearson. MOTION: I move that we approve the Agenda and Minutes as presented.
06:05:11	3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational) RAC Chair Brayden Richmond updated the RAC
06:11:54	4) DWR Update (Informational) Kevin Bunnell updated the RAC on all regional activities.
06:27:45	5) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments (Action) Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator
06:29:08	RAC Questions Verland King: Wants to know how many grazing permits we have in the state.
06:30:17	Public Questions None
06:31:08	RAC Comments Tammy Pearson: Likes the groupings, it looks a lot cleaner to read and understand. Verland King: Expresses that nobody would sign up for it unless they were in desperate need.
06:33:41	MOTIONS The following motion was made by Tammy Pearson, seconded by Bart Battista. MOTION: I move that we accept the recommendation as presented. Passed unanimously.

<p>06:34:00</p>	<p>6) Proposed Fee Schedule (Action) Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief</p> <p>Presented his recommendation and answered questions.</p>
<p>06:36:16</p>	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>Austin Atkinson wants to know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we feel like \$1 is enough for multi-year licenses is enough from your department? • Do we have an auto renew process for licenses? • What about last time when you increased the non-resident fees, did that go through the same process? Must it always go through this process of RAC, board, legislation and then governor? • Is there a way to address and/or recommend reducing the mountain lion permit fees? • Is there a schedule for when licensing fees need to be reviewed and address? Every year or just when needed? <p>*Kevin and Brayden asked Austin his personal opinion on licensing in Utah in comparison to other states and resident vs. non-resident fees.</p> <p>Bart Battista wants to know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this really going to be effective in 2 years when we meet the curve? • Does the division use contract staff to do some work? • Is there specific examples of something the division has cut recently? <p>Chuck Chamberlain: Have you taken this to legislature to talk about tax increase?</p> <p>Tammy Pearson: I realize there's a ton of projects such as fire rehab for funding. Have you taken that into consideration or is that part of this?</p> <p>Verland King: Are you guys thinking about cutting back on stuff?</p> <p>Brayden Richmond: Is the division doing enough for its employees? I've had the opportunity to work with division employees and I can't say enough good things about them. I just worry we aren't doing enough for the employees.</p>

<p>06:56:43</p>	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Kevin Norman: Here with SFW, we are here in support of the division's recommendations. We know that nobody wants to pay more money but we also know it's absolutely necessary. We work close with the division and we don't know any of them getting rich. If you ask them monster muley's they might think they are but I don't know any of them that are. I appreciate their efforts and them looking out for two of our most important groups in the state, the kids and the veterans, holding off on the increases for them. As a dad, I know the value of the tradition of hunting and being able to keep that alive and well. Easier on families is important. Thank you for that, thank you for your time and we are in full support of this recommendation. Thank you.</p>
<p>06:59:30</p>	<p>RAC Comments</p> <p>Chad Utley: Expresses his support in the recommendation and understands things are expensive</p> <p>Verland King: Expresses his concern that raising the license and permit fees is not a good idea given the fact that hunting quality and quantity has gone down. Does not see it reasonable to sell hunters a license/permit for more money when the likelihood of putting it to use is minimal. Verland does not agree with the recommendation.</p> <p>Bart Battista: Explains that from a management perspective, if you're trying to increase the population you have to take proactive strategies which costs money. Reducing projects isn't an answer or solution to the issue. Expresses his support in the recommendation by explaining there's way for a person to budget their expenses to afford hunting and fishing opportunity.</p> <p>Chuck Chamberlain: Has had the opportunity to work with wildlife biologists and has great respect for their abilities, the work they do and the working relationship he has with them. Expresses his appreciation. Chuck is in full support of the recommendation.</p> <p>Craig Laub: Is understanding of input costs but thinks sometimes you have to make the cuts.</p> <p>Tammy Pearson: Would rather hunt than take her family to Disneyland.</p> <p>Riley Roberts: Respectfully explains that you can never save your way to wealth. In this case, wealth is wildlife and habitat in the state of Utah so it doesn't matter how much we cut. Riley is appreciative of the division's efforts in saving but strongly agrees that the only way to</p>

	<p>better wildlife and habitat is by increasing revenue, regardless how it's done (projects, wages, license fees, etc.). Is in favor of the divisions recommendations.</p> <p>Austin Atkinson: Mostly in agreeance with the division's recommendations and is appreciative of the division always putting wildlife first. Would like to see more opportunity for the kids. Would like to see non-resident youth fees decrease, it would be a great revenue and hunting opportunity. Non-resident youth permit fees should be addressed. Recommends cutting back on cougar permit fees.</p> <p>Brayden Richmond: Is in support of the dedicated hunter fee increase recommendation.</p> <p>Chuck Chamberlain: Recommends creating opportunity for a one day fishing license.</p> <p>Tammy Pearson: Agrees with Austin's cougar recommendation and making it an add-on permit.</p>
<p>07:20:40</p>	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>Craig Laub: Water will help the numbers more than anything.</p> <p>Verland King: Thinks that DWR can look hard internally and find other alternatives than raising the prices. Doesn't want to price hunters out of the market. Make some cuts, not necessarily employees, but in projects and other ways.</p> <p>Dan Fletcher: Expresses that working with the wildlife biologists has been great and a lot of great work has and is being done on the ground. We've developed more water which is helping hunters through drought conditions and unfortunate circumstances. Is in support of the division's recommendations to increase license fees.</p> <p>Verland King: I don't mean to say don't do any projects. I just say use more common sense and studying. Be more frugal with where you spend your money on projects.</p>
<p>07:29:00</p>	<p>MOTIONS</p> <p>The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Verland King.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we create a non-resident youth general season elk and deer permit fee that matches the resident deer and elk prices.</p> <p>Passed unanimously.</p>

07:30:50	<p>MOTIONS The following motion was made by Austin Atkinson, seconded by Tammy Pearson. MOTION: I move that we keep the cost of the cougar spot-and-stalk permit at \$30 and do not increase the cougar pursuit permit, keeping it at \$30. Passed 7 to 2. (Opposed: Bart Battista, Chad Utley)</p>
07:35:17	<p>MOTIONS The following motion was made by Chuck Chamberlain, seconded by Craig Laub. MOTION: I move that we re-instate the one day fishing license for a \$5 fee. Passed 6 to 3. (Opposed: Austin Atkinson, Riley Roberts, Chad Utley)</p>
07:40:28	<p>RAC Comments</p> <p>Riley Roberts: Would have liked more information from the Division on what the impact would be financially before making a motion. Opportunity to discuss.</p> <p>Austin Atkinson: States he doesn't fish.</p> <p>Chad Utley: Would have liked more information before making a motion. Opportunity to discuss.</p> <p>Tammy Pearson: When has the wildlife board passed what the RAC has recommended?</p>
07:43:30	<p>MOTIONS The following motion was made by Bart Battista, seconded by Chuck Chamberlain. MOTION: I move that we accept the remainder as presented. Passed 7 to 2. (Opposed: Craig Laub, Verland King)</p>
07:45:25	<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>

**Southeast Region RAC Meeting
Hybrid Conference
August 3, 2022**

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

RAC AGENDA – July/August 2022



- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 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. | R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments
- Chelsea Duke, Wildlife Lands Coordinator | ACTION |
| 6. | Proposed Fee Schedule
- Kenny Johnson, Administrative Services Section Chief | ACTION |

Hybrid Conference
August 3, 2022
SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

1. Approval of Agenda & Minutes

The following motion was made by Kirk Player, and seconded by Eric Luke and passed unanimously, 8/8.

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

2. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendment

The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Kirk Player, and passed unanimously, 8/8.

- **MOTION: to accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.**

3. Proposed Fee Schedule

The following motion was made by Eric Luke and was not seconded.

- **FAILED MOTION: To decrease the cougar spot and stalk tags from \$30 to \$15.**

The following motion was made Eric Luke and was seconded by Kirk Player and passed, 7/1.

MOTION: To make the non-resident youth combination license, general seasons deer permit, and general season elk fees the same price resident youth fees.

The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Kirk Player, and passed unanimously, 8/8.

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

SER RAC Meeting
August 3, 2022

Southeast Region RAC Meeting
August 3, 2022
Attendance

RAC Members Attending

Kent Johnson, Chairman
Kirk Player
Eric Luke
Dana Truman
Steven Duke
Lynn Sittrud
Charles Fisher
Brad Richman
Darren Olsen

18:31:00	RAC chair Kent Johnson called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members to indicate who attended the broadcast.
18:33:18	<p style="text-align: center;">Approval of Agenda and Minutes (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Kirk Player, and seconded by Eric Luke and passed unanimously, 8/8.</p> <p>MOTION: To approve the agenda and minutes for the Southeast Region RAC meeting.</p>
18:39:00	<p>4. Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</p> <p>Scot Flannery updated the RAC with Wildlife Board decisions.</p>
18:42:00	<p>5. DWR Update (Informational)</p> <p>Chris Wood updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
18:53:00	<p>1. R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendment (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</p>
18:53:00	RAC Questions
18:57:00	Public Questions
18:57:00	Public Comments
18:57:00	RAC Comments
17:01:00	<p>The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Kirk Player, and passed unanimously, 8/8.</p> <p>MOTION: to accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.</p>
17:02:00	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Proposed Fee Schedule</u> (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/feedback.html</p>
17:05:00	RAC Questions
17:14:00	Public Questions
17:14:00	Public Comments

17:24:00	The following motion was made by Eric Luke and was not seconded. MOTION: To decrease the cougar spot and stalk tags from \$30 to \$15.
17:35:00	The following motion was made Eric Luke and was seconded by Kirk Player and passed, 7/1. MOTION: To make the non-resident youth combination license, general seasons deer permit, and general season elk fees the same price resident youth fees.
17:47:00	The following motion was made by Dana Truman and was seconded by Kirk Player, and passed unanimously, 8/8. MOTION: To accept the recommendations as presented by the DWR.

Northeast Region RAC Meeting
August 4, 2022
Vernal, Utah
Summary of Motions

1) Approval of Agenda

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Rebekah Jones and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the agenda as presented.

2) Approval of May 2022 Minutes

The following motion was made by Jeff Taniguchi, seconded by Natasha Hadden and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the Northeast Region RAC meeting as transcribed.

5) R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jeff Taniguchi and passed unanimously.

MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the addition of adding outfits and guiders to the special use examples.

6) Proposed Fee Schedule

The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded Rebekah Jones and passed 6-1.

MOTION: To allow Dedicated Hunters to buy out the first 16 hours at \$30.00 hour, to buy out the remaining 16 hours would be \$40.00 hour with a direction to the Division to work with other agencies to provide more Dedicated Hunter projects.

The Following motion was made by Natasha Hadden seconded by Jeff Taniguchi Motion passed 6-1

MOTION: To accept the remaining proposal as presented by the Division.

Daniel Davis was voted in as new Vice Chair

Meeting Adjourned 8:10 pm

Northeastern Region RAC Meeting
August 4, 2022

RAC Members

Attending

Dusty Carpenter
Natasha Hadden
Rebekah Jones
Brett Prevedel-chair
Mike Smith
Jeff Taniguchi
Joe Arnold-remote

Absent

Brad Horrocks
Daniel Davis
Ritchie Anderson

Ute Tribe Present

Robert Johnson

DWR Personnel

Miles Hanberg
Torrey Christophersen
Tonya Selby
Kenny Johnson
Chelsea Duke
Pat Rainbolt

Total public: 6

06:30:00	RAC Chair Brett Prevedel called the meeting to order. He called the roll of RAC members and indicated which UDWR personnel were present. He explained the process that there will be no live presentations or public comments taken during the meeting.
06:31:41	<p>1) Approval of Agenda (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jeff Taniguchi and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we approve the agenda as presented.</p>
06:31:30	<p>2) Approval of Minutes (Action)</p> <p>The following motion was made by Jeff Taniguchi, seconded by Natasha Hadden and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: I move that we approve the November 30 minutes as transcribed.</p>
06:31:45	<p>3) Wildlife Board Meeting (Informational)</p> <p>RAC Chair Brett Prevedel updated the RAC.</p>
06:41:43	<p>4) DWR Update (Informational)</p> <p>Miles Hanberg updated the RAC on all regional activities.</p>
06:54:58	<p>5) Land Use Rule Amendments for 2022 (Action)</p> <p>A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</p>
06:58:50	<p>RAC Questions</p> <p>The RAC members asked about adding guides and outfitters to examples. E-bike rule change.</p>
07:10:02	<p>Public Comments</p> <p>Miles Hanberg summarized public comments received from the online presentation.</p> <p>Public Comments</p> <p>No specific comments</p>
07:00:00	<p>RAC Discussion</p> <p>WMA Grazing rule changes/Regional level</p>
07:11:00	<p>5)R657-28 Lands Use Rule Amendments</p> <p>The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden, seconded by Jeff Taniguchi and passed unanimously.</p> <p>MOTION: To accept the DWR recommendations as presented with the addition of adding outfits and guiders to the special use examples.</p>

<p>07:12:30</p>	<p>6) Proposed Fee Schedule A pre-recorded presentation was provided online on the Division website prior to the meeting: https://wildlife.utah.gov/agendas-materials-minutes.html</p>
<p>07:20:00</p>	<p>RAC Questions Did you hear that turkey swan and elk tags cost about the same?</p>
<p>07:35:00</p>	<p>Public Comments Miles Hanberg summarized public comments received from the online presentation. Public Comments Concerns about the lack of projects and would like to get 3 deer in 3 years. The fees are too high as is. Strongly disagree with DH increases. Concern of being denied on project. Get back to the basics, lower fees. SFW-appreciate no fee increase for veterans and youth, in full support</p>
<p>07:42:15</p>	<p>RAC Discussion RAC members discussed fee proposals.</p>
<p>07:57:35</p>	<p>6)Proposed Fee Schedule The following motion was made by Natasha Hadden and seconded Rebekah Jones and passed 6-1. <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION: To allow Dedicated Hunters to buy out the first 16 hours at \$30.00 hour, to buy out the remaining 16 hours would be \$40.00 hour with a direction to the Division to work with other agencies to provide more Dedicated Hunter projects.</p> The Following motion was made by Natasha Hadden seconded by Jeff Taniguchi Motion passed 6-1 <p style="text-align: center;">MOTION: To accept the remaining proposal as presented by the Division.</p> </p>
<p>08:05:09</p>	<p>Daniel Davis voted in as Vice-Chair.</p>
<p>08:10:42</p>	<p>Meeting Adjourned</p>



State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DEIDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

Department of Natural Resources

JOEL FERRY
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

J. SHIRLEY
Division Director

August 12, 2022

J. Shirley, Director, Division of Wildlife Resources
Kevin Albrecht, Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Randy Dearth, Vice Chairman, Utah Wildlife Board
Utah Wildlife Board Members

RE: 2022 Expo Permit Internal Audit – Rule 657-55

Dear Director Shirley 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 25, 2022.

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 2022 Expo Permit Program

Dated August 12, 2022

Background

The Western Hunting and Conservation Expo was held in Salt Lake City from February 10 – 13, 2022. 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 2022 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 typically had 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.

Prior to the virtual expo in 2021, the first process component was the handling of sensitive information given by applicants on paper forms to apply in the draw. This process has evolved from being collected manually on paper, to exclusively electronic since the virtual Expo in 2021.

Processing and shredding paper applications and the security concerns associated with it have been ameliorated, and will no longer be reported in our review. There were some backup blank hard copy forms available, but no paper applications were used in 2022; 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 2022 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 2022.

Conducting the Draw

The actual drawing was conducted at the Division Office in Salt Lake City on February 15, 2022. We had essential staff from the Division, technical representatives from the Department of Government Operations, DNR, GraySky Technologies, MDF 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.

No applicants drew multiple permits in 2022, and one hunter was deemed ineligible for a Turkey permit because he already had a spring turkey permit from the DWR draw.

No compliance issues were identified by the Division in 2022.

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 2022 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 met in 2022, with nearly 47,000 being reported. There were 17,255 unique applicants in 2022, which was a decrease of about 20% over the virtual Expo of 2021. Not surprisingly the reduction was primarily due to reinstating the in-person validation for applicants.

There were no compliance issues with attendance in 2022.

Applicant data for years 2007-2022 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
2022	17,255	374,935	291,050	83,885	\$1,874,675

Resident versus Nonresident Success

Data was reviewed comparing the number of resident applications to nonresident applications. Success rates are as follows: 78% of the applications were Utah residents who drew 164 permits or 82% of the total. 22% of applications were nonresidents who drew 36 permits or 18% of the total.

As anticipated participation trended more in line with previous in-person events prior to 2021.

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 2022, there were no combination or hunting licenses sold on site. All licenses were sold online.

There were no compliance issues with license sales in 2022.

Application Revenue

For 2022, the Expo accepted applications from January through the end of the Expo, which was held from February 10 – 13, 2022. The draw processed 374,935 applications, generating \$1,874,675 in gross application revenue. There were a few people who were precluded from attending the Expo due to being quarantined for Covid; the Expo processed refunds to those people for 107 applications totaling \$535.00.

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 \$562,402.50 in 2022. This revenue was split 50/50 between SFW and MDF, with each organization receiving \$281,201.25. 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, 2024.

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 2022, all project revenue collected in 2020 must be spent or transferred to the division before August 1, 2022. The 2020 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 2022	Total Project Revenue Available	Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	Projects Billed in FY23	Remaining Funds Verified Bank Balance
MDF	\$414,690.50	\$281,201.25	\$695,891.75	\$370,362.59	\$286,770.00	\$38,759.16
SFW	\$386,409.16	\$281,201.25	\$667,610.41	\$152,250.00	\$128,868.00	\$386,492.41
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$801,099.66</i>	<i>\$562,402.50</i>	<i>\$1,363,502.16</i>	<i>\$522,612.59</i>	<i>\$415,638.00</i>	<i>\$425,251.57</i>

SFW

Carry Over Revenue for Division-Approved Projects	\$386,409.16
New Project Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2021	\$281,201.25
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	(\$152,250.00)
Projects Paid to DWR but not Cleared	<u>(\$128,868.00)</u>
Remaining Funds Adjusted Bank Statement Balance	\$386,492.41

MDF

Carry Over Revenue for Division-Approved Projects	\$414,690.50
New Project Revenue for Division-Approved Projects 2021	\$281,201.25
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	(\$370,362.59)
Projects Paid to DWR but not Cleared	<u>(\$286,770.00)</u>
Remaining Funds Adjusted Bank Statement Balance	\$38,759.16

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 \$1,312,272.5 in 2022. Of these funds, \$473,019.78 were spent by SFW on expenses 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 \$839,252.72 of these funds were split 50/50 between MDF and SFW, with each organization receiving \$419,626.36. Bank records and project expenditures were reviewed. SFW has expended all 2020 – 2021 revenue, and has \$350,122.58 remaining of 2022 revenue for Utah conservation initiatives. MDF has expended all 2020 revenue and has \$823,606.91 remaining of 2021-2022 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 2022	Total Project Revenue Available	Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	Remaining Funds Verified Bank Balance
MDF	\$1,053,980.55	\$419,626.36	\$1,473,606.91	\$650,000.00	\$823,606.91
SFW	\$741,687.50	\$419,626.36	\$1,161,313.86	\$811,191.28	\$350,122.58
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$1,795,668.05</i>	<i>\$839,252.72</i>	<i>\$2,634,920.77</i>	<i>\$1,461,191.28</i>	<i>\$1,173,729.49</i>

SFW

Carry Over Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	\$741,687.50
New Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives 2021	\$419,626.36
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	<u>(\$811,191.28)</u>

Remaining Funds Verified Bank Statement Balance	\$350,122.58
---	--------------

MDF

Carry Over Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives	\$1,053,980.55
New Revenue for Contractor-Approved Initiatives 2021	\$419,626.36
Project Expenditures During Current Audit Year	<u>(\$650,000.00)</u>

Remaining Funds Verified Bank Statement Balance	\$823,606.91
---	--------------

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 2022. 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 applications reduce slightly in 2022 due in part to reinstating the in-person validation requirement that was waived in 2021 out of an abundance of caution. Attendance trends were up in comparison to other in-person Expos.

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: J. Shirley, 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

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	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	\$	65,588.50
5800 FY22 DeerFawn/Adult Survival and Condition	2022	\$	43,738.92
		\$	<u>318,155.00</u>

All 2021 Funds Expended

2022 Revenue \$ 281,201.25

5800 FY22 DeerFawn/Adult Survival and Condition	2022	\$	714.08
5748 Church Hills Pipeline and Water Enhancement Project	2022	\$	7,500.00
5899 Logan Canyon/Left hand fork Juniper Project - Phase 1	2023	\$	27,000.00
6171 FY23 Deer Fawn/Adult Survival and Condition	2023	\$	30,000.00
6056 Utah Wildlife Migration Initiative	2023	\$	73,750.00
5893 Burnt Beaver Phase V	2023	\$	80,000.00
5939 Stansbury Mountains Big Game Habitat Improvement FY23	2023	\$	23,478.01
		\$	<u>242,442.09</u>

Remaining Balance 2021 \$ 38,759.16

Remaining Balance \$ 38,759.16

Division Approved Projects Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife

2020 Revenue \$ 229,959.00
 2020 interest Revenue \$ 281.11
 Total \$ 230,240.11

5169 Predator Management Funding - Cache/ 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

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	\$	56,983.00

Upland Habitat Enhancement, Vegetation Management and Wildlife

5641 Technicians Salt Creek and Public Shooting Grounds WMA	2022	\$	4,163.15
5793 Purchase Pheasants for Youth Hunt FY22	2023	\$	10,000.00
5859 Book Cliffs Bighorn Sheep Disease Protection	2023	\$	24,000.00
5887 Herbert Institute Wildlife Research Project	2023	\$	50,000.00
5809 Bighorn Sheep Specialist	2023	\$	8,468.00
		\$	<u>212,863.84</u>

Remaining Balance 2021 \$ 105,291.16

2022 Revenue \$ 281,201.25

Remaining Balance 2022 \$ 281,201.25

Remaining Balance \$ 386,492.41

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
5897 Cinnamon Creek Acquisition	2022	\$ <u>111,535.69</u>
		\$ 351,033.82

All 2019 Funds Expended

	2020 Revenue	\$ 347,303.00
5897 Cinnamon Creek Acquisition	2022	\$ 347,303.00

All 2020 Funds Expended

	2021 Revenue	\$ 595,141.86
5897 Cinnamon Creek Acquisition	2022	\$ 191,161.31

Remaining Balance 2021 \$ 403,980.55

2022 Revenue \$ 419,626.36
 Remaining Balance 2022 \$ 419,626.36

	Total Remaining Balance	\$ 823,606.91
--	-------------------------	---------------

Contractor Approved Projects Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife

2020 Revenue \$ 347,303.00
 2020 Interest Revenue \$ 1,076.56
 Remaining Balance 2020 \$ 348,379.56

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
Bookcliffs 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
KSL Outdoors Conservation Education	2022	\$ 23,810.00
SFW Upland Game Program	2022	\$ 90,978.18
Salt Creek WMA Upland habitat enhancement	2022	\$ 2,300.00
SFW Chukars Release	2022	\$ 16,875.00
Teal Lake improvements	2022	\$ <u>12,806.94</u>

\$ 348,379.56

All 2020 Funds Expended

	2021 Revenue	\$ 595,141.86	
Teal Lake improvements	2022	\$ 19,044.24	
Ogden Bay water pumps	2022	\$ 4,191.86	
Wild Horse Bench Fence	2022	\$ 37,620.00	
Predator Management	2022	\$ 65,292.54	
WAFWA Sage Grouse conference	2022	\$ 1,000.00	
Henry Mountain Water improvement	2022	\$ 1,400.00	
Wheelchair in the Wild pheasant hunt	2022	\$ 1,320.00	
Pheasant Facility	2022	\$ 265,424.79	
Fish Lake Marina	2022	\$ 80,000.00	
5908 Farmington Bay Dike-line Restoration	2023	\$ 28,750.00	
6029 Ogden Bay WMA Upland/Wetland enhancement FY23	2023	\$ 1,352.21	
6039 FY23 Northern Utah WMA Carp Control	2023	\$ 3,000.00	
6064 Mitigation for Willard Spur WMA Parking lot expansion project	2023	\$ 17,500.00	
6073 Harold Crane Center Dike Repair	2023	\$ 69,246.22	
		\$ 595,141.86	

All 2021 Funds Expended

	2022 Revenue	\$ 419,626.36	
6073 Harold Crane Center Dike Repair	2023	\$ 12,003.78	
6083 Ogden Bay WMA East dike restoration II	2023	\$ 40,000.00	
6057 Richfield Upland Game and Waterfowl Management Project Phase VIII	2023	\$ 17,500.00	
		\$ 69,503.78	
	Remaining Balance 2022	\$ 350,122.58	

Remaining Balance \$ 350,122.58

Attachment 3



On Tuesday, February 15, 2022 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: 9:54 am

End Time: 10:01 am

PASSCODE: Baby Shark!

PRINT NAME	ATTENDANCE	
Lindy Varney	In-person	DWR
J Shirley	In-person	DWR
Greg Evans	In-person	DWR
Brian Swaner	In-person	DWR

PRINT NAME	ATTENDANCE	
Chris Carling	In-person	SWF
Covy Jones	In-person	DWR
Riley Peck	In-person	DWR
Troy Justensen	In-person	DWR
Ray Crow	In-person	MDF
Mike Canning	In-person	DWR
Robin Cahoon	In-person	DWR
Todd Adams	In-person	DNR
Phil Gray	Virtual	DWR

Attachment 4

Administrative rule R657-55

Wildlife Expo Permits

Scroll to bottom of page to view a menu of all administrative rules

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

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 Subsection (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).



SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DIEDRE M. HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

JOEL FERRY
Executive Director

Division of Wildlife Resources

J. SHIRLEY
Division Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Wildlife Board

FROM: Covy Jones Wildlife Section Chief

DATE: August 9, 2022

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
 - Book Cliffs, North (2 any legal weapon)
 - Book Cliffs (1 archery)
 - Paunsaugunt (1 archery)
- Elk
 - Central Mtns, Nebo (1 any legal weapon, antlerless)
 - Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek/South (1 muzzleloader)
 - Cache, South (1 late season, any legal weapon)
 - Cache South (1 muzzleloader)
 - Panguitch Lake (1 late season, any legal weapon)
 - Southwest Desert, South (1 muzzleloader)
- Pronghorn
 - Book Cliffs, South (1 any legal weapon)
 - Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden (1 any legal weapon)
 - Fillmore, Oak Creek South (1 muzzleloader)
- Bison
 - Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (1 any legal weapon, hunters choice)
- Desert Bighorn
 - Kaiparowits, West (1 any legal weapon)
- Mountain Goat
 - North Slope/South Slope, High Uintas West (1 any legal weapon, hunter's choice)

Replacements for Additional Permits:

- Deer
 - San Juan Elk Ridge (1 any legal weapon)
 - South Slope, Diamond Mtn (2 any legal weapon)



- West Desert, Vernon (1 archery)
- Elk
 - La Sal (1 any legal weapon, antlerless)
 - Beaver, East (1 archery)
 - Cache, Meadowville (1 archery)
 - Fillmore, Pahvant (1 archery)
 - Plateau, Fishlake/Thousand Lakes (1 late season, any legal weapon)
 - Wasatch Mtns (1 mid-season, any legal weapon)
- Pronghorn
 - Beaver (1 any legal weapon)
 - Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek (1 any legal weapon)
 - Nine Mile, Anthro-Myton Bench (1 any legal weapon)
- Bison
 - Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South (1 any legal weapon, hunter's choice)
- Desert Bighorn
 - San Rafael, North (1 any legal weapon)
- Mountain Goat
 - Beaver (1 early season, any legal weapon, hunter's choice)

All other expo permits will remain the same as last year.

CDJ

2023 Expo Permits by Species and Residency

		TOTAL PERMITS		
		Res	NonRes	Total
Grand Total		154	46	200

				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	La Sal		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
Total				3	2	5

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Bison	Book Cliffs, Little Creek/South	BI6530	Hunter's Choice	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	BI6503	Hunter's Choice (early)	0	1	1
Bison	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	BI6536	Cow Only	1	0	1
Bison	Henry Mtns	BI6505	Cow Only (early)	1	0	1
TOTAL				3	1	4

				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
TOTAL				9	3	12

Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	PERMITS		
				Res	NonRes	Total
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, North	DB1017	Any Weapon	4	1	5
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs, South	DB1018	Any Weapon	2	1	3
Buck Deer	Book Cliffs	DB1011	Archery	1	1	2
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	0	1
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	1	2
Buck Deer	South Slope, Diamond Mtn	DB1023	Any Weapon	4	1	5
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	2	1	3
Buck Deer	West Desert, Vernon	DB1042	Muzzleloader	1	1	2
Buck Deer	Zion	DB1043	Late-season Muzzleloader	1	0	1
TOTAL				37	10	47

Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	PERMITS		
				Res	NonRes	Total
Buck Pronghorn	Beaver	PB5025	Any Weapon	1	0	1

Buck Pronghorn	Book Cliffs, Bitter Creek	PB5026	Any Weapon	1	0	1
Buck Pronghorn	Cache/Morgan-South Rich/Ogden	PB5032	Any Weapon	2	0	2
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	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	2	0	2
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
TOTAL				22	2	24

Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	PERMITS		
				Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Elk	Beaver, East	EB3024	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Beaver, East	EB3000	Archery	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	Cache, Meadowville	EB3032	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, Meadowville	EB3003	Archery	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3036	Any Weapon (early)	1	0	1
Bull Elk	Cache, South	EB3005	Archery	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	Fillmore, Pahvant	EB3008	Archery	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	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	1	2
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	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)	3	1	4
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
TOTAL				68	23	91

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Bull Moose	Wasatch Mtns/Central Mtns	MB6011		1	1	2
TOTAL				1	1	2

				PERMITS		
Species	Area	Hunt Number	Condition	Res	NonRes	Total
Desert Bighorn Sheep	Kaiparowits, East	DS6601		1	0	1
Desert Bighorn Sheep	San Rafael, North	DS6609		1	0	1
TOTAL				2	0	2

				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	0	1
Mountain Goat	Beaver Early	GO6800	Hunter's Choice	0	1	1
Mountain Goat	La Sal, La Sal Mtns	GO6817	Hunter's Choice	1	0	1
TOTAL				3	1	4

				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
TOTAL				2	0	2

				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
TOTAL				4	3	7