

**Which best describes your position regarding the waterfowl rule and swan hunt recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about these waterfowl recommendations?**

I disagree with making Trumpeters illegal to harvest. We have an increase of 100k trumpeters, and we are not going to manage them?

Trumpeters are not listed as endangered or even a threatened species, other states have tried to implement a season on them and were unsuccessful due to anti-hunting pressure. The Central Flyway portion of Montana has even lifted the restrictions on the taking of Trumpeter swans and we are going backwards?

I also believe you are not comparing apples to apples on bird identification, ducks and geese are highly distinguishable from one another. I have guided and hunted swans for 30 years, if a Trumpeter is silent or not flying with Tundra swans, they can be almost impossible to tell apart on the wing. We have made it unsportsmanlike to land birds and shoot them on the water and this would be the only way to be 100% certain, after viewing it in binoculars to tell them apart.

If we must wait on FWS to come back with isotype testing and by the data I would rather see tag numbers reduced and a closure of the Northern boundary. I would like to see Utah work closely with FWS and push for an increase of study to see what population of Trumpeters we are seeing; do they need to be managed/hunted?

In addition, I think waterfowlers would like to know...

Will citations be issued to those that take Trumpeter swans?

What would the fine be and if it is considered poaching would one lose his license for 3-5 years?

Will enforcement be stepped up on WMAs to discourage wanton waste of those who accidentally shoot one?

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 16, 2023 7:57 pm

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU variance requests?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU variance requests?**

Please Stop trading our better quality public land for the poorer quality private land. Please respect the public land hunter and do what's best for the public. Stop prioritizing private land interests over the public!

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the wild turkey management plan?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the turkey recommendations for 2023?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the upland game recommendations for 2023–25?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the waterfowl rule and swan hunt recommendations?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed revision to the pen-reared gamebird rules?** Somewhat disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the pen-reared gamebird rules?** If you have these rules in place will you take forever to process the paperwork?

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to the animal collection, importation and possession rules?** Somewhat agree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU variance requests?** Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU variance requests?** CWMU Hunter need to stay on the cwmu. Extending boundaries onto a different cwmu or on public land is absurd. If multiple CWMUs want to combine and make a single larger one so be it. Leave everything else alone

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the translocation management plan for desert tortoises?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the Parowan Front WMA habitat management plan?** Neither agree nor disagree

---

Form Name:  
Submission Time:

May 2023 RAC Proposals Feedback  
May 17, 2023 9:26 am

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU variance requests?**

Strongly disagree

---

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU variance requests?**

Do not allow the variance to add non contiguous lands to a CWMU. This variance has the potential to allow CWMU hunters to hunt off the CWMU. It sets a terrible precedence for future CWMUs.

---

**Which best describes your position regarding the waterfowl rule and swan hunt recommendations?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about these waterfowl recommendations?**

I like the direction the Northern and Central rac is going.

**Which best describes your position regarding the CWMU variance requests?**

Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments about the CWMU variance requests?**

I strongly disagree with the North Peak CWMU boundary variances. For the simple fact that the two new pieces are jagged up and down boundary lines and will have unidentifiable boundaries. They are also over a mile away from the CWMU and will cause more confusion to the CWMU boundaries. This will cause potential problems for both the CWMU hunters and the public land hunters.

I would like to know if these new parcels are fully fenced on all four sides? From my experience in this area, I don't think it is.

Also, what will be done about the public access road that will go through both of these private parcels?

The north parcel (973 acres) has a county class B road through it. It's a good maintained dirt highway.

The other parcel south (520 acres) does have a public class B as well access road, with a gate that needs to be open. Will this gate be locked? This road isn't as maintained as the north country road but more like a well maintained two track, the map still shows it as a class B. I do know that this has always been opened for the public land hunters to travel through the private to get to the public ground. If the gate is locked, it will cause a dead end and will not be a loop. Both roads show up on the Box Elder Country Land travel plan map. As well as onx maps.