

Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation? Neither agree nor disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37? Strongly disagree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41? Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about these proposed changes? Utah should follow in the footsteps of Arizona and do away with conservation permits. They should all be put back into the public draw. I've heard Utah has more money than all the surrounding states combined as far as "conservation" money but where are the results?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 10:30 am

Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?

Strongly agree

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?

If cougar permits are removed from the conservation permit program, they need to be replaced by bear. Not deer or elk permits.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 12:34 pm

Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37? Strongly agree

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

I represent nonprofit Chairbound Sportsman and have a general comment in support of the CWMU offerings for nonprofit hunts of big game species. Over the years many of our members with disabilities have had successful hunts and this has been a great benefit for their self confidence and rewarding outdoor experiences. Please keep these ongoing and consider adding cow elk hunts as well. Regards Kenneth Vaughn Board member 801-499-9770

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 12:44 pm

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 2:58 pm

Which best describes your position Somewhat disagree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

I think there were some great things that came out of the CWMU rule committee but because the committee was stacked with individuals who were a voice in favor of the CWMU association instead of a balanced group, the committee recommendations fell short in a few areas. Here are my thoughts.

1. While I do like the majority of the plan to help CWMU's reach their cow harvest. I don't believe in any circumstance that the CWMU's should be given private cow permits even if they are just giving them away. The majority benefit to the public of the CWMU program is that they get 100% of the antlerless tags if a CWMU chooses the 90/10 bucks/bulls split. If a CWMU needs to be given cow permits because they aren't meeting their quota then I suggest they be moved down to a different tag split which will then give the private land owners more control over the cow tags without sacrificing the benefit to the public (the 50% partner in the CWMU program). Whenever tag splits are brought up the CWMU's tout that the public get all the antlerless tags and therefore there is no reason to change the splits. I would hate to see the public's benefit be given away without splits being adjusted accordingly.

2. Along those same lines, I'm saddened to not see anything addressing CWMU's that don't have any antlerless permits to give to the public. There are 56 CWMU's that are receiving buck/bull permits in 2024 that offer no antlerless tags to the public. Only 2 of the 56 have elk permits. The rest are deer only or deer/pronghorn units. These CWMU's don't offer antlerless tags for good reason because they are not elk CWMU's, and our deer management plan tries to steer away from hunting doe deer too much. Nevertheless, these CWMU's are taking advantage of a 90/10 split which maximizes their benefit and minimizes the public benefit simply because of where their units are located. I would recommend that all of the CWMU's that don't have antlerless permits to offer are required to either do an 80/20 split or give 1 additional antlered tag to the public each year, whichever is greater.

3. I would like to see something recommended to the wildlife board to require the DWR to keep the hunt planner updated. I attempted to contact all 125 registered CWMU's this spring in preparation for the application period. There were several instances where the contact information provided on the hunt planner was incorrect (both emails and phone numbers). Also the information about the CWMU's (rules, number of guests, etc) was incorrect in almost every instance. The general public has a lot of issues with the CWMU program, but I truly believe that at least half of that is because of misinformation or a lack of information, and having the hunt planner incorrect or providing bad contact info doesn't help. I would like to see the DWR directed to review/update the hunt planner every time a COR is renewed. If this is supposed to be happening already I can

promise you its not taking place.

I do have some things I'm very much in support of in the new rule changes and wanted to put a few of them below.

1. Super happy to see the guest policy being addressed. I think that has been a long time coming and is a reasonable compromise. Public hunters can either be guided and bring one guest, or they can have up to a car full of people that has to stay with them. Makes much more sense than what has been done in the past and brings a family hunting element to CWMU's that wasn't always there previously.

2. I support the changes with trade lands and contiguous acres and think they will be good things for both the public and private.

3. As mentioned a bit above, while I don't agree with everything being proposed for the antlerless elk harvests I am happy to see some of the other tools being proposed to help with antlerless harvest to help get some of these elk herds under control.

4. I think its great that they're giving the CWMU advisory committee some help by offering better guidance and direction. That committee does great work.

Please take a real look at each of these issues and don't just pass everything through like is usually done with CWMU proposals. These are important issues to everyone. If you don't feel like you understand the program, please educate yourself on both sides so you can make informed decisions.

**Which best describes your position
regarding the proposed changes to
Administrative Rule R657-41?**

Strongly agree

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 5:46 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these I've been a public hunter on a cwmu unit and killed the biggest deer of my
recommended changes? life and had the best hunt to date.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 5:46 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these Been involved in the CW program for 27 years best program in the western
recommended changes? US for the Public Hunter and the private landowner very much in support of
this program. Thank you.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 5:55 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these I am in support of the CWMU program. I appreciate the opportunity to hunt
recommended changes? on better managed private property. Program has my full support

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 6:13 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these I'm a public hunter and haven't drawn. I have been an observer with
recommended changes? someone who has drawn though and had an amazing time.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 9, 2024 9:40 pm

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 10, 2024 2:13 am

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 10, 2024 2:18 am

Which best describes your position Strongly agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 10, 2024 7:10 am

Which best describes your position Somewhat agree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these I agree with the cow elk over population tools i submitted prior but in review
recommended changes? again i do not agree with the use of atv horses etc portion.

Which best describes your position regarding the cougar harvest and management information in Darren's presentation?

Somewhat agree

Do you have any comments about the latest cougar harvest and management information?

I support the continued trapping of Cougars

Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

I am against any kind of trade lands. These trades never favor the public hunter. It is confusing trying to find the trades on the DWR website and they are not shown on Onx. With the many mapping systems available, OnX ,Gohunt ect, there is no need to trade lands for a recognizable boundary. People can accurately navigate the boundaries. A lot of these CWMU operators want trades because the deer and elk move off of the CWMU onto public lands adjacent to the private. By trading lands, we are taking opportunity from the public hunter. I would like to see Zero land trades. If a CWMU can't make it with 100% private land, then they shouldn't get an approval to operate.

Which best describes your position regarding the proposed changes to Administrative Rule R657-41?

Somewhat disagree

Do you have any comments about these proposed changes?

One of the purposes of the conservation tags is to make money for wildlife. Covy said in his presentation that some of the recommended changes are to "Maximize conservation permit revenue". I find this disingenuous with the way things are currently. The UDWR is leaving money on the table. One sure way to Maximize revenue is to eliminate the In-person Validation of applications at the Western Hunting Expo. Currently an applicant must physically travel to Salt Lake City to be allowed to apply for the 200 permits taken from the public drawing. How is that fair to the people that live in Blanding (308 miles) or Vernal (175 miles) or St. George (305 miles) let alone Nonresidents. If we are truly trying to Maximize revenue, then we need to get rid of the In-person Validation and go to online applications. There is even data that supports this. In 2021, because of the pandemic, people were allowed to apply for the 200 tags online. That year there was 21,680 applicants. That's over 2000 more applicants than the next highest year which was 2023 and had 19,565 applicants. In addition, the number of Nonresident applications in 2021 was 161,187. The next highest year was 2023 at 97,853 applications. that's a difference of 63,000 applications which equates to \$315,000 we are not getting just from Nonresidents because of in-person validation. (These numbers come from the 2023 DWR audit. The most recent I could find)

These are public permits, and they should be made available to ALL that want to apply, not just those that have the time and means to travel many hundreds of miles and take a day off from work. I would highly recommend that the RAC and Board make a motion to eliminate In-person Validation for the 200 public permits at the Expo. This would be a sure way to Maximize Revenue on these public permits.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 12, 2024 4:41 am

Which best describes your position regarding the recommended changes to Administrative Rule R657-37?

Strongly disagree

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

I dont understand why we would give cow tags to a CWMU which has chosen to take the 90/10 split. They should all be given to the public. And I'm sure there are several people who could be at the landowner property at a moments notice if you created a list or an email.

I also am utterly dismayed the committee has failed to address the lopsided tag split. The CWMU program is a good program that allows each party to gain something. Unfortunately the general public gained a lot less than the private land owners. The land owners bring to the table the land. Which without the animals has less value. The public brings the animals, which without the land has no value. So we COOPERATE to some resolution.

The landowner gets:

3 months to hunt

90% of the most valued tags. Bucks and Bulls.

They get to use a rifle almost the entire time

The get guaranteed tags.

The public gets:

5 days to hunt

10% of the bucks and bull tags

Can use a rifle

No guaranteed tags

How about we switch for the next 10 years that the public gets 90% and the landowner gets 10% of the bucks and bull tags? The Public gets 3 months to hunt and the Landowner gets 5 days?

If the landowners don't like it... they can withdraw? If the public doesn't like it, can we withdraw?

I think the program has value. Many people have expressed this. But the DWR can do a better job at representing the general public and the value of the animals.

We can do better to create positive experiences for all involved.

Form Name:
Submission Time:

May 2024 RAC Proposals Feedback
May 15, 2024 9:05 pm

Which best describes your position Somewhat disagree
regarding the recommended changes to
Administrative Rule R657-37?

Do you have any comments about these recommended changes?

Glad to see the CWMU rule being addressed but I do have some comments.

Cons:

1. While I do like the majority of the plan to help CWMU's reach their cow harvest. I don't believe in any circumstance that the CWMU's should be given private antlerless elk permits even if they are just giving them away. The majority benefit to the public of the CWMU program is that they get 100% of the antlerless tags if a CWMU chooses the 90/10 bucks/bulls split. If a CWMU needs to be given cow permits because they aren't meeting their quota then I suggest they be moved down to a different tag split which will then give the private land owners more control over the cow tags without sacrificing the public's share of the deal (the 50% partner in the CWMU program). Whenever tag splits are brought up the CWMU's tout that the public get all the antlerless tags and therefore there is no reason to change the splits. I would hate to see the public's benefit be given away without splits being adjusted accordingly.

2. Along those same lines, I'm saddened to not see anything addressing CWMU's that don't have any antlerless permits to give to the public. There are 56 CWMU's that are receiving buck/bull permits in 2024 that offer no antlerless tags to the public. Only a handful of these have elk permits. The rest are deer only or deer/pronghorn units. These CWMU's don't offer antlerless tags for good reason because they don't have elk, and our deer management plan tries to steer away from hunting doe deer too much. Nevertheless, these CWMU's are taking advantage of a 90/10 split which maximizes their benefit and minimizes the public benefit simply because of where their units are located. I would recommend that all of the CWMU's that don't have antlerless permits to offer are required to either do an 80/20 split or give 1 additional antlered tag per year to the public, whichever is greater.

3. I would like to see something recommended to the wildlife board to require the DWR to keep the hunt planner updated. I attempted to contact all 125 registered CWMU's this spring in preparation for the application period. There were several instances where the contact information provided on the hunt planner was incorrect (both emails and phone numbers). Also the information about the CWMU's (rules, number of guests, etc) was incorrect in almost every instance. The general public has a lot of issues with the CWMU program but I truly believe that at least half of that is because of misinformation or a lack of information, and having the hunt planner incorrect or providing bad contact info doesn't help. I would like to see the DWR directed to review/update the hunt planner every time a COR is renewed. If they are already supposed to be doing that I can tell you it isn't happening.

4. I think the public should be given 5 minutes to comment on this item since there is so much being crammed into one presentation.

Pros:

1. Super happy to see the guest policy being addressed. I think that has been a long time coming and is a reasonable compromise. Public hunters can either be guided and bring one guest, or they can have up to a car full of people that has to stay with them. Makes much more sense than what has been done in the past.

2. I support the changes with trade lands and contiguous acres and think they will be good things for both the public and private.

3. As mentioned a bit above, while I don't agree with everything being proposed for the antlerless elk harvests I am happy to see some of the other tools being proposed to help with antlerless harvest to help get some of these elk herds under control.

4. Glad to see the CWMU advisory committee helped out by giving them a little more direction. They do a great work.

Please take a real look at each of these issues and don't just pass everything through like is usually done with CWMU proposals. These are important issues to everyone. If you don't feel like you understand the program, please educate yourself on both sides so you can make informed decisions.

**Which best describes your position
regarding the proposed changes to
Administrative Rule R657-41?**

Strongly agree