

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
December 15, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

MOTION: To accept the agenda and minutes as written
Passed unanimously

Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33

MOTION: To approve the split summer pursuit season as recommended by houndsmen (including the houndsmen's recommended pursuit permit numbers) and remove the eight dog restriction during the harvest statewide and accept the number of (harvest) permits as proposed by the Division
Failed 6 to 4

MOTION: To split the San Juan Pursuit Unit at the causeway into the Elk Ridge Unit (20 permits) and the Blue Mountain Unit (10 permits) to reduce the number of people on the Blue Mountain Unit; approve a split summer pursuit season on Book Cliffs, San Elk Ridge, Blue Mountains, and the La Sal units as proposed by the Utah Federation of Houndsmen but maintain the Divisions recommended number of pursuit permits; limit the number of dogs to eight only on four units (Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, Blue Mountains and La Sal) during summer training season only and maintain an unlimited number of dogs for the rest of state; accept the remainder of the Division's recommendations as presented
Passed unanimously

MOTON: To extend the spring hunt to June 6th on all units statewide
Failed 8 to 2

Statewide Beaver Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the management plan as presented
Passed unanimously

Central Region Advisory Council
Central Region Conference Center
1115 N. Main St, Springville
December 15, 2009 @ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

John Bair, Sportsmen
Matt Clark, Sportsmen
Larry Fitzgerald, Agriculture
Richard Hansen, At Large
George Holmes, Agriculture
Gary Nielson, Sportsmen, Vice Chair
Fred Oswald, Non-consumptive, Chair
Jay Price, Elected
Duane Smith, Non-consumptive
Allan Stevens, At Large
Larry Velarde, Forest Service

Members Absent

Micki Bailey, BLM, excused
Byron Gunderson, At Large, excused

Others Present

Rick Woodard, Wildlife Board Chair

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

VOTING

Motion was made by John Bair to accept the agenda and minutes as written

Seconded by Larry Velarde

Motion passed unanimously

2) **Regional Update (Information)**

- **John Fairchild, Central Regional Supervisor**

Wildlife

- Regional personnel participated in the Parker Mountain antelope capture project that resulted in about 170 animals being transported to the West Desert (Snake Valley and Puddle Valley Units)
- Post season deer classification work still going on; pretty important data for setting season length

Habitat

- Six elk have been hit by vehicles in the last week north of Ephraim. 150-200 (bulls, cows and calves) are crossing at night to fields west of the highway and returning in the early morning hours to feed and bed down on the east side. We're working with UDOT to get speeds reduced and will be hazing the elk at night to keep them on the east side of the highway.

3) **Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 (Action)**

- **Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

Richard Hansen – Can people be hunting and just pursuing in the same area at the same time?

Justin Dolling – Yes.

John Bair – In the fall there are some units you cannot pursue on unless you have a kill tag.

Matt Clark – You showed there were 50 bears killed by the Division this year. Is there any way to allow hunters to take these animals?

Justin Dolling – Just to clarify, Wildlife Services is the agency that removed those bears for livestock depredation reasons. The Division took three bears and we have been trying to have hunters harvest those animals.

John Fairchild – Livestock owners can also take animals to protect livestock. Not all those animals are taken by Wildlife Services. Some were taken by livestock owners.

Matt Clark – Is that a federal agency?

John Fairchild – Wildlife Services is a federal agency that is operated out of the State Department of Agriculture and Food. They are both state and federally funded.

John Bair - Have you hunted bears with dogs? I have average dogs and there is no way that eight of my dogs could catch a bear. When I hunt bears I hunt with three or four other guys and a couple of them have good bear dogs. Mine are mostly sound support at the tree. I really don't think this is enforceable. If someone turns loose his dogs and some lost dogs show up at the same tree how do you enforce that?

Justin Dolling – There is some grey area but I think our officers can sort out the evidence they find. If two packs join on the mountain our officers can determine if they are parked in the same drainage. I don't have a good answer but we do feel like it can be enforced and is necessary.

John Bair – I appreciate the loop hole you just gave me.

Questions from the Public

Chad Coburn – Were complaints about conflicts primarily in the summer?

Justin Dolling – Most were summer and late season spring complaints and were primarily on the La Sals and San Juan.

Chad Coburn – Do you have the Animal Damage Control kills itemized? I would like to see what units the 50 bears came from.

Justin Dolling – I have that and can get that information to you.

Chad Coburn – You can't compare hunting lions in Colorado and bears in Utah [*this was in reference to a statement Justin made regarding the 8 dog limit imposed by Colorado for their cougar hunt*]. It is totally different and should not be compared.

Justin Dolling – I have talked to houndsmen and have received differing opinions.

Chad Coburn – You cannot catch a bear with one or two dogs. You are barking up the wrong tree if you think you can.

Eric Mecham – Could the eight dog restriction be put in place only on the problem units?

Justin Dolling – Anything can be done. Our regional managers would like to see a statewide regulation for consistency. Also, chasing a bear with 12 plus hounds doesn't look good. Larger pack sizes also increases the likelihood that they will chase non target animals.

Eric Mecham – But you have not had reports anywhere else?

Justin Dolling – We did not have reports last year but we have in the past.

Eric Mecham – It would not be any more confusing to limit the number of dogs on the units you are recommending a draw for permits on.

Comments from the Public

Jason Binder – President of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen and I also represent Northern Utah Big Game Hound Association and the Uinta Basin Big Game Hound Association. There are 671 members in the three groups put together. We got together and looked at the recommendations. We understand the problems that have occurred on the San Juan unit. We have put together some things we would like to see (see handout). We would like to see the summer training season split in half to give more residents the opportunity to train dogs. The dates would be July 10th to 24th and a second season July 25th to August 8th. There would be 25 permits in each season for residents. There was a survey on the internet but a lot of houndsmen don't have the internet. There were 340 resident pursuit permits and 84 non-resident pursuit permits sold last year. We would also like to see the San Juan unit split between the Monticello side and the Elk Ridge side to increase opportunity.

We also recommend only limiting the number of dogs to eight during the summer training season and only on the Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, La Sal, and Blues units. That is when you have the conflicts with campers. This would still allow hunters the opportunity to harvest a quality bear. You don't catch these big 400 pound boars with only a few dogs. If you draw a bear tag you want to take a mature bear.

Our final recommendation is to leave the permit numbers the same as last year. For the last two years we have had a major increase in bear tags. The Division has started a study to determine bear density in the state. We need to find out how many bears are in a unit before we keep increasing tags. I think the reason people are seeing more bears is because there are more people in the mountains. We would like to see the numbers from this study before we increase permits.

Ben Lowder – Utah Bowman's Association – We recommend extending the spring hunt on all units to June 6th to increase opportunity for hunters. Access to Forest Service land is a big issue in early spring. A longer season would alleviate those issues. On the units that already have the extended season we have seen an increase in hunter success and less depredation bears taken by Wildlife Services. We support the houndsmen associations regarding the limit of dogs. We don't see any reason to limit the number of dogs during the harvest season. Limiting the number of dogs allowed reduces the hunter's opportunity to harvest a mature bear. The final issue I would like to talk about is Forest Service access. I know hunters who have had spring permits and cannot get access. One hunter I know turned his tag in because the road was not open and after contacting the Forest Service he could not get access. This was up Hobble Creek and they were waiting for roads to be clear the whole entire loop. We would like to see increased cooperation between Forest Service and the Division.

Chet Young – Utah Federation of Houndsmen & Northern Utah Big Game & Uinta Big Game Associations – Bear hunters traded the fall pursuit for the summer training season a few years back. That was to reduce the conflicts with hunters with limited entry elk and deer tags. Now we are losing that also. We understand it takes 10 to 15 years to draw an elk tag. It also takes us 8 to 15 years to draw a good bear tag. We want to have the same opportunity as the elk hunters to harvest a quality animal. Limiting bear hunters on these units to a draw makes it very tough to train dogs. That is why we are asking to split the season. This will create more opportunity without adding any more dogs to the mountain. Limiting the number of dogs on the kill season to eight will make it very hard or impossible to harvest a quality bear. Large bears don't get big by being easily intimidated. This recommendation will cause more younger and female bears to be harvested. Those are the bears that houndsmen will catch because they don't have the dog power to stop a big bear.

Randy Long – I am a member of several environmental groups but I am speaking for myself. I am against the bear hunt. All wild animals can be dangerous but that doesn't mean we should kill

them. Bear hunting should stop. When we camp we need to keep food put away and that will protect us from all wildlife.

Hal Black – I have looked at the numbers of permits on various units and nine of 22 units have increased numbers of tags on the fall hunt. If that is a trend that means you will put females more at risk. So 40 percent of units will have higher fall permit numbers than in the spring. John (Bair), you should retire your average dogs or quit chasing bears. There are people who can catch bears with eight dogs.

One way to reduce the number of bears killed by Wildlife Services is to hire older people to work for them because the young guys make their mark and look good by how much they kill not how much they keep from killing. The agriculture people don't want to hear this but we have one guy who gets brownie points by being really aggressive. This year Wildlife Services killed about 25 percent of the bears taken in the state. It seems like there could be more of an effort made to allow hunters to take some of these bears. My recommendation is to fire the younger Wildlife Services people and get old guys that are crippled and we will reduce the kills.

I have always supported hounds chasing bears. It is not a new thing for bears to be chased by dogs, we just used to call them wolves. I don't know what the right number of dogs chasing bears would be but there could be too many as well as too few.

Chad Coburn – Utah Federation of Houndsmen – It was a big thing to get three clubs together. This is important to us. We have increased permits three or four years in a row. We don't have final numbers from the study that is going on to see what our bear densities are. We want to cut the San Juan unit in half. It is a large unit. We want to split the season and give the same number of permits for the first and second season. There would be 25 people on the mountain in each season. We are looking for opportunity. As far as dog restrictions, I have nine points for bear and I want a nice bear when I draw my tag. I don't own eight dogs that can get that bear. I want to be able to go with my family and train my dogs. There are conflicts in what ever we do. We are willing to work with the Division in the summer training season on the problem units. There is no problem in the spring and the fall. Let's not take the opportunity to get a trophy bear away.

RAC Discussion

Fred Oswald – I would like to give Justin a chance to respond to the recommendations.

Justin Dolling – Our bear management plan is a well written plan that was developed with a diverse group of users and the plan suggests there is room for more permits. Based on that plan we feel firm that there is room for growth and we would like to see the increase we recommended. For pack size restrictions other RACs have opted to recommend limiting the number of dogs to eight on the units that we have had conflicts on. I would urge you to keep some consistency. If you do want to split the training season to an early and a late I would recommend reducing permit numbers because I feel hunters would stay longer with a shorter season because they know they will only be able to make one trip.

Fred Oswald – Could you comment on Hal's comment with regard to the increase in fall permits.

Justin Dolling – I think you are seeing a couple different things there. On the south Manti unit we saw an increase in female take. It was above 40 percent. The region was concerned so they opted to move those spring tags to the fall where for whatever reason on that particular unit they are seeing fewer females in the fall harvest. The table may be confusing because the conservation, convention and sportsman permits all come out of the spring category and because we had an increase in convention permits from 15 to 19 the additional permits are those are coming out of the spring. Another thing is that in the past we have not been itemizing convention permits and those also come out of the spring.

Fred Oswald – RAC comments and motions

John Bair – Didn't the southern region RAC vote to bag the dog limit and extend the spring harvest?

Justin Dolling – They went with our eight dog limit for pursuit and no restriction for harvest and they recommended to extend the spring hunt a week.

John Bair – I think extending the spring hunt would be good.

Justin Dolling – It provides some opportunity but the longer into spring we extend that season the greater the likelihood of harvesting females. I would hate to see us lose that spring opportunity by increasing the female harvest. For chronic depredation areas we have extended the spring hunt and our percent of females harvested has gone up.

Larry Fitzgerald – What is the recommendation for a split season?

Justin Dolling – Houndsmen are recommending an early and late season for summer training.

Larry Fitzgerald – Wouldn't that create two opening days like we had on the deer hunt this year?

Justin Dolling – It is a pursuit only season. There is no harvest.

Gary Nielson – I know turkey hunters in the spring created problems for bear hunters. I also agree that you can't catch a bear with less than ten dogs.

Fred Oswald – I know you have objectives in the plan such as the number of females in the harvest and the average age in the harvest? I am having a hard time understanding where you are getting the conclusions that would lead you to believe that it is okay to continue to increase permit numbers. You are not getting that data from those two figures are you?

Justin Dolling – We look at percent of females in the harvest, the average age of the harvest and adult survival. Those three targets have been fairly static over the last three years with the increases we have had.

Fred Oswald – Your graph showed that the number of bears being harvested is increasing so the assumption is that we must be growing more bears every year. It doesn't make sense to me that we can continue to increase every year.

Kevin Bunnell – Last year there was a nine percent increase. A fifteen percent increase will equate to twelve to fifteen bears being taken statewide. It is not a significant number.

Fred Oswald – So I guess you are saying we are growing that many more bears every year or our objectives would start falling.

Justin Dolling – That is a possible conclusion. I fall back to the plan that shows we can harvest more.

Richard Hansen – Is there any way we can we work with Forest Service on access problems?

Larry Velarde (Forest Service rep.) – Hobble Creek is not in my district but we have the same issues. We keep the gates closed to protect the area from impact and especially from ATV use in the fall and spring. What I try to do on my district is put gates in strategic locations so we are following the snow line.

John Fairchild – I did talk with the Forest Service and they were looking for the dates of hunts and ways to accommodate hunters as well as protect the resource.

Richard Hansen – I don't see why you can't allow ATVs on a paved road that is covered in snow. Another comment I have is that I never saw a bear as a kid and now you can see them every year. It is another predator that affects deer herds. Someone told me about a bear he saw kill a fawn in August. Do you want more bears or more deer?

Duane Smith – Justin, what if we approve the split season and stay with the number of proposed tags and take the eight dog restriction off of the harvest season?

Justin Dolling – We could probably accept that. I would encourage you to look at the permit numbers and the fact that you are going to be dealing with shorter pursuit seasons on those problem areas. I could support that but if you split the season I would like to see a reduction in permits for summer pursuit.

VOTING

Motion was made by Duane Smith to approve the split summer pursuit season as recommended by houndsmen and remove the eight dog restriction during the harvest statewide and accept the number of permits as proposed by the Division.

Seconded by Allan Stevens

John Bair – So your motion is to remove the eight dog limit during harvest statewide and leave the eight dog restriction during the summer pursuit season statewide or only on four problem units.

Duane Smith – I am saying statewide on the summer pursuit eight dog restriction but I would accept an amendment.

Motion amended by John Bair that the eight dog restriction during the summer training season only applies to the Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, the Blues and the La Sals. The rest of the state would have no dog restriction.

Motion amendment accepted by Duane Smith

Kevin Bunnell – To clarify, you are recommending to remove the eight dog restriction on harvest and pursuit in the spring?

Duane Smith – I don't want to remove the eight dog restriction during pursuit but only during harvest.

Kevin Bunnell – If there is pursuit and harvest going on at the same time you can't limit one and not the other.

John Bair – The amendment is that the only eight dog limit that would apply is during the summer training season on the Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, the Blues and the La Sals.

Fred Oswald – Justin, your point of view was if we go with the split season then you wanted a reduction in summer permits?

Justin Dolling – For summer pursuit, correct.

Fred Oswald – That is not in the motion.

Larry Fitzgerald – Could you explain your logic in wanting to reduce the number of pursuit permits if they cannot kill anything?

Justin Dolling – If you look at our proposal we are recommending for example 33 permits on San Juan for the summer season and the houndsmen are recommending 33 in an early season and 33 in a late season, so 66 permits. My theory is that with a short season people have tendency to pursue more time which won't reduce the number by half.

Alan Stevens – That isn't what I thought Duane's motion said. I thought he said to keep the number of permits the same so that would be 33 permits between two seasons.

Duane Smith – I was talking about the number of bear harvest permits.

Second withdrawn by Alan Stevens

MOTION RESTATED

Motion was made by Duane Smith to approve the split summer pursuit season as recommended by houndsmen (including the huntsmen's recommended pursuit permit numbers) and remove the eight dog restriction during the harvest statewide and accept the number of permits as proposed by the Division.

Seconded by John Bair

Houndsmen? – If a bear goes through a campground and hounds chase it out is that not a benefit to you and the public campers?

Larry Velarde – If we have an incident in a campground the campground would be shut down and the Division would set up a trap. If there is just a sighting there is not much we do besides tell people that there was a sighting.

In Favor: John Bair, Duane Smith, Matt Clark, Larry Velarde
Opposed: Alan Stevens, Jay Price, Larry Fitzgerald, George Holmes, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson

Motion failed 6 to 4

Motion was made by John Bair to split the San Juan Pursuit Unit at the causeway into the Elk Ridge Unit (20 permits) and the Blue Mountain Unit (10 permits) to reduce the number of people on the Blue Mountain Unit; approve a split summer pursuit season on Book Cliffs, San Elk Ridge, Blue Mountains, and the La Sal units as proposed by the Utah Federation of Houndsmen but maintain the Divisions recommended number of pursuit permits; limit the number of dogs to eight only on four units (Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, Blue Mountains and La Sal) during summer training season only and maintain an unlimited number of dogs for the rest of state; accept the remainder of the Division’s recommendations as presented

Seconded by Jay Price

Gary Nielson – What reduction did the Division want if the season was split?

Justin Dolling – We didn’t want to double the number of permits. The reduction would be up to you.

In Favor: Allan Stevens, Larry Fitzgerald, Jay Price, George Holmes, Richard Hansen, Gary Nielson, John Bair, Duane Smith, Matt Clark, Larry Velarde

Motion passed unanimously

Fred Oswald – Do we want a motion about Forest Service access?

Gary Nielson – Can you pass that along to the board that we felt the access to Forest Service land was a problem?

Fred Oswald – I can do that.

Motion was made by John Bair to extend the spring hunt to June 6th on all units statewide

Seconded by Larry Fitzgerald

Jay Price – Doesn’t the Division have data that shows that would increase the female harvest?

Justin Dolling – Yes.

Duane Smith – That would also create conflicts on Memorial Day.

In Favor: Larry Fitzgerald, John Bair

Opposed: Alan Stevens, Jay Price, George Holmes, Richard Hansen, Gray Nielson, Duane Smith, Matt Clark, Larry Velarde

Motion failed 8 to 2

4) Statewide Beaver Management Plan (Action)

- **Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator**

Questions from the RAC

John Bair – How far will a beaver travel?

Justin Dolling – They disperse when they are about two and a half and they can travel pretty far. They live in colonies so once they have an established colony their range is anywhere from 43 to 56 acres.

John Bair – Do they pretty much travel tributaries and water ways?

Justin Dolling – Primarily.

Richard Hansen – How high do they live?

Justin Dolling – They seem to like lower valleys but they can live pretty high as long as they have water that doesn't freeze.

John Bair – Are they long lived?

Justin Dolling – I don't know. I think they can be depending on the level of trapping. They were almost trapped out of the state. In 1899 beaver trapping was closed to protect them.

George Holmes – When was it reopened?

Justin Dolling – We had our first open season in 1952.

Comments from the Public

Calvin Crandall – I am representing the Utah Cattlemen's Association – Justin gave this presentation at one of our meetings which sparked a lively debate. In the business meeting after the presentation there was a lot of discussion on this matter. There were some members in favor of the plan. One guy talked about an area in Deseret where there was little vegetation along a stream and then a beaver moved in and now there is a five to ten acre meadow that has much more feed. He was in favor of the beavers. There were some people in the southern end of the state that said there is no such thing as a good beaver. We did not adopt a policy that said we support this management plan. The concern that I have is who determines what a nuisance beaver is? Is it in the plan? Who do I call with a nuisance beaver? Are explosives an option and do we have access to that? Since September 11th dynamite is hard to come by. Before that we bought it for our place in Wyoming with no problem. Do the transplants have to come before the board and will locals be told about it?

Justin Dolling – The plan does not identify when a beaver is a nuisance. It is pretty obvious when they are causing property damage. You have to get a hold of us and we can issue removal permits.

Calvin Crandall - Is that part of the plan?

Justin Dolling – It will be developed as part of the plan.

Calvin Crandall – That was a big concern. What are the details? Who will remove the beaver and how long will it take?

Bob Brister – Utah Environmental Congress – We think it is important that a beaver management plan is developed and adopted and we generally support the plan. We think the beavers are important to conservation and wildlife habitat restoration. We would like to see an emphasis on using beavers as a watershed ecosystem management restoration tool.

Fred Oswald – Kirk Robinson was unable to be with us. He and his organization, Western Wildlife Conservancy, are also in support of the beaver plan.

Randy Long - All wildlife can become nuisance but we must accept that. I have seen several areas with beaver ponds all over the state. They are cute animals and we must have a management plan.

RAC Discussion

John Bair – If we put specific guidelines in the plan about what a nuisance is are you worried that might tie your hands at times?

Calvin Crandall – That is the question.

Fred Oswald – I think the management plan makes the Division proactive in managing beavers. I am a little confused as to why the management plan wouldn't be beneficial to people like you and me who have beaver problems.

Calvin Crandall – I can see the benefit of it but I can also see the individuals who don't like it. It came down to how do you determine nuisance? If you define that is that going to tie my hands if it does not fall in that?

Fred Oswald – I think the management plan will actually help people who don't like beaver and don't want them around.

VOTING

Motion was made by George Holmes to accept the management plan as presented

Seconded by Gary Nielson

In Favor: All

Motion passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

35 in attendance

Next board meeting January 7, 2010

Next RAC meeting February 16, 2010 at Central Region Conference Center

Northern Regional Advisory Council

Dec 16, 2009

6:00 P.M.

Place: Brigham City Community Center

RAC Present

Robert Bynes –At Large
Paul Cowley-Forest Service
James Gaskill- At Large
Russ Lawrence- At Large
Jon Leonard-Sportsman
Ann Neville- Noncon.
Bret Selman- Agric
Craig Van Tassell- Sportsman
John Wall- At Large

DWR Present

Jodie Anderson
Ron Hodson
Justin Dolling
Randy Wood

Wildlife Board

Bill Fenimore
Ernie Perkins

RAC Excused Absence

John Cavitt- Noncon.
Joel Ferry- Agric
Shawn Groll- At Large
Brad Slater- Elected

RAC Absent

Michael Gates- BLM

Meeting Begins: 6:00 p.m.

Number of Pages: 13

Introduction: Robert Byrnes- Co-Chair

Agenda:

Review of Nov 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Review of Agenda

Wildlife Board Meeting Update

Regional Update

Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33

Statewide Beaver Management Plan

Bonneville Cutthroat Trout Introductions- **Removed from Agenda.**

Item 1. Review and Acceptance of Nov 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes

Byrnes-Make note that Bret Selman was present and Shawn Groll was an excused absence.

Motion: Gaskill- Accept the minutes as amended.

Second: Neville

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda

Motion: Leonard- Accept the agenda as proposed.

Second: Cowley

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Cowley- Are we going to have all these agenda items? I do not see Craig here and yet he is on the agenda. Are we going to postpone that to the next meeting?

Hodson- Let me find out. I don't believe that is going to be here tonight.

Item 3. Wildlife Board Update

Gaskill- The code is pretty specific that when the Wildlife Board makes a decision, contrary to recommendation of the RAC, they will explain in writing why they did not accept the recommendations from the RAC. My understanding is that they consider the minutes of the meetings to be those justifications. I do not think they are representative, they are not directed at the RAC. I think we are left out in the cold after we make a decision. Our RAC voted unanimously not to shorten the season based on DWR recommendations and other considerations that we discussed on the RAC. I would like to know why the Wildlife Board chose not to accept that. By law, they are required to explain in writing.

Byrnes- I will be representing the RAC at the Wildlife Board meeting and I will pose your question why we are not receiving that input back.

Cowley- It may be better off just to make a request to receive the explanation back for the direction in the code.

Item 4. Regional Update

Ron Hodson, Regional Supervisor

Half of the region has been out to Farmington Bay putting in a trail system.

I just spoke to Craig Schaugaard and we asked three weeks ago to have the Bonneville Cutthroat Trout Introductions to be removed off of the agenda.

Item 5. Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33

Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

RAC Questions

Gaskill- How do you calculate adult survival?

Dolling- I do not know the formula to calculate that but it is essentially a life table you look at. We have each pre-molar aged on a harvested bear and we look at the distribution of ages from one through the maximum age. There is an equation you can put that in to that calculates survival.

Gaskill- I was intrigued last year by an attempt to survey bear populations by capturing hair. What has happened with that?

Dolling- We expanded that DNA study to four units this last summer and our plan is to continue to collect that information. Next year, we will be sampling 3 units. The 3rd year we will bring all five units back online and we will be able to establish a trend on that 3rd year.

Gaskill- Is it working pretty well?

Dolling- It seems to be working very well. We don't have the results from this year. We collected over 400 samples on those four sites and are in the lab for genetic analysis.

Neville- Will we get an update when that comes in?

Dolling- Yes, we will.

Gaskill- It seems like incidence is increasing but when I looked at that chart it kind of looked like the data indicates a 3 year cycle. Have you looked at that? Do you think there is something else going on here?

Dolling- It could be cyclical because there are cohorts of age classes that move through the population. Those bears that tend to get into trouble are the yearlings. If we had a good production year, you would anticipate that there would be a lot of yearlings on the landscape two years after that production. On the other hand, there was good precipitation and there should have been great foliage on the land for bears. Why incidence are spiked is a mystery.

Gaskill- I don't quite understand the rationale for not requiring pursuit permit. Can you explain that a little bit to us?

Dolling- We have been told by our legal council that we cannot disproportionately discriminate between residents and non-residents when it comes to commercial activities. Because pursuit can be viewed as a commercial activity, we can discriminate equally, but we cannot restrict the number of folks that participate for commercial reasons. One way to solve that is to carve off

the commercial aspect of pursuit and require that if they are being compensated for more than \$100 dollars, it is probably commercial and they need to be a licensed guide and do all the requirements necessary to become a licensed guide and have a client present with them. Then we would not require a pursuit permit.

Gaskill- Is this going to have any kind of impact on income or anticipate raising fees?

Dolling- That guide licensing program is administered through a different department. I do not anticipate that it will be a big revenue reduction as a result of this. There are probably very few folks who will become licensed guides for this purpose.

Neville- Do you have an opportunity to work with other departments and potentially the forest service to compare camping and number of people in the backcountry compared to the incidences? Are there more people camping and seeing bears now than there were 5 years ago?

Dolling- We could look at that. I do not know if the land management agencies track that or not.

Cowley- In our fee areas, that would be pretty easy to track. It just kind of depends on where they are at and where the occurrences are.

Cowley- Increase between 2009 and 2010 proposal. Some of those numbers are not adding up correctly.

Dolling- You have to look at the note on the bottom of that table. We pull out the conservation permits, convention permits and statewide permits.

Cowley- So, if you added those in you would get that number?

Dolling- Exactly.

Cowley- That helps.

Dolling- Probably the best thing to do is refer back to that table that was provided in your RAC packet.

Cowley- Even though the folks, for commercial purposes, do not have to get a pursuit permit, that does not exclude them from meeting the public land managers requirements. Is that correct? They are doing it for commercial purposes; they still have to meet the requirements on public lands by the land management agencies.

Dolling- As far as applying for and obtaining a special use permit?

Cowley- Right.

Dolling- Yes, that is part of the whole application package for guides and outfitters.

Byrnes- Do we allow any other groups to utilize protected wildlife without buying a permit or a COR or something like that?

Dolling- I cannot think of any example off the top of my head.

Gaskill- Certainly we can go watch them.

Byrnes- What department is setting the regulations for outfitters and guides?

Dolling- The department of occupational licensing.

Byrnes- DOPL?

Dolling- Yes.

Neville- With your complaints, did you categorize them as far as location. It seems it is a sweeping thing across all of the units. Were there more concentrated complaints in some areas than others?

Dolling- The chart I presented is a statewide total. We do have that information that we could

go back to our database and see if there are spikes on management units that are occurring.

Neville- I am just wondering if there were enough complaints statewide, if that is why you did the blanket change or if there were more issues in particular areas?

Dolling- I am confused now. Could you restate that question?

Neville- Are there more problems concentrated in certain areas or is it all in areas that people recreate? I represent the nonconsumptive and so I am thinking of the people making the complaints.

Dolling- So, you are talking the areas where there is conflict between houndsman and recreational users?

Neville- Correct.

Dolling- So your question is: were they concentrated within portions of those units?

Neville- Yes.

Dolling- Parts of those units are more accessible so I would assume that they were concentrated. I do not have any information one way or the other.

Neville- Do you know if that was even logged.

Dolling- No.

Neville- O.K. Thanks.

Public Comment

Jason Binder- President, Utah Federation of Houndsman- We have looked through the divisions proposal and are asking to split that San Juan unit and allow 10 houndsman to hunt in the Monticello blues area and 20 houndsman on the Elk Ridge unit. Ask to split the summer training season into 2 15-day seasons. More opportunity for resident hunters. Dog restriction problem mainly during summer training season. Asking that 8 dog restriction only apply to summer training season on those 4 units and spring and fall hunts be allowed to run dogs to catch bear. Hunting season be left to whatever dogs it takes to catch a trophy bear. Remaining season be left alone. Wait for studies to see how many bears are on the units before increasing tags.

Chet Young- Utah Federation of Houndsman- Limiting our hunt. Would appreciate looking over our proposal and giving it thought. Limiting dog numbers will make it hard to harvest a large, quality bear. Concerned on increase in bear tags for the 3rd year now.

Byron Bateman- Sportsman for Fish and Wildlife- Support increase in harvest permits statewide. Strongly oppose 8 dog pack limit statewide. Would approve 8 dog limit on 3 restricted draw units.

Kenneth Duncan- Impossible to enforce dog limit. Support proposal presented by the Utah Federation of Houndsman. Against increasing number of tags at this present time until we get more data in.

Eric Mecham- Supports Houndsman and putting dog restrictions on the 4 units only. Rest of state for pursuit and harvest be left alone.

RAC Questions

Gaskill- Could you explain the 8 dogs per pack more specifically because they did raise some interesting issues that I had not thought about as far as packs combining. How are you going to define a pack and deal with those kinds of issues?

Dolling- Our law enforcement in the Southeastern region were involved in the discussions when we talked about pack size. The feeling was that would apply during the pursuit so if you had 20 hounds in camp, that would be ok. But during the pursuit, you would only be allowed to release 8 when pursuing a bear.

Gaskill- What if there is another camp next to you and you are essentially hunting independently or maybe claiming to hunt independently and not. How would you distinguish that and how would you deal with that?

Dolling- Our officers do a good job at sorting out the facts and the evidence when they go to issue a citation or determine whether or not a citation needs to be issued. I think there are a lot of scenarios. They will have to use discretion.

Neville- If the recreationist complaints against the houndsman were concentrated, in an effort to try and be fair, where you did have those complaints as opposed to totally across the state. Is that too hard to enforce? Could you do it by region? I want to be fair to the recreationists but also be fair to the houndsman.

Dolling- It all falls back to how we manage wildlife in the state. We do it at the unit level. It is really difficult to make changes at a level less than a subunit and have much of an influence.

Gaskill- There was a question about depredation tags and as I recall, there didn't seem to be an increase in the number of depredation tags over the last few years or depredation kills. Am I missing something?

Dolling- It has been fairly constant. That is not necessarily depredation tags; it is a wildlife service removal for the purpose of livestock protection.

Gaskill- That is an unlimited thing. Is it solely based on livestock complaints? If there are no complaints, then Wildlife Services is not out chasing bears. Is that right?

Dolling- That is the way our memorandum of understanding is written. There has to be a confirmed loss and then a wildlife service agent will come in and remove that offending bear. They tell us they do the best they can to remove the offending bear.

Gaskill- In the last few years, you have been reducing that ratio of depredation kills to hunter sport kills, correct?

Dolling- We have been able to shift some of that with our extensions but I would caution that when we have extended those spring hunts by 7 days, we have also increased the percent female in the harvest. In some cases, it is over the 40%. We feel that is justified if we are dealing with a chronic livestock problem because it is going to be a dead bear whether it is removed by a hunter or wildlife services. We have to be cautious because if we get above 40%, that is when we see indications that the bear population is decreasing.

Cowley- Can you respond to the houndsman's request to have a split unit down there and how the division would respond to that.

Dolling- I think how you design it is more social so I don't know that I would be opposed to splitting and creating an early and a late pursuit season. What I would recommend is that if that does happen, the permit numbers that they recommend be reduced because I am concerned

that if we recommend 30 individuals for a 30 day season and you put 30 individuals into an early season and 30 into a late, the potential for the number of use days increases under that scenario.

Cowley- Because someone is likely to hunt for just the full 15 vs. the full 30.

Dolling- Correct. I would urge you to look at the permit numbers and possibly reduce that so we can solve the problem that we heard about last summer.

Cowley- Houndsman, could you respond to that. Would you be willing to entertain that direction? Does that make sense to you?

Chet Young- Yes, it makes a little bit of sense to us. If the division offered 25 tags, we would like to have 50 because we have already lost our fall pursuit and now it is limited to where very few houndsman will be able to enjoy that.

Byrnes- Let me go back to the question. If we look at splitting the season on those 3 or 4 units, based on what was presented and if it is 25 tags right now for the full season, does it make sense to actually drop the number of tags in each half of that season because the 100 days would probably be greater with equal number of tags vs. maybe going with 20 tags each half season.

Chet Young- Going from 25 to 20 each half?

Cowley- Right.

Chet Young- That would be comfortable.

Lawrence- I am worried about added pressure on those bears and what effect that might have. I am not a houndsman and I am not a bear biologist so I don't know if that would have increased pressure causing health issues with the bear population.

Dolling- That is a difficult question to answer. The reproductive information that we collect has not shown any reduction in offspring for those units. It does not seem to be an issue. We are more concerned about the conflict between the user groups.

Lawrence- Thank you.

Selman- Out of those 53 bears that Wildlife Service's takes, are they taken by hounds or other means? Do you know?

Dolling- The 53 reported in that table, Wildlife Service's removed 43 of those.

Selman- Is that by hounds or other means?

Dolling- It is a combination of both. They use snares or hounds or some are shot. They do attempt to remove the offending animal.

Selman- It makes sense to me that a lot of that would be other than hounds.

Dolling- Typically, they will use all the techniques mentioned. Hounds are used quite frequently to pursue a bear or hunt a bear off a carcass.

Leonard- How much of the problem on the interference with the summer recreators do you attribute to non-residents? Do you think those numbers are enough to alleviate the problem?

Dolling- When we developed our permit recommendations for summer pursuits, we looked at the number of residents that pursued as results of our survey and the number of non-residents. The La Sal was running about 50/50. We tried to set those levels to where we did not impact our residents. One exception was on the San Juan. Our survey showed that we had 50 pursuit trips and we set our permit recommendation at 30 and 3.

Cowley- I take it these 4 units are in the Southeast region. Is that the entire Southeast?

Dolling- Correct.

Hodson- There are more units in the Southeastern region other than those 4.

Dolling- Actually, the Book Cliffs are included in two different regions. It is part of the Northeast and Southeast.

Leonard- Is part of the update or revision of the plan, after next year?

Dolling- We will open up the plan for a complete revision and see if there are ways to improve. That will include harvest, livestock protection measures and pursuit.

Leonard- It seems like some pretty significant proposals this year in view of a pretty in depth look that will be going into the next stage of planning.

Dolling- Our new plan will go into effect in 2011. We will have one more year under this plan of recommendations before the new plan takes effect.

Byrnes- Did you look at requiring the client of the outfitter to have a pursuit permit?

Dolling- It all goes back to the individual that is responsible for the hounds. It is not the client, it is the dog handler. The dog handler would normally be the one to purchase a pursuit permit. The client is either a licensed hunter with a kill permit or an individual that wants to come out and photograph bears and compensate the guide for that experience. It all goes back to the dog handler that is required to have the permit.

Byrnes- You are saying that the dog handler is the individual pursuing the bear?

Dolling- Yes. The dog handler would be the guide in this case.

Byrnes- Basically he is the one pursuing the bear. It just concerns me that we are not charging a fee or requiring permit for consumption or use of protected wildlife. We do on almost everything else. Potentially, if an outfitter wants to work in those limited areas, he could have a pretty good clientele because we are limiting the number of people that can actually go there and pursue bears.

Dolling- We are limiting the recreational side of things but not the commercial side.

Byrnes- Right, so an outfitter could actually sell his services to as many non-residents as he wants as long as he limits himself to the number of dogs he is running.

Dolling- We are focusing on the summer pursuit so there is no harvest occurring there.

Byrnes- Right, but there is pursuit and you are limiting the pursuit there. Your goal is to allow limited control of pursuit use but you are not limiting the use by outfitters at all.

Dolling- The only good response I can give you is that we feel there is very little commercial activity when it comes to summer bear pursuit. If we see it is a problem, we can restrict. We just have to restrict at the same level.

Byrnes- Potentially, an outfitter could run someone else's dogs and have them present without limitations right?

Dolling- If he is being compensated for greater than \$100 dollars and is a licensed guide and he has a client present, he does not need a pursuit permit.

Byrnes- So, if I am from Colorado and I bring my dogs and he runs them, I pay him \$100 dollars, we could pursue bears as much as we want.

Dolling- The dog handlers presume to be the dog owner. It is in the draft rule.

Byrnes- Ok.

Dolling- You can beat that system like any other law. We defined in rule that the dog handler is also presumed to be the dog owner.

Byrnes- Thank you.

Gaskill- If we want to limit pursuit then we ought to say that everyone who is pursuing, needs a pursuit permit or at least somebody in that group needs to have a pursuit permit. It is not limiting except those who do not have guides.

Dolling- Our feeling was that there would be very little activity with this type of guiding service. We felt like they already have to be licensed through DOPL and to require something else on top of that, if there are not going to be that many individuals that are participating, did not make sense.

Gaskill- But you are not requiring more of the guide. We are not suggesting that the guide has to have a permit as much as we are suggesting that whoever hires the guide has to have a permit.

Byrnes- He said that by definition, the actual pursuer is the owner of the dogs.

Gaskill- Sure.

Byrnes- The attorney general's office has said that we can't limit the guides because they are in commercial business. We can't differentiate between resident and non-resident. We would have to give an equal number of resident tags and non-resident tags. Then the person running the dogs is the outfitter and is by definition the pursuer and the customer is not the pursuer so he would not need a pursuit permit.

Gaskill- Easily remedied by changing the definition of pursuer.

Cowley- If you read that definition, it is pretty strict. It really limits that down. The division has done a good job on focusing that.

Gaskill- I would just suggest that we need to watch that very carefully and if it becomes a problem, we need to address it.

Dolling- I agree. We do not anticipate that there will be a problem. If there is, we will come back next year with a new recommendation.

Neville- How many of you are all licensed guides?

Jason Binder- The way the laws have changed this year, there are actually no licensed guides. It is a totally new program.

Dave Ferguson- Even a licensed guide is going to have pursuit permits in their pocket. They are not guiding a client every day of the season. I don't think that is going to be an issue.

Motion

Motion: Selman- Keep the 8 dog limit on the three restricted summer pursuit units and leave the pack size unchanged on the remainder.

Second: Van Tassell

Discussion on the Motion

Cowley- Are you recommending that they split that one unit into two sub-units?

Selman- No.

Cowley- So that is different from the houndsman's recommendation?

Selman- Yes it is but it is all inclusive.

Neville- Did you want to approve the rest of the recommendations?

Selman- No, I was just working on something.

Cowley- Are you looking at leaving the number of tags that were recommended by the

houndsman the same or would you leave that to the division?

Selman- I was just working on the dog restrictions.

Gaskill- Is your suggestion based on having more complaints?

Selman- It is just based on what these guys have asked for. They want to still go and have a bigger pack to get those sheep killers up in the trees. Let's let them go ahead and do that.

Gaskill- I just want to understand your reasoning because the division recommended limiting the pack size not to reduce the killing of bears but to reduce the number of complaints they are getting.

Selman- I think that was explained to us.

Cowley- It was in these units where they felt like the largest conflict was.

Selman- So we chunked that out and that's what they wanted.

Gaskill- But when we asked the question, he was not able to tell us if there were more complaints in the La Sals than in the Uintah's.

Dolling- The three units that we received primarily all of the complaints on were the La Sal, San Juan and Book Cliffs. That is where 98% of the complaints came from.

Byrnes- For clarification, you are only talking about that summer season?

Selman- Yes.

Byrnes- So, during the limited entry hunt on those three units in the spring or fall, could run as large of a pack size as they want.

Selman- Right, because they got to get that sheep killer.

Lawrence- I would like to add a split of the San Juan unit. If the purpose is to reduce the human/bear conflict and a great deal of those are on the blues, then it makes sense to reduce those numbers on the Blues themselves.

Byrnes- It is really human houndsman conflict, not human bear conflict.

Lawrence- Yes, that is correct.

Byrnes- Do you want to amend Bret's motion or do a different motion?

Lawrence- I would just amend that motion.

Selman- I was just trying to chunk something out so that we could get on with it but whatever you want to do.

Byrnes- Russ, you would have to make an amendment and we would have to get a second.

Lawrence- I am not going to try and repeat that so let's go the other route.

Leonard- If Bret has dealt with the dog issue as a component of this and based on public comment, would like to add in the split season recommendation that the houndsman have made with a reduced number of permits they are willing to accept. Could we do that in two separate motions?

Byrnes- He is just approaching the dog limits for summer. That could be in the next motion.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Motion: Cowley- Accept the Houndsman's season split on Book Cliffs, Elk Ridge, Blues and La Sal and subunit split on the San Juan. Permit numbers recommend by the Division.

Second: Leonard

Discussion on the Motion

Leonard- In that, we put the Northern Big Game Hound Association but it is really a conglomerate of houndsman groups. I don't know if you want to capture that.

Lawrence- Do you want to generalize the name houndsman? The sheet here that the houndsman have presented are statewide, all groups. It would be statewide, all groups recommendation of houndsman.

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Motion

Motion- Cowley- Accept the remainder of the presentation by the Division.

Second- Selman

Discussion on the Motion

Cowley- I am going to withdraw that. The one concern I have is that we are going to go through a major re-write of this management plan next year.

Dolling- The plan will be developed next year but we will be making recommendations under the old plan next year.

Cowley- So, for 2 years. One of my concerns is the increased number of tags that have been put in place over the last 3 years. All that has been presented here is just one year. Maybe we should leave those permit numbers alone until we revise the plan. I am mixed because we are meeting all of the conditions as far as the adult female's percent mortality or survival, the age of the bear killed. So, if we are meeting all of those why not pick up the extra opportunity. I am going to back out and let someone else decide.

Gaskill- I don't know that you can withdraw that motion; I think we have to vote on it. It has a motion and second. I think we need to vote on it.

Van Tassell- So the motion leaves the bear number permits as proposed.

Selman- Bears eat sheep.

Byrnes- You should know.

Motion Passes: For: 6 Against: 2, Neville and Cowley voted against.

Item 6. Statewide Beaver Management Plan

Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator

See Handout

Public Questions

Scott Nielsen- I am a landowner and we do have a beaver problem once in a while. How do we handle it when we have a beaver problem? Do we come to fish and game?

Dolling- You would typically come to our agency and report that problem. There are options we are trying in the plan as far as what your ability would be to deal with the beaver population and our options in assisting you with that problem. You would come to us initially.

RAC Questions

Neville- With your educational plan to do the brochures, did you look at potentially putting them online first before you actually printed them. Or have the ability for individuals to print them out.

Dolling- I think that is a general trend we are moving towards.

Neville- O.K.

Dolling- We would like to publish those online and allow people to print them off.

Neville- I want you guys to save trees and money.

Public Comment

Stan Bassett- Utah Trappers Association- Good plan, we are behind this plan. List of local trappers that can be reached if there is a beaver problem. This way immediate response can be had with less damage.

Jim Catlin- Wild Utah Project- We help conservation community solve some of the tougher ecological problems. We are in favor of this plan. Working on beaver management along the highway up in the Logan river area. Pamphlets on the public education program in New Mexico.

RAC Comments

Selman- I am encouraged by this plan. I have been on both ends of this.

Gaskill- This is a no brainer, they don't eat sheep.

Selman- No.

Gaskill- I am in favor of this plan.

Motion

Motion: Neville- Accept the proposal as presented.

Second: Leonard

Motion Carries: Unanimous

Item 7. Other Business

Byrnes- Do we have anyone from the public who want to comment about the 5 day deer hunt?
Scott Nielsen- Manager of Lost Creek Ranch. We plan this a year or two in advance and we are one of the few ranches that do not go onto a CWMU. We have leased out our property to an outfitter for half the hunt and the other half we sell 50 permits. This year, we got caught by surprise. These people who were going to get these permits do not have a place to hunt. We are losing 100-150 hunters on our property because of this notice. Do not think there was adequate notice. Should plan in advance so we can plan the hunt in a way we can adjust revenue.

Meeting Ends: 8:20 p.m.

NORTHEASTERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Vernal UBATC

December 10, 2009

Started at 6:30 pm; Adjourned at 8:45 pm

RAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rod Morrison-Sportsmen
Mitch Hacking-Agriculture
Kirk Woodward-Sportsmen
Bob Christensen-RAC Chair
Kevin Christopherson-NER Supervisor
Beth Hamann-Non Consumptive
Brandon McDonald - BLM

UDWR PERSONNEL PRESENT:

Justin Dolling- NRO
Randall Thacker- NER
Charles Greenwood- NER
Maryann Wangsgard- NER
Gayle Allred- NER
Ron Stewart- NER

RAC MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Loran Hills-Non Consumptive
Floyd Briggs-At Large
Rod Harrison-Elected Official
Carlos Reed-Native American
Amy Torres-At Large
Curtis Dastrup-Agriculture

WILDLIFE BOARD MEMBERS:

Del Brady

1. WELCOME, RAC INTRODUCTIONS AND RAC PROCEDURE – Bob Christensen, RAC Chair

Bob Christensen: We'd like to get started. I'd like to thank everybody for coming tonight to the RAC meeting. Let's do some introductions. Myself, I'm Bob Christensen, I'm the RAC Chair, I'm with the Forest Service. Then on this end, Brandon, do you want to introduce yourself?

Brandon McDonald: Brandon McDonald, I represent the BLM

Beth Hamann: Beth Hamann, I represent non-consumptive.

Kevin Christopherson: I'm Kevin Christopherson. I'm with Wildlife Resources and I act as an Executive Secretary, and I don't vote on the RAC.

Kirk Woodward: I'm Kirk Woodward, Sportsmen

Mitch Hacking: Mitch Hacking, I represent Agriculture

Rod Morrison: Rod Morrison, Sportsman's Rep.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES – Bob Christensen, RAC Chair

Bob Christensen: Okay, thanks. I think all of you have looked over the agenda, most likely. Do we have a motion on the agenda, for approval of the agenda?

Kirk Morrison: I move that we go with the agenda.

Bob Christensen: Okay. Kirk moves that we approve the agenda. Is there a second?

Beth Hamann: I'll second.

Bob Christensen: Second by Beth. All in favor?

MOTION to approve agenda by Kirk Woodward
Second by Beth Hamann

Favor Unanimous

Bob Christensen: Okay. Actually, we're still one short of a quorum tonight. Hopefully, I think Amy's supposed to, she should be here. So, if Amy comes then we'll be able to have Motion and Vote. I might have been a little premature on that approval on the agenda. Anybody have a chance to look at the meeting minutes from last RAC meeting? Any changes anybody thought you need to come before the RAC?

Okay, with that we'll move on to the update on the Wildlife Board Meeting that was held last week.

3. WILDLIFE BOARD MEETING UPDATE – Bob Christensen, RAC Chair

Bob Christensen: Most everything passed the Board; it was consistent with what we had voted on. There were a couple of things that was different, quite a bit different actually. The one was, one of the major ones was, for this season, the 2010 deer hunting season. It will be; it's reduced from a nine-day hunt to a five-day hunt, statewide, although the youth will still be able to hunt the nine days.

Rod Morrison: Is that limited entry too, or just the general season?

Bob Christensen: General season. Yes, this is the general season rifle; this is just the rifle hunt, too. And then those units that are below the 15 bucks per 100 doe ratio on the rifle general season deer, general deer season, will be only a three-day hunt. So that

includes, in our region that includes the South Slope Vernal unit; if it's below that buck-to-doe ratio. And, unlike this last year, both the five-day hunts and the three-day hunts will start on the same opening day. Last year, the reduced hunts were delayed four days and this year they'll start on the same day.

Then the other one, for the 2011 hunt structure, the information, the Board gathered, Anis Aoude did a good job of summarizing a lot of the comments that came in from the public. From what I have in my notes here, the Board asked the Division to specifically look at moving the muzzleloader season. First, that it be prior to the rifle hunts. That seemed to be a common comment from the public, not having the muzzleloader in between the two rifle hunts.

And then also look at the youth hunting both rifle seasons.

And another one here, similar to 2010 season dates, change the nine-day deer hunt to five-day.

And they also asked the Division to look at the small-unit concept, looking at managing the deer management units in the smaller sub-units across the state.

And they asked the Division, and that was sent to, I guess that will be sent to the deer committee to take another look at that. And, so again, these are just things that the Board asked the Division to look at or the deer committee to look at. And that proposal, they'll put together a proposal next year for the 2011 hunt structure.

That was the main differences I saw. Does anybody have anything to add? Did I miss anything?

Kevin Christensen: The only thing I would add is that proposed hunt structure is going to be a three- to five-year plan and that's a radical change from what we've had. So, we've got a good audience here. Boy, get your input in. We want to get your input. Next year they're going to try to come out with a revised version, I want to say August, I forget. So you get two chances in the next year; so once, I forget, do you remember Dell, was it late spring or early summer, that proposal will be back out; but then in November of next year, some five-year plan will be adopted, some form of this or not. These are some big changes, so if you don't like it or you do like it or you want to change it a little, get us your comments.

Bob Christensen: Okay. That will do it for the update from the Wildlife Board Meeting last week. We'll ask Kirk, I know the elk committee's met. Kirk could you give us an update on the elk committee and what you're looking at?

Kirk Woodward: Sure. We met again two weeks ago now, and it's actually been really productive. The elk committee's gathered all of the data from the survey that was distributed randomly to elk hunters in the state. And that data really shows that for the most part, the hunters in the state are really happy with the way that the elk hunt is going;

the current structure, the opportunity vs. quality. For the most part, everybody's (in that survey), the majority was happy with the structure. In that committee, they identified several concerns that we're going to address and then from the data from that survey and then all of those concerns, we'll formulate a plan that will come to the RAC process. So it's actually been very productive and moving forward well.

Bob Christensen: Do you have anything to add, Ron?

Rod Morrison: I agree. Seems like, I'm just impressed with the way it's going from the deer committee meeting. Seems like they letting us put more input in; and just working harder at it.

Kirk Woodward: It's the mediator we have.

Rod Morrison: Yeah. You did really well [Justin Dolling]. I agree. It's a good committee and good things are going to happen on this committee.

Kirk Woodward: You know a lot can be said for that. Keeping us on track really makes a difference on the committee because when there's so many opinions as we're moving towards something that's as passionate as elk hunting and deer hunting in the state, to stay on track, and to have you do that is valuable 'cause any one of us could get off on a tangent, that we feel is important. It's working.

Bob Christensen: Okay, thanks Kirk for that update.

REGIONAL UPDATE: Kevin Christopherson

Welcome everyone, our Northeastern Region Advisory Committee meetings will now be held here in this new building for 2010. The Vernal Uintah Basin Applied Technology Center. It should be a better location for us.

The Legislative season is coming up. Some of the bills to be addressed will be:

Refund bill. By law we're restricted in our ability to refund people's money. They're trying to liberalize that rule so we have a more opportunity for refunds.

Stream Access Bill: The court ruling a couple years ago declared land below the high water mark is sovereign lands and the public has access to. This created a lot of confusion between private landowners and sportsmen. The legislature is trying to clear up some of the controversy with legislation. If you're a duck hunter or fisherman, this bill could be a big deal.

Wildlife Rehabilitators: We have an internal team evaluating our injured animal rehabilitation program. We currently have a volunteer-driven rehabilitation program designed to allow animals to be released back in the wild. We've got more animals

coming in and fewer volunteers to deal with them. We need to ask ourselves some hard questions. Do we hire people to do it, do we stop doing it? We're looking at what some other states are doing. We'll probably see something come through the RAC in how we handle animals.

Wildlife Projects:

Deer survival studies: We've started a state wide radio-collared deer to determine survival rates. We are concentrating on two areas in our region, the South Slope and the Seep Ridge Road. We are trapping and radio collaring deer next week. We know that hard winters kill deer, but we want to get a better estimate of mortality.

Seep Ridge Road: We have been working with the County. It runs right through some crucial deer winter range. We will be working with them on deer and elk passage culverts to cut down on deer mortality.

The DWR has Radio-collared elk in Ouray National Wildlife Refuge. We have a population of elk on the Fish and Wildlife Refuge and they do not allow elk hunting. At night they move onto private landowners and cause some problems. We've reached an agreement to start managing the issue. We'll figure out which elk are moving and when they are moving.

This time of year, we pay our taxes, or rather Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILTS) to the county. This is a program that's win/win. These are lands that we've acquired for sportsmen access or critical habitat or both. Our PILT payment is almost double the Green Belt rate so local government benefits from our ownerships as well.

Kirk Woodward: regarding collared deer, I heard there are specific things they're going to watch for but mortality is not one of them.

Charlie Greenwood: Survival. Doe survival, fawn survival. Not so much what killed them but the mortality rate. Then we'll be able to determine pop sizes better from that information.

Kirk Woodward: So if we have a signal that a doe died what happens?

Charlie Greenwood: We pick up collar when we can. This will go on continually. We can monitor mortality each year .

Kirk Woodward: But no report on reason for mortality;

Charlie Greenwood: The main thing is, is it alive or is it dead. Sometimes the mortality factor is built in.

Kirk Woodward: A concern is that we don't have the manpower to do that study so I was concerned if they die and the collar is wasted.

Charlie Greenwood: We'll pick up the collars. They're good for 5 to 7 years.

Mitch Hacking: If you pick up the collar you can probably tell how they died.

Charlie Greenwood: Yeah, hopefully we can tell, if it's not scattered too much.

BEAR PROCLAMATION AND RULE: Justin Dolling

Recommending 49 additional permits, statewide.

NE Region:

New hunt proposed for Book Cliffs #10 C, roadless area (spot and stalk only, no hounds, no bait). 4 spring and 3 fall permits recommended.

Summer pursuit conflicts:

UDWR received numerous complaints about summer pursuit on the San Juan, La Sal mainly, with some complaints on the Book Cliffs Units, ranging from hounds running through campgrounds chasing domestic animals, running through cabin areas, etc.

Got a group together and looked at the issues. Decided to limit use and number of individuals who can pursue and limiting the number of hounds.

Recommendations:

Book Cliffs 25 resident permits, 3 non- resident permits

-Limit pack size statewide to 8 dogs or fewer for pursuit & harvest. Only a maximum of 8 dogs could be used in any single bear pursuit.

-Recommend a pursuit permit not be required for a licensed guide or outfitter on public land or individual on private land with written landowner permission when compensated and accompanied by a client

-Recommend spring pursuit on Unit 2/3/4/5 in the Northern region.

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: When they discontinued the spring hunt, why was it discontinued? Is this something that could happen again?

Justin Dolling: What it was was a lot of emotion. It was before I was involved in bear management but what I understand is that there was a fear that females would be more vulnerable and because they would be more vulnerable you'd have more orphaned cubs.

Mitch Hacking: This was a fear from the public?

Justin Dolling: Yes and based on that controversy, we chose to recommend closing it.

Mitch Hacking: It could happen again.

Justin Dolling: It very well could, although our data supports that spring hunts usually result in higher take in the male section.

Mitch Hacking: So that gives you a little bit of ammunition there. Next question, on the problem bears. In 2007 we knew it was the drought that caused it, but then in 2009, what caused that problem?

Justin Dolling: I'm perplexed with that. I don't know if that means we had more people and possibly more bears that interact in the woods these days than we did ten years ago, five years ago. But the conditions out there would have suggested that we wouldn't have a problem, shouldn't have a problem. But for whatever reason, we did.

Mitch Hacking: Would it be that there's a higher population of bears, do you think?

Justin Dolling: Possibly. There's definitely a higher population of humans, possibly a higher population of bears. The other thought is that, you remember how wet it was in April, May and June? Folks didn't really get a chance to get out and camp until that first week in July and that's when all the trouble started.

Rod Morrison: Justin, are these seven additional permits for the roadless, are they going to be taken out of the original Book Cliff numbers or are they additional?

Justin Dolling: They're going to be in addition to.

Rod Morrison: Okay. I kind of have a concern about, how are you going to keep hounds out of the roadless area when you can't control where hounds go when they turn on a bear. I think you're going to have a severe problem there.

Justin Dolling: Possibly. I can't answer for our law enforcement folks but the way I understand it is that if you strike a bear outside of that roadless area and their hounds go into the roadless area, you go gather up your hounds and just don't harvest a bear.

Rod Morrison: I do see a problem there of it not working for spot and stalk on the area because of that, where your dogs go. I just have a concern about that's not going to work

Kirk Woodward: Is there a reason why that is a spot and stalk rather than a hunt?

Justin Dolling: Yeah, what our strategy here is, we're not getting the appropriate level of harvest in that roadless area and we're seeing conflict between bears, and big game, campers, and horseback folks that go in and camp and so we'd like to direct some harvest

into that roadless area. And one way to do it is through just identifying it as a separate unit. And we tried this a couple years ago for open for hounds and baiting, and spot and stalk's always an option. We heard from our law enforcement folks that, it's such a small area, you can't really expect a guy to turn hounds loose and stay within that unit, user wise, so our next thought was, all right, let's try a spot and stalk. Bottom line is we want to try to reduce the bear issue.

Bob Christensen: Any other questions? I just had one question. There's 25 permits for the Book Cliffs for residents. Is that right?

Justin Dolling: We're recommending 25 residents and 3 non-residents.

Bob Christensen: Do you guys have any idea how many people were in there before?

Justin Dolling: I'll just run through them all. Last year, our survey for the Book Cliffs, there were 23 residents, 0 non-resident, and this is just summer. La Sals had 19 residents, 15 non-residents for a total of 34. The San Juan had 50 resident, 15 non-resident for a total of 65.

Questions from Public:

Bruce Horrocks: How's the pursuit going to work in that wilderness? You never had nothin' on there. Is there gonna be summer pursue for the roadless?

Justin Dolling: For our recommendation for the roadless hunt?

Bruce Horrocks: Yeah.

Justin Dolling: It would still be open to pursuit in the spring and summer.

Bruce Horrocks: Spring and summer. When's the spot, it's gonna be in the fall, the spot and stalk?

Justin Dolling: Yeah. It will be a spring and fall spot and stalk.

Bruce Horrocks: So we can still go pursue there during the spring and summer.

Eric Mecham: I have a question for you, Justin, on behalf of the rest of the hound doggers here. On this survey, how many people of hound doggers, if you would, please raise your hand who was surveyed, called and asked about your hounds? One? Two? If I may ask, was you by yourself or with a partner?

With a partner.

Eric Mecham: So if you said you turned six dogs or eight, and your partner turned eight, I just feel that this, I want to understand that this survey's correct. I don't feel that it's

quite fair for the dog limitation, that if five of these gentlemen surveyed that hunts together and they all hunted roughly five dogs apiece or six, that it's really not going to quite eliminate as many dogs off the mountain as you feel it will.

Justin Dolling: Okay, I'll try to answer that. We tried an internet-based survey this year and we sold 420 pursuit permits and we sampled almost 33% of those to generate our numbers. And the second part of your question, in regards to hounds, what we were hearing from the folks that were calling in and complaining primarily boiled down to two things; there were too many folks out pursuing and there were too many hounds on the hill. And every one of the complaints had those two things in common.

Eric Mecham: That's what I'm saying, is the survey to me doesn't seem accurate just in the simple fact that if you surveyed my dad and me, and I turned in that I hunted this many dogs and he hunted this many dogs. We hunt together, so there's, your survey says that I hunted eight and my dad hunted eight so you're only counting that amount. And my next thing with this is the Book Cliffs maybe had one phone call, La Sals-20, San Juan-150. It would seem to me that, in that particular areas, where we're having troubles, to try to eliminate that trouble and we'd all be proud to eliminate some of these problems in that area, not the whole state. So, that survey, I don't feel that was correct. Still don't. If you want to explain it, I'd appreciate it.

Justin Dolling: I understand where you're coming from and there could be some error in that regard. If two folks reported individual pack sizes but hunted together, there could be some error there.

Eric Mecham: 'Cause there's not a one of us in here, I'll betcha, that don't hunt by ourselves. I mean 99% of us don't ...

Justin Dolling: Currently the way the rule is drafted, if two or three of you hunt together, that's fine. You are restricted to pursuit units, but you can only have a maximum of eight hounds. So you can provide two, your buddy can provide two.

Eric Mecham: You say there were no non-residents in the Book Cliffs. There was.

Justin Dolling: Our survey showed in the summer pursuit season, there were no non-residents. In the spring, there were non-residents.

Eric Mecham: I feel that could be quite a bit misleading, taking that many dogs and people off the hill.

DeWain Boren: I have a question, it's kind of like more of a statement. With limiting like the eight dogs to the pack, you're going to put more people, I'd say, where we used to hunt together, me and my dad and buddies hunting together, you're gonna get me in a different truck with eight dogs, him in a different one and my buddies all in a different one. Therefore, you're going to be putting that many more hounds out there, to where before, he would dump in two or three, I'd dump in two or three, my buddies would

dump in three or four. Yeah, you've still got about 12, maybe 13 dogs up a tree but you've got less traffic running around. I just wanted to kind of bring that up and say, if you're limiting the dogs, you'll actually have more hunters in the field than people riding together who dump dogs out of the exact same truck.

Justin Dolling: I think really what we're trying to solve here is these pack sizes of 20 plus, 15 plus. That's where the conflict is coming from.

Bob Christensen: We'll still take a few more questions. Just remind you that we're taking questions now. If you want to make a comment, we've got these comment cards up here, come up and get one and fill it out.

Chett Young (Utah Federation of Hounds men): On the deal we talked about it, I talked with Justin about it, and it showed that there was 22 hunters on the Book Cliffs last year for summer pursuing. How many people in here went to the Book Cliffs last year?

Raise of hands.

Chett Young: Some, so pretty much that ate it up. If nobody else, so now we're limited to 25 tags on that unit to go there. That number's way too low. We would like to have an opportunity to hunt.

Larry Massey: I was kind of concerned on why the increase in the number of kill tags? If you don't know there's any more bears, why the increase?

Justin Dolling: Because we don't know exactly how many bears there are in the state, our management plan sets up those performance targets, and those performance targets are fairly well accepted in bear management. And so, if we are running less than 40% female, our average age is greater than five and our adult survival is greater than 78%, then we have room for opportunity and permits.

Larry Massey: That's what I was wondering, if you don't know, or have a super good idea of if there is or isn't an increase, I know part of this question too, is if summer pursuit helps keep down the problem bear also, to raise the kill number.

Justin Dolling: Problem bears don't factor into our recommendation process. They're there and we consider that but what we really look at is the percent female in the harvest, the age, and the survival. On the other hand, if we start running 42-43% female and our average age drops below five, you're going to see us go the other direction. That's an indication that bear numbers are dropping.

Bruce Horrocks: On the problem bears being killed, you bring it up that you wanted to have them come in. How do we go about that? I've went down to the Fish and Game I don't know how many times, put my name in. I've been called once.

Justin Dolling: On a problem bear?

Bruce Horrocks: On a problem bear. And I know probably another guy, that he's not here, that gets called quite a bit.

Larry Massey: And he works for the state.

Bruce Horrocks: Yeah.

Justin Dolling: I would punt that off onto the region. Regions probably collect that information.

Bruce Horrocks: Who do we need to talk to?

Charlie Greenwood: Yeah, right here. Just continue giving us your names.

Bruce Horrocks: Do you have an agenda you go through, who you call?

Charlie Greenwood: We try to keep track of the names. The guy you're talking about we use a lot, we have success with him, he gets the bears. We've used a couple different hounds men up in Daggett County too, so just keep working with us and we'll try to give you the opportunity.

Randall Thacker: There is a difference between the livestock depredation animals and nuisance animals, public safety animals. And that's the ones that actually, the livestock damage ones, for the most part is, Wildlife Services actually end up targeting an animal that isn't always pursuable with hounds. That may be a bear that's not going to come back there for two days, maybe three days, whatever it is it's been in there and taken it. It depends on how recently it's killed. The state actually has a Memorandum of Understanding with them to permit them to go ahead and actually take an animal that's there on site if it's a situation where it's not going to work real well to bring in hounds men, we aren't going to be sure we kill the exact bear. But we've got to let them do their job too and actually address a problem before it kills another calf or another sheep or whatever it is. So think of those in two separate categories: there's the wildlife that are doing damage to livestock and there's also the other problem, response type area too. They're very different things.

Kevin Christopherson: Another consideration is the speed when it's a human safety issue. If we get a call on a Wednesday afternoon, need to get someone down there almost immediately so we tend to use the people who are available. We can't wait until Saturday to hunt a bear when it's a potential human safety issue. But yeah, get on the list. We don't have any preference. We just need those bears taken out. We don't really care who gets them.

Larry Massey: One other comment to that. Everybody ought to be on that list 'cause it won't take 'em 15 minutes to run through a list and make a phone call. It's still not fair for everybody else to not have a crack at it and this one individual has most of it.

Kevin Christopherson: Well, they can come. Like I said, come get on the list.

Larry Massey: But it ought to be a fair deal, you know, to get on the list.

Kevin Christopherson: Yeah. We don't have a preference. We just need that animal taken care of as quickly as possible. That's all we care about.

Larry Massey: 'Cause I know Bruce, he's got a phone there and he's on call. He'll answer the phone any time and will pretty well go at the drop of the hat and never gets a call, or only got one.

Bruce Horrocks: One, and it was in the middle of town.

J.C. Brewer: I'm not a hounds man but I have encountered a couple of bears with streamers in their ears recently up along the state line. When Utah captures a problem bear, do they destroy it or mark it and turn it loose? Who's turning loose the bears with the streamers in the Baxter Pass area, is that Utah or is that Colorado doing that?

Charlie Greenwood: It's not us. We don't put streamers in their ears.

J.C. Brewer: Okay, then that's Colorado doing that 'cause in the Baxter Pass area this summer somebody's releasing problem bears from somewhere else and marking them and I don't like meeting them in the brush.

Bruce Horrocks: Do you have any boars out there collared?

Justin Dolling: No, we're primarily dealing with sows.

Bruce Horrocks: We caught one this spring. It was a boar. He was collared. I come home, I called Hal Black, and he said it wasn't one of his. Where did that bear come from?

Randall Thacker: Was he a young bear? Would he be like a two- or three-year old? They did collar some of the yearling bears they took to Idaho and brought back. Those were all collared regardless of sex.

Justin Dolling: They were released on the Book Cliffs two years ago?

Randall Thacker: Yeah, so if it was a three-year old, that could be that. There could be a handful. We're talking like eight bears, not a lot.

Danny Rasmussen: I have a question concerning the amount of hounds you could have during pursuit. Can we have more in the back of our trucks in a box? You guys are familiar with how bear hunts work. The bear will go all day and sometimes the dogs will

quit. Can we turn more dogs in? Me and my buddies together, can we only have eight dogs in our possession?

Justin Dolling: Our intent is that the pack size of eight or less would only be during the actual physical pursuit of a bear. As long as you pull some out, and put some back in.

Danny Rasmussen: How is it going to be enforced?

Justin Dolling: Our law enforcement officers will be out in the field and they're going to have to weight the evidence and use their best judgment.

Anthony Bright: What is going to happen if two guys turn dogs loose in different drainages on the same bear and they all end up in the same tree, different drainages but they come together on one bear? He has eight dogs, I have eight dogs.

Justin Dolling: If you're parked in two separated drainages that will be fine. But if you're parked together, that's a different thing.

Larry Massey: Will they be asked to view that in consideration before they start throwing tickets at us? Cause that happens.

Tony Domgeld: 9 times out of 10, if you do have different hunters turning dogs in a different direction, you usually come together some time during that day, looking for your dogs. How's that going to work?

Justin Dolling: That will be law enforcement's judgment call. You can "what if" scenarios all day long.

DeWain Boren: Do you know what the fine is going to be, if they come together and there's 16 dogs? Is it going to be a five-year penalty and loss of license?

Justin Dolling: I don't even know if a bail schedule has been developed yet.

Brad Evans: My question is, the eight-dog limit is going to be limited to each pursuit permit holder? If I go hunting by myself, I'm going to turn eight dogs loose, but if I'm hunting with a group of people, it's the disgressionary of the group of people to decide whose dogs get let loose to make an eight-pack limit?

Justin Dolling: Our pack size recommendation is that you can have no more than a limit of eight during the pursuit.

Brad Evans: If a single person can go out with eight dogs and run a bear, but yet there's a group of people that each have pursuit permits that are allowed to turn eight dogs loose by themselves. Nobody owns a bear track or the bears they're pursuing so I just don't understand how you can limit the pack size to the chase rather than the permit holder itself

Justin Dolling: That's where the conflict arose. 20 dogs hanging off a bear, running through somebody's cabin cause most people to get upset. When we looked at all the issues that are received, all the complaints that are received, it boiled down to two things: there were too many hounds on the hill and too many folks up there during that time when there were other people were trying to recreate, so that's why we settled in on restricting the number of permits and capping the pack size.

Eric Mecham: In your professional opinion, do you see anything wrong with just limiting that eight-dogs for the problem area? Next year or when we go through this again, why can't we do the eight-dog with that unit only or them two units only? And then if the problem arises again, face it instead of taking away from everybody in the whole state for one problem area. Do you feel that could be a possibility?

Justin Dolling: It could be a possibility. Perception is 100%. We have large pack sizes in other units but we're not receiving the complaints. But to be consistent and to make it easy for people to understand when they're pursuing bear, to have pack size limitations. Bottom line is we just want to solve our problem. And if you have a counter recommendation then that's what this process is for.

Eric Mecham: Could that be adjustable?

Justin Dolling: That would be up to the these folks here.

Bruce Horrocks: Today I turn eight dogs loose. Sometimes they get sore-footed, they don't come out. Tomorrow can I turn eight more loose if I still have eight more out in the field two don't come back because they are laid down sore footed?

Justin Dolling: It's back to this "what if" thing. It's all based on what the officer sees at the time, so they interview you, look at the evidence in the field. They're gonna make that judgment

Maryann Wangsgard: How do you know they're laid down sore-footed? If you know they're laid down, sore-footed and not treeing a bear then why don't go get them if you know where they're at exactly?

Bruce Horrocks: Sometimes it's hard. So what are you going to do to us? If I only turn eight more out on this track I found the next day...

Larry Massey: Well that wouldn't matter cause that's be two separate bears.

Maryann Wangsgard: Every circumstance is different.

Bruce Horrocks: It's going to depend on how you feel that day is how you're gonna act on us.

Maryann Wangsgard: Like I said, we've got to look at the whole situation.

Bob Christensen: So it will be up to the discretion of law enforcement

Comments from the Public:

Bob Christensen: I have a comment card

Ryan Thornock (Utah Farm Bureau) Regarding the 15% increase statewide. We support that for two basic reasons: We had a conversation with Wildlife Services. They told us they took 47-50 bears in 2009 due to depredation. That represents an increase of about 15-20% over the 15 year average. That gives us an indication that depredation was a bigger problem in '09. Also, from the feedback from members we think predation from bears is up so we agree with the 15% increase recommendation by DWR.

Morgan Smuin: If I'm a pursuit permit holder and you're allowed eight dogs per bear chase, would it be legal to have 16 hounds, turn eight out on one track, go down the road, and turn eight out on another track.

Justin Dolling: No because the pursuer is also the dog handler. You've got to be with one group or another as the handler.

Morgan Caldwell: You can track them and be with them all day. Why?

Justin Dolling: The person who owns the permit has to be with the dogs during the pursuit.

Brad Evans: Where do we find these laws on dog handling?

Justin Dolling: There are rules on the website and you can look at the bear rule. It's the actual rule. There are laws and rules and the guidebook is the next step down.

Jason Binder (President of Utah Federation of Hounds men Association also representing the Utah Big Game Hound Association). Paper handout of recommendations to let you guys look at tonight. 500 hounds men members of each club. We've looked at these issues with the problems that have arisen down in the La Sal and San Juan because of all the recreation people down there. The reason why they've added the Book Cliffs is because they didn't to add all the influx from those units onto the Book Cliffs.

Propose on La Sal San Juan unit, split the unit in half and provide more opportunities for hunters to hunt with 10 permits on blues side of the mountain and 20 permits on the Elk Ridge side of mountain. We're also proposing that the summer training season is a 30 day season, we'd like you to recommend that we split that hunt and give people a 15-day hunt. Keep the same amount of tags, 25 residents, 3 non-residents, and for the second 15 day hunt, you have the same numbers. You're keeping the same amount of opportunity,

because there is an error in the survey and there are obviously more people hunting than we have got recorded.

As far as dogs restrictions go, we'd like to see the dog limit be only on the summer training season, not on a spring and fall actual kill season. There is some bears that will not climb a tree with eight dogs on them. It's been brought up in other RACs. There are some big bears there that are not going to climb a tree with only eight dogs on them. It's obvious that the direction of the Division is to harvest the big mature boars. They ought to be able to give us the dog power to harvest the big boars. As far as the increase in permits, the Division's actually doing studies around the state in Boulder and Strawberry and Kamas that determines the density of bears in each area and how far they're traveling. We'd like to see the information back from those studies before there is an increase in tags.

Eric Mecham: I support what Jason just said. Just to stress that the eight-dog limit is a huge thing to take away from friends and family. Your bear, raising the permits, feel strongly we're good with what we're having, the increase is before its time. Maybe down the road, watch it down the road, right now, leave it alone.

Chet Young: (Utah Federation of Hounds men and Northern Big Game Hound Association). The paper Jason read, there was a paper underneath that, I handed both of them out earlier. We met with Justin, Kevin Bunnell, and Northern Club on it. We tried to come up with a solution where we have an opportunity to hung. As bear hunters, we traded the fall pursuit for the summer training season. This was to minimize problems with people who have been putting in the draw for 15 years, putting in for an elk tag. We've already lost fall pursue. We want to be able to go on these premium units, train our dogs. Get a feel for the area if we drew a tag in there for the fall. That's our time to scout. Without hunting them in the summer, we can't see them. We also put in for our bear tags for 10 to 15 years, waiting to draw these tags. When we do draw the tag, we want to have more than eight dogs so we can harvest a quality animal. These big boars didn't get big because they're easily intimidated by a handful of dogs. They've got big because it takes a lot of pressure to put them in a tree. On the kill hunts, if we keep the numbers limited to eight dogs, there are going to be more people killing sows because they can't stop the big bears pushing above the 40% threshold, pushing the age below five years old.

Dewain Boren (Uintah Big Game Hound Assoc): A lot of these campers in the La Sals, Book Cliffs, and majority have been non-residents. I think that's where the biggest problem. The non-residents trash the area and then they leave the state. Limiting the non-residents is a pretty good idea. As far as the dogs coming through campgrounds, it's because the campers are leaving coolers out. The bears are coming in there and we're doing them a favor by running the bears out of there while their kids are playing.

Kirk Robinson (e-mail Statement from Executive Director. Western Wildlife Agency): Support DWR's proposal to limit hounds to eight used to hunt and chase bears.

Brad Evans: Board members might not be aware that Utah is the only state in the western United States that has a number of pursuit permits that are available to the non-residents just the same as to the residents. Utah is becoming widely known, in the western United States, for that fact, all over the United States, that it's a state where non-residents can access the permits as easily as the residents can. They can have their way while they're here and then leave. As far as I know, there haven't been any restrictions on any of the non-resident pursuit permits and I do see that there's a reduction on the recommendations that you have but why haven't we tried to limit that before it got to this point and let the residents be able to hunt in a good state!

Hal Mecham: Are you going to allow a summer pursuit in the new Book Cliff unit? And if you haven't thought about that, would you consider it?

Justin Dolling: Summer pursuit would be allowed in the new Book Cliff unit, but...

Hal Mecham: Will it be included in the number of regular Book Cliff tags or will it be a split number? Why not have a split number and give some extra use?

Justin Dolling: I'm thinking, summer pursuit, restricted summer pursuit?

Hal Mecham: Strictly summer pursuit, just like you're doing a strictly summer pursuit on the Book Cliffs. Split some of the population. Stick them in the hole.

Justin Dolling: Currently the way our recommendation reads is that the 25 resident permits could pursue in the entire Book Cliff unit, which would include the roadless area.

Hal Mecham: But if you leave it like that, you'll have 25 people who are pursuing, none of them in the roadless. If you put an extra five in the roadless, somebody will use them.

Justin Dolling: Our recommendation doesn't include that. You can recommend that.

Bob Christensen: That will be something for us to consider.

Danny Rasmussen: Seems like the Fish and Game is really good about closing the areas or limiting the amount of people who can go in and not considering the effect it's gonna have on other areas. You're limiting the amount of people hunting the Book Cliffs. Well guess what, all those people that were hunting that aren't going to be able to hunt, they're going to head north. We've got a lot more campers up there. Gonna head to diamond. We're gonna have hounds, and complaints from landowners, a lot more traffic in other areas. Just want you to take that into consideration

Comments from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: I'm pretty much on board with the houndsmen with what they've come up with. #2 the dog restrictions, it does take a lot of dogs on a kill. #3, I don't believe I'll be on board there. I think the populations are up. I'd like to see the increase in tags.

I think that's why we've had the problems. I'd also like to make the statement that campers aren't always right. You can file complaints on them as well as they've done against you guys.

Brandon McDonald: BLM has expressed, they've noticed a large increase in trashing of the camping areas in Book Cliffs including off-road travel. Some of those areas would pertain to Bitter Creek drainage, Chepeta Canyon, South Canyon and some down P.R. Springs. It's all been documented. BLM would like to work with the DWR more closely and strengthen that relationship in law enforcement. Hopefully we can get a better leverage on the negative resource impacts on the area by bear hunters.

Kirk Woodward: I think it's an unfortunate thing that we can't make a motion. And so, I think that the best thing that we can do is come together and at least make a recommendation, even though we can't make an official motion to the Wildlife Board, of what it would be if we were able to make a motion. And so, the recommendation, I can't move to make a recommendation, but I think that there's a couple of sensible things that we have heard tonight. One is to split the Book Cliffs and give some additional tags to the roadless, or pursuit, during that summer pursuit to the roadless area, so that we do actually force people into that roadless area because we do want to take some bear in the roadless area. And I think that it's true that if we just leave it the way that it is, everybody's going to be where they can drive, where they can get to. It's a lot easier to do. So, I think that's a great idea that we ought to take into consideration. And if we could make a motion, I would make a motion.

Bob Christensen: That was just pursuit.

Kirk Woodward: That was just pursuit, but the point was made that during the summer, that's their scouting and so if they're finding a big boar out there during the summer, that it may push people into that area to go and take their bear during the hunt where right now they're not going to look that way. And I don't know if that makes a difference or not when it's spot and stalk and I'm still a little unclear why it would just be spot and stalk in the roadless area when we have a vehicle to take bears... when the idea is to reduce the numbers out there probably it's the most useful tool we have.

Then the other important point we that I think we ought to consider is that if we limit them to eight, they're all going to jump in their separate vehicles and we may doing just the opposite of what we're thinking we're going to do when they're all turning loose now, individually eight, where maybe together they would only have turned 12, if they had gone in the same vehicle. So I think that's a point that we really ought to think about as we make those recommendations, because the point, I forget who made the point, but I think it was a good point, that now I can only turn eight so I'm going to drive in my separate truck with my eight dogs and somebody else is going to drive their separate truck instead of being together. I do think that's an important point.

And then, along that same line, the recommendation from the sportsmen is that, in conjunction with what we want to do, we want to kill big boars; I've been to trees where

you need a lot of dogs to get a big boar off a tree. So I think it's important that we consider, if we're asking them to kill that age class, that type of bear, giving them the tools to do that. So from the sportsmen's, aspect I think that those recommendations ought to be listed and passed on. I'm glad Del's here to do that for us.

Bob Christensen: Those suggestions will be recorded in the meeting minutes and the Board will look at those.

Mitch Hacking: Comment to the hounds men here that if you're really passionate, and committed to the cause, you need to attend the Wildlife Board meeting January 6, 9:00 am.

Bob Christensen: Thanks everybody for your comments. The Board will look at them and take them into consideration.

STATEWIDE BEAVER MANAGEMENT PLAN: Justin Dolling

10 year plan

Questions from RAC:

Mitch Hacking: We own ground in Brush Creek. We get a beaver dam every year at this time. Morgan comes up and blows the dam. What do you recommend? Would it be better to try to get the beaver first and then blow the dam?

Justin Dolling: When you blow the dam, it's hard to say whether the beaver goes upstream or downstream. But there are options, like flow meters.

Mitch Hacking: I quite admire what they can do. We run cattle on Forest permits. We can repair the ponds they have built, but you see all these old beaver ponds. The only way we're ever going to get new ponds is through the beaver. Is there something we can do?

Justin Dolling: We have a transplant priority list and that's the hope is that in appropriate environments they can create stock water.

Mitch Hacking: The only way to get ponds on the Forest is to have the beaver do it. Is there any process a guy like myself and go through the Fish and Game or go to the Forest Service or DWR to get on the list?

Justin Dolling: I think I'd consult with the Forest Service and see if they're on board and then work with our Regional people.

Charlie Greenwood: We've got beaver in all our drainages. It we don't have them now on the Forest, it's because the habitat's gone. If the habitat was there, they would be

there. We have them in all of our drainages including out in the Book Cliffs, that's why we did not put anything on the transplant list. We've got them and where the habitat is there, we've got 'em.

Bob Christensen: There are drainages on the Forest Service where we have problems and we work with the Division on that, flooding the roads in Uintah Canyon, etc. But we work with the Division on that and they help out quite a bit.

Rod Morrison: What do you mean by using non-lethal methods? Are you changing the flow of the water?

Justin Dolling: If we had suitable habitat and interest from all parties, we could live trap beaver and move them into suitable sites. The other part that the plan alludes to is, there are structures you can build in the mouth of the culvert that tricks the beaver into moving up or down stream so you don't have that threat of flooding the road right there. There are flow features that you can dig through the dam install a pipe that keeps the pond at that level and the water comes down through the pipe and acts as a fish passage, and they don't hear that water so they're not inclined to continue to work on the dam. If it makes sense, if we can install something like that for \$300 that will last for ten years, that's a lot cheaper than sending someone up to blow the dam.

Questions from Public:

J.C. Brewer: I'm sure you're well aware that Miles Hanberg and I have been looking at the possibility of increasing water resources on the Book Cliffs. One of the things that caught my attention recently is that the Bitter Creek is going dry every year in the fall. With the exception of a place or two, at or about Cooper Canyon, Nelson Canyon. No water downstream for our deer or elk, or other critters. When I was a boy, there was a significant stream of water and I don't remember ever seeing it dry. Last spring I noticed that the beaver have extended the length of that swamp nearly half a mile up in that country. Is anybody trapping and controlling the number of beaver? In light of the drought situation we've been in for years and the swamp has increased by 1/3, we're getting a lot less water. Is there a possibility that we could reduce the number of beaver or help the stream flow longer?

Kevin Christopherson: I don't know the particulars about that area but the watershed initiative laws focused primarily on sagebrush steppe areas, but we're starting to look a little bit more now at riparian issues, so you're going to see areas along streams as well. If they're able to capture water during the wet time of the year it can soak into the bank and raise the water level so beaver can actually help the situation. So you have to look at it by a case by case situation.

J.C. Brewer: There is a lot less outflow in that same area. I noticed your folks have been doing some irrigation with little to no success because of such a little amount of water.

Kevin Christopherson: We need to start looking at that. The watershed in general has helped a lot of streams. On the other side, on the Cunningham ranch, we have some flows that we haven't had in years before that. We'll have to get with you and start looking at that.

Ryan Thornock (Utah Farm Bureau): We don't have any concerns with the beaver plan as presented. We appreciate the damage and nuisance elements of the plan. That's helpful to landowners. We also recognize the importance of beavers to the ecology. We would like to stress with these translocation efforts that the landowners will be contacted and worked with. They can offer a lot of historical perspective and I think that's valuable. We'd hate to recreate a problem. We really don't have any concerns with it. We just want to emphasize that there's been a lot of time and expense being involved with trying to control them. My dad went after a beaver with a backhoe. He lost and the beaver won.

Comments from the RAC:

None

Meeting adjourned 8:45 pm

Next RAC meeting: February 11, 2010

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
Cedar City Middle School
Cedar City, UT
December 8, 2009
7:00 p.m.**

1. REVIEW & ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES AND AGENDA

MOTION: To accept minutes and agenda as written.

VOTE: Unanimous.

2. BEAR PROCLAMATION & RULE R657-33

MOTION: to accept the Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 as presented with the exception that the spring season be extended by one week for all of the Southern Region units. Also that pack size not be limited for hunting, only for pursuit.

VOTE: Unanimous.

3. STATEWIDE BEAVER MANAGEMENT PLAN

MOTION: To accept the Beaver Management Plan with the exception of adding a translocation site at the head of the east fork of the boulder.

VOTE: Unanimous.

4. SOUTHERN REGION RAC SCHEDULE FOR 2010

MOTION: To accept the Southern Region RAC Schedule for 2010 as presented.

VOTE: Unanimous.

**Southern Regional Advisory Council Meeting
 Cedar City Middle School
 Cedar City, UT
 December 8, 2009
 7:00 p.m.**

RAC Members Present	DWR Personnel Present	Wildlife Board Present	RAC Members Not Present
Chairman Steve Flinders Layne Torgerson Dale Bagley Steve Dalton Sam Carpenter Paul Briggs Dell LeFevre Clair Woodbury	Douglas Messerly Giani Julander Lynn Chamberlain Brian Shearer Teresa Bonzo Justin Dolling	Jake Albrecht Tom Hatch	Rex Stanworth Cordell Pearson

Steve Flinders called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 20 interested parties in attendance in addition to RAC members, members of the Wildlife Board, and Division employees. Steve Flinders introduced himself and asked RAC members to introduce themselves. Steve Flinders explained RAC meeting procedures.

Steve Flinders: Let's get things started folks; it's 7 o'clock. Appreciate everybody coming out tonight

on a cold wintery night. Restrooms are out the hall; out to the intersection and down to your left. We'll take a break in a couple of hours if we're here that long. My name's Steve Flinders, I'm the RAC chair. I represent the Dixie and Fishlake National Forest. We'll have the RAC introduce itself. We'll start on my left down here.

Layne Torgerson: Layne Torgerson from Richfield, I represent the sportsman.

Dale Bagley: Dale Bagley from Marysvale, elected official.

Sam Carpenter: Sam Carpenter from Kanab, I represent the sportsman.

Douglas Messerly: My name's Doug Messerly, I'm the regional supervisor with the Division of Wildlife. My staff and myself serve as executive secretary to this council, nonvoting.

Paul Briggs: I'm Paul Briggs; I represent the BLM here in Cedar City.

Dell LeFevre: Dell LeFevre, I represent the ranchers, farmers, and anybody that has trouble with elk.

Clair Woodbury: I'm Clair Woodbury from Hurricane; I represent the public at large, especially those that love elk.

Steve Flinders: I want to recognize a couple of Wildlife Board members: We've got Jake Albrecht and Tom Hatch, on the back row. We appreciate you guys coming out tonight. Let me talk a little bit about how this meeting is going to proceed. We'll first have presentations from the Division of Wildlife and ask for your, if you can be quit and respect the presenter and we'll give plenty of time for questions afterward. After questions I'll ask for comments, and I ask that you please fill out a comment card. We'll follow three minutes for individuals and five minutes for groups. The officer on the side over here can show you what a comment card looks like. Get those filled out and up front if you would. We'll then proceed to discussion by the RAC and motions and voting. With that I'm ready for acceptance of the RAC agenda and minutes, guys. Sam.

Review and Acceptance of Agenda and Minutes (action)

Sam Carpenter: I second that. I recommend that we accept the minutes and the agenda as presented.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Sam. Seconded by Paul. Those in favor? It's unanimous.

Sam Carpenter made the motion to accept the agenda and minutes as presented. Paul Briggs seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Wildlife Board Update: -Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: Give you a rundown on the Board meeting last week. It was quite eventful.

- Most of the items discussed down here went through the Wildlife Board quite well. The unit by unit hunt structure for 2011 was discussed more than briefly, in fact it's going to be looked at again, a chance for folks to look at it

as a way of an informational item, it sounds like next summer. So it's on the Wildlife Board's action log. And unanimously placed on the action log by the Wildlife Board.

- One thing I need to bring to your attention, there's a new sheep unit, apparently on the Zion. And perhaps, Doug in your regional update you can talk about the results of that survey. I was put on the spot as to whether we wanted to go on in support of having a hunt on the new Zion unit. I spoke for you guys and said it was probably wouldn't look an opportunity like that in a bad light. So that passed.
- The statewide deer hunt is five days long with nine days for youth, and just three days long on the five units that we saw and were brought before us during the RAC, those units that are under objective. I think the Monroe being one of those down here.
- They also passed a motion that dealt with requesting the Division bring them a three-year guidebook in 2011. So we'll see if that happens, a three-year proclamation. I remember a two-year proclamation and we didn't get through the first year.

Steve Flinders: Anyway that's all I've got for the Wildlife Board update, unless anybody has any questions. All right Doug, what's going on with the Southern Region?

Regional Update:

-Douglas Messerly, Regional Supervisor

Douglas Messerly: Thanks Steve.

- With regard to the Zion Desert Bighorn Sheep unit; in the 70's we transplanted some desert bighorn sheep into Zion National Park in an effort to reestablish them in historic range. Those sheep didn't do much for many years. But of late we've started to get sightings outside of the park and they seem to be doing real well and expanding. As a result of those sightings, etc, we've commissioned a flight in cooperation with Zion National Park to try and census the unit of sheep both within the park and without the park. To our pleasant surprise we counted 240 animals. As we've discussed in the past it's difficult for us to count all of the big game animals from an aircraft and the sightability on desert bighorns, in particular, is quite low. So what we can tell you is there's at least 240 sheep, probably more. And they're about split evenly between those inside the park and those outside the park. It's the opinion of our biologist that taking a few rams on those units, on that unit is probably not going to be an issue biologically. Unfortunately we got that information just two days before our last RAC meeting and so it was difficult for us to formulate a recommendation to present to you guys at the time. However, between that RAC meeting and the Board meeting the information got out and it was actually recommended by (Unintelligible) that we open the unit this year and the Division of Wildlife's in agreement that we can do it. Now permit numbers will be set at our regular bucks and bulls meeting later in the year or earlier next year, and so the permit numbers have not been

established. But in order to get it in the proclamation so that people knew to apply for it they had to be approved at this last Board meeting. It's actually a good thing. We've got a lot of work to do in terms of working out a management plan. We've got some collaboration and cooperation with the land management agencies, including the park. We share this herd to some extent with Arizona and Kaibab band of the Piute tribe. So there's some work that we need to do in terms of coming up with a management plan. But it's very likely that we'll be able to harvest a few sheep off of that unit. For those that aren't familiar with where they are it's the Kanan Mountain area behind Hilldale, Colorado City, all the way into the Barricks and Mineral Bench, if you know where that is in Kane County and Washington Counties.

- In addition to that I wanted to remind the council and the public that the turkey application period this year for turkey permits in the spring for those limited entry units is December 10th through the 28th. I try to tell people when it's Christmas time you've got to think about turkeys. So remember to do that if you have an interest in applying.
- Antlerless hunts are in full swing now, primarily the elk antlerless hunts they're going on all over the region. This snow will probably help hunter success on many of the units. On some of the units it will hurt but on many of the units this will help and it's what a lot of people have been waiting for. So away we go.
- Finally our annual pronghorn trap is going to commence tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock on Jakes Knoll on the Parker Mountain. We've talked about it with this council many times. Our efforts there are to reduce the population and manage that wildlife. This year those pronghorn are going within Utah to the Northeastern Region, the Vernal area, the Central Region our west of Utah Lake, the Dugway area, as I understand it. I'm not sure exactly where they're going there. And then we're moving a few south onto the monument, I think 25 head onto the monument. So we hope to catch 325 pronghorn tomorrow. Anybody that would like to join us is welcome to come on up. We're starting at 8:00. It's expected to be -5. And I understand there's about six inches of fresh cold snow up there.

Douglas Messerly: If there are any questions I'll be glad to answer them Mr. Chairman, but other than that that's what I have.

Steve Flinders: Any questions for Doug? All right then, let's move on to agenda item 5, Bear Proclamation and Rule. Justin Dolling.

Bear Proclamation & Rule R657-33 (action) 9:43 to 26:06 of 1:50:46
-Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator
(see attachment 1)

Steve Dalton arrived during the bear presentation

Steve Flinders: Any Questions from the RAC for Justin?

Questions from the RAC:

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Thanks Justin that was a great presentation. Do we have any estimates on what our total bear population is in this state? Do we keep track of anything like that or attempt to count?

Justin Dolling: We have some rough estimates. I almost hate to give them to you because bears are very difficult to survey. We have a study now that's hopefully going to provide us some density estimates that we can then extrapolate and try to get a feel for how many bears we have in the state. But our last estimate, which was probably generated ten years ago, would suggest there are somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 bears, plus or minus a thousand.

Sam Carpenter: And we feel they're on the increase, is that true?

Justin Dolling: I feel like bears are doing well in the state. And based on our plan and our performance targets we've been well below the 40 percent females on the harvest. Our average age is well above five. And our adult survival is above 78 percent. So based on that it would suggest the bears are doing quite well.

Sam Carpenter: One more quick question. You suggested there that you had a lot of complaints from the public during these pursuits. What kind of complaints are those? Are they too noisy or just that they're in the area? I don't, I'm not sure.

Justin Dolling: Yeah that's a good question, and I should have touched upon that in the presentation. We received complaints about the noise associated with hounds in campground, improved campgrounds at all hours of the night. The noise associated with hounds during pursuit. Dogs running through improved cabin areas. Dogs scattering livestock. Dogs running through improved campgrounds. And just a lot of disruptive activity when folks were out there trying to recreate.

Sam Carpenter: Doesn't that suggest that these are the same people that are complaining because the bears are there in the first place and want them out? I mean isn't that generally the people that complain and want the bears taken away; the people camping and the people that have residences and have bears present?

Justin Dolling: I don't know that we've had a category of folks that complain about bears being; not wanting bears to be taken out. We've had incidences where bears and humans have come in contact with one another. But I don't know that I would say that our recreational users are suggesting we remove more bear.

Sam Carpenter: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Other questions? Go ahead Paul.

Paul Briggs: Justin I was wondering, you were showing a graph earlier that said your complaints or bear encounters with people was up the last few years. Do you have that data by region or is it statewide?

How does that number reflect here in the Southern Region?

Justin Dolling: I apologize I don't have that by region. That's a statewide bar. Teresa may be able to give us a feel for whether the complaints were up or down in this region last year.

(Teresa Bonzo motioned that they are up.)

Steve Flinders: Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: This extended season on bear; what are the dates on that extended season?

Justin Dolling: It would be a seven-day extension. It would go into the first week in June.

Steve Dalton: So the rest of the permits in the rest of the areas here will end the first of June or the end of May?

Justin Dolling: Yeah, it will be the end of May.

Steve Dalton: Okay. Was there consideration for the Boulder Mountain unit to have an extended season?

Justin Dolling: That extended season primarily targets areas where we have chronic livestock issues.

Steve Dalton: That's what I was talking about.

Justin Dolling: I'm not familiar with the Boulder, but the Boulder is not included at this point.

Steve Dalton: Okay.

Steve Flinders: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah Justin, one question I had; it appears that those three summer pursuit areas have been having some trouble. If we limit those areas, and maybe the houndsman when they address us tonight can answer this question, will those efforts be moved to other regions and cause a perceived problem? Or is that just a, I guess at this time.

Justin Dolling: We're not quite sure what the trickle out effect may be. We did include the Bookcliffs because we felt like that's an area where most folks could agree that pressure may shift. I can see pressure possibly shifting onto the Boulders and onto the Manti but we just don't have a good feel at this point.

Clair Woodbury: Just have to wait and see what happens.

Justin Dolling: Yeah, exactly.

Steve Flinders: Justin, I've got a question about that pursuit survey that you mentioned. That was of everyone that had a pursuit permit. Is that right? Did you look at a subset of those who had kill permits or is that for all pursuit permit holders?

Justin Dolling: That was just for pursuit permit holders. And we did two surveys and they produced a little different result. We did a phone survey, which we've been doing for a long time now, and we shifted over to an Internet based survey. And the gal that did our survey work felt like she had more confidence in the Internet based survey.

Steve Flinders: I'd be curious to know of those who had harvest permits had, you know, what their pack sizes were.

Justin Dolling: We didn't ask that question of the harvest permit holders. And in fact this last year was the first year we asked the question: How many hounds do you run during a pursuit? So we only have one year worth of data on that.

Steve Flinders: One other change with these limited entry or restricted pursuit units, you don't need to have one of those permits if you're a legitimate bona fide outfitter and a guide, accompanied by a hunter, is that right?

Justin Dolling: And compensated greater than \$100.00 dollars, correct.

Steve Flinders: So those are limiting the casual pursuit person, typically.

Justin Dolling: The recreational pursuer, yeah.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Did I see another hand? Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I don't know if this is the right time but in looking over my packet, but on the separate units and the proposed permit numbers for those units, and maybe it's because I'm new, but I noticed that the Beaver and the Pahvant were set up as a same unit. Is there a reason why we can't have a hunt on the Pahvant and a hunt on the Beaver? I mean, Teresa maybe you can answer that.

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah. Several years ago we didn't even have a hunt on the Fillmore Pahvant. We could break it up. It was probably two or three years ago we started getting a complaint or two on the Pahvant so we decided maybe this should be a hunted unit. But I mean it's not worthy of a whole lot of tags. So we thought we could just combine it with the Beaver. The majority of those hunters are going to be hunting on the Beaver but there's really no reason that we couldn't break it out and just put like one or two tags. We just have to shift the tags, one or two on the Fillmore Pahvant and the majority down on the Beaver.

Layne Torgerson: that's what I was thinking was it would be easier to enforce, I guess, if a guy drew a permit on the Pahvant and he had to hunt the Pahvant. Where, I mean if he drew a permit on . . .

Teresa Bonzo: Yeah, with bear we also have Panguitch Lake and the Zion combined as well. So it gives them I guess a little more flexibility of where they want to go. There's not a big reason why.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions? Go ahead Dale.

Dale Bagley: On your pursuit the eight-hound limit, does that, that's the total you can have in your

possession while you're out or is that the total you can have in pursuit but you can have more in the truck not in pursuit?

Justin Dolling: Yeah. Our intent there was that would be the maximum number of hounds you could have chasing a bear.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC?

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Okay, we'll open it up for questions from the public. If you could come to the mic and give us your name and just questions right now please.

Brian Johnson: Brian Johnson is the name. I've got a handful of questions. You guys started an experimental extended season date for a week and you shifted the mortality from you guys to the sportsman just, I mean just like that, is what the graph showed, right? Is it a pretty substantial switch?

Justin Dolling: Well it would be not only from us but primarily wildlife services.

Brian Johnson: Wildlife Services. And that's what I'm saying when I say you guys, I mean the Division. Do you have the data on Southern Utah areas like the Boulders? I mean Steve brought out the great point, the Boulders. How many bears were taken on the Boulders besides versus hunters versus Wildlife Services; or the Panguitch Zion, or these other units? I'm just wondering, these units in the south, I think there are a lot of guys that run sheep and it doesn't make sense to me why we don't extend the, extend it a week, extend the season a week statewide and shift this mortality rate to sportsman versus Wildlife Services. And one more week actually does quite a bit when you're hunting bears as far as access goes and other things. So I'm just wondering if there's, I mean you can have the mic if . . .

Justin Dolling: Essentially we're trying to just focus in on the chronic problem areas; and chronic meaning long-term problem areas that have been a real problem in the past. And whenever you start to hunt bears later in the spring your percent female in the harvest goes up. And on those chronic problem areas we have seen a percent female in the harvest go up, although we are shifting some of that harvest from, primarily Wildlife Services, which is not affiliated with us, but we have a memorandum of understanding with Wildlife Services to protect livestock into the sport harvest category. I guess a short answer to your question is the units you mentioned probably don't have the levels of livestock take that move it into the chronic category in our mind.

Brian Johnson: Dell, in your opinion what would constitute a chronic; how many dollars do you have to lose to be considered chronic? Just curious.

Dell LeFevre: One dollar for me.

Brian Johnson: Fair enough. I think, like I said, you guys can make recommendations as you'd like but the Panguitch Zion unit, two bears were harvested this year on the Panguitch Zion this spring.

Steve Flinders: Let's stay with questions for a minute Brian. Do we have Wildlife Services take data for the Southern Region? Has there been mortality associated this year with Wildlife Services or nuisance

bears?

(Teresa Bonzo nodded yes.)

Justin Dolling: I have that information; it'll take a while to look through it.

Steve Flinders: It looks like we're going to be digging into it. If you can just give us some of that, even off the cuff would be helpful. Any other questions Brian?

Brian Johnson: Yeah I got a couple more. Has the Division, I mean it sounds like the Boulder unit it's a spot and stock. They're recommending us, not the Boulder, sorry. Book Cliffs, they're recommending a spot and stock hunt. Has the Division considered any other units of selling tags over the counter for spot and stock either for archery or for other opportunity that the success rate's going to be fairly minimum and the impact's going to be fairly minimum? Have they considered anything like that?

Justin Dolling: This to my knowledge is the first spot and stalk hunt we've recommended. And so we're starting into this slowly. Road-less areas are kind of unique in respect that they're difficult to get into, they don't get a lot of pressure from hounds currently, people aren't baiting bears there, so it's a logical place to try to spot and stock and see if it catches on. We don't even know how many people would have an interest in spot and stock hunting only.

Steve Flinders: Doug, have you got something to add?

Doug Messerly: In addition to what Justin said, any bear permit can be used as a spot and stock permit. You don't have to use dogs or bait to take a bear.

Brian Johnson: Absolutely, just your percentage goes up dramatically if you're using bait or dogs. I mean bears aren't a historically animal that people see out in the woods. So it's a tough one to spot and stock. So my opinion, I was just thinking tag sales would be high for you know, harvest would be low so it's a money maker is all my thoughts were. Um, I have a question on, we close the season during the big game hunts on bears. Why do we close the season outright? Why can't we leave it, I can understand why we close it for dogs but why can't we leave it open for spot and stock and for bait? I don't think that would have that many complaints on spot and stock bear hunters or bait bear hunters during the big game hunts. Has there been a lot of complaints about those two particular aspects of bear hunting? I think they wear hunter orange. I mean if it's rifle you have to all day, I mean no matter what you're using.

Steve Flinders: Do you want to field that question Justin about, we close the hunt statewide, we close the hunt statewide . . . Well I was going to say Justin do you want to field that questions? I was going to repeat his question about . . .

Justin Dolling: No I can go ahead and field the question. Yeah, primarily that October month was removed from the bear hunt season due to the conflict with big game hunters. And with the hounds running out in the woods during the big game hunts and folks out trying to pursue big game, there were conflicts there. So that season was split. There's a, as I pulled up the slide, there's an early part to that fall hunt and then in November there's a later part. We've not considered allowing spot and stock during big game, during the month of October. There'd be some issues that would have to be worded

through if that was to be considered; like hunter orange.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions Brian?

Brian Johnson: How many do I get?

Steve Flinders: You can have one more.

Brian Johnson: Just one? Okay, let me go through my list and see what the most (unintelligible). Is there any data on how many fawns or calves the mortality rate from bears on fawns and calves? I mean, because I know in Idaho there's areas that have 70 percent fawn mortality and calf mortality from bears and those are the areas that are two bear tags. Is there any, is there any data on that?

Justin Dolling: I'm currently aware of three studies here in Utah; and vertebrates do make up a portion of the bear's diet. It's a very small portion. And those vertebrates include porcupine, rodents, mule deer, and livestock. But primarily bears are omnivores and based on our bear densities, in my opinion, don't have much of an impact on fawns or calves.

Brian Johnson: Thanks for your time guys. That was my question.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any more questions from the public? We got one more question from the RAC here, Layne go ahead.

Layne Torgerson: I just want to intercede. This is informational only. I've guided on a very large ranch in New Mexico for 18 years. And they did a study this last year, they have a resident elk herd that lives right there on the ranch, just right around the lodge. The wildlife manager and the game manager caught and tagged ten elk calves last spring, as they hit the ground. And they followed those ten calves throughout the summer. Of those ten calves three of them they know were taken by bears. One was taken by a golden eagle, one was drown in the river, and one they don't know what happened to it. They never did find the tracking device, it was implanted. So to answer Brian's question, or to just for some input, you know just from that, that's a real closed controlled environment, I understand that, but bears do take elk calves. And they tend to, on the ranch down there they tend to hone in on those calving areas. When those elk go to those calving areas you'll see an influx of bears. And bears and coyotes and mountain lions come to those areas.

Steve Flinders: Good exchange, let's keep moving on. I've observed some of the same things in Idaho. Any other questions from the public? Let's move on to comment cards then.

Comments from the public:

Steve Flinders: First one's from Jason Binder, Utah Federation of Houndsman. Next will be Chet Young. One of you guys want to take the five minutes for the Federation of Houndsman? You got it.

Jason Binder, Utah Federation of Houndsmen: (See attachment 2) Thank you for your time. My name is Jason Binder. I'm the president of the Utah Federation of Houndsman. Today I'll be representing a Utah Federation of Houndsman and the Northern Big Game Hunt Association out of Morgan. I've give out copies to the paper I'm going to talk about to most of you folks. Steve Dalton didn't get one. But

we're requesting that the Division leave the tag numbers the same for bear for this year. Right now we've got studies going on in Kamas and four other units in the state to where Jordan Pederson, he's been a part of the Division a long time, he is uh, and some other folks are doing studies to actually determine bear densities. And over the last couple of years we have already increased tags over 20 percent in the last two years. So we'd like to see those tags remain the same as last year. And also I'd like to address the limited entry summer pursuit season. There's been a lot of concern through members of our club on behalf of what's going on on those units. First of all we'd like to see a split on the San Juan unit. It's a great big unit. I don't know if many of you are very familiar with that. But on that unit it splits Elk Ridge and the Blue Mountains, there's what you call the Causeway. And we'd like to see a split on that unit and make it two different units for the, just for the summer training season, and allow only ten, ten residents to hunt the Blue side at a time, and twenty residents on the Elk Ridge side of that unit. That way it takes more hunters away from the Monticello where we're having a lot of problems with the all the complaints. And we've also put together a little graph on here that we'd like to split that summer training season in half. The date that is July 10th through August 8th, we would like to see that split in half. And take for example the Book Cliffs where 25 residents could go hunt on that unit the first 15 days and then 25 residents could go hunt the second 15 days. That way we are given the opportunity for residents and nonresidents both to be able to have the opportunity to hunt. And on the graph I've broken out all four of those units. You can see what we've done on there. As far as the dog restrictions, most of the complaints have come from that Monticello area. And as far as the eight-dog limit, we'd like to just see that go for the limited entry units, eight dogs, and the rest of the state stay the same as it was last year. And during the harvest season, in the spring and fall, we'd like to see that stay the same where people have the opportunity to harvest a big bear whether they have eight dogs or fifteen dogs. And we feel that that will help harvest more mature bears and it will also be able enable the state to harvest the bears they're wanting to harvest with sport harvest. Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Chet, followed by Brian Johnson.

Chet Young, Utah Federation of Houndsmen: I'm not going to take a lot of time. I agree with everything Jason said. I met with Kevin and Justin, here a week or so ago. And it seems like most of the phone calls and the complaints were on the San Juan unit on the Blue side of the mountain. So we wanted to keep the numbers low with our proposal and keeping it in line with his. But a lot of houndsman are family hunters and they hunt with their friends. We go out and we hunt as a group. And by making it a draw and only being able to run eight dogs, it limits the amount of us that can hunt together. That's why we're asking statewide, during the summer training, to leave that at no limit on the dogs except for on the three units that have a problem; so we can still go somewhere else and hunt with our family and friends. And that's all I have.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Chet.

Brian Johnson, Utah Bowman's Association: Brian Johnson. I'm here representing Utah Bowman's Association. They would like to recommend that the season extend seven days statewide like these areas they talk about, the other four or five areas they have, extend those statewide. And I'm just a little confused. I was going to ask this question but I've asked like thirty so I'll . . . The eight dogs, that was during the hunting season too? Yeah, we'd like to recommend that during the hunting you can drop as many dogs as you'd like; just because these big bears are tough to kill with dogs. You know, you've got to keep fresh dogs on them. So that's our recommendations.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Brian. We'll open it up for RAC discussion and a motion

John Keeler: (speaking from audience) Steve I have a comment.

Steve Flinders: You do?

John Keeler: (inaudible from audience).

Steve Flinders: John Keeler, come on up.

John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau: Can we get that information on the Wildlife Services take first?

Steve Flinders: Sure. Wildlife services mortality in the Southern Region units that you've got.

Teresa Bonzo (speaking from the audience).

Steve Flinders: We've heard the Boulder and we've heard the Panguitch Zion unit.

Teresa Bonzo: (Speaking from the audience, inaudible).

Steve Flinders: Come up to the mic John.

John Keeler: John Keeler with the Utah Farm Bureau. We generally support the recommendations but we have had more reports of bear interactions with livestock, particularly sheep, as any year that we've had in a long time. With some sheep herds and those areas reporting that several bears were taken. I called Wildlife Services today and talked to Jerrod. He just gave me the state figures. He said that there was, he wasn't quite sure but somewhere between forty-seven and fifty that were taken in 2009. Although he said it's their fiscal year so it doesn't jive necessarily with the calendar year. But in a fifteen year their average, or they've had the high of 62 and a low of 18 which give an average of about 40. So 47 to 50 is above their average. And he indicated that 22 were taken south of Salt Lake and 28 north of Salt Lake. In looking at the recommendations it looks like the central and the other regions except the northern have about 15 percent plus which we would support. But in these areas where there have been this predation by bear in these sheep herd areas, we need to be concerned about that and take those numbers; and of course Wildlife Services does that, as does DWR, in cooperation with them. But it looks like in those problem areas they've had a 20 percent plus problem with what they they've had in the past. So we are concerned about that and would recommend that those areas be watched. Some sheep operations have had 40 percent loss of their lambs, which is just unbearable almost for them. So there have been problems there.

Sam Carpenter: Is this due to bear?

John Keeler: Yes, these are bear.

Sam Carpenter: And did I understand you correctly that you are agreeing and going along with the DWR recommendation or the houndsman?

John Keeler: We would support as many numbers as we can get, and if they're taken by sportsman that's

fine, if you want to move that pressure from Wildlife Services . . . It's a little more difficult to get hunters immediately, according to some, immediately on the spot rather than Wildlife Services. Because when you have bear in those sheep herds you've got to get them out right away.

Teresa Bonzo: John, just to answer your question. For the Monroe we had one depredation kill. For Mt. Dutton we had one depredation, Wildlife Services kill. And for the Boulder we had one. Four were in that depredation other category, but one was Wildlife Services or livestock related. The other ones we had some campers. So those are the three that we've got in the Southern Region taken by Wildlife Services for depredation.

Steve Flinders: Are the nuisance bears on top of that Teresa, do you recall? There was one on the Beaver unit that I recall last summer.

Teresa Bonzo: This one doesn't include nuisance.

Steve Flinders: Go from memory. We trust your memory.

Teresa Bonzo: (Off the mic) Marysvale.

Steve Flinders: We need you at the mic., microphone.

Justin Dolling: You're just talking just specifically for the Southern Region?

Steve Flinders: Southern Region. We're apparently going to debate permit numbers here for a minute. The houndsman are proposing that you stay at the '09 numbers.

Justin Doling: Hang on; I think I might have it.

Douglas Messerly: Teresa, if you can just relate to us in the microphone the number of animals that authorized to kill. I think the Marysvale was it.

Teresa Bonzo: Marysville. I know we investigated one in Kimberly. But we actually took action and removed one in Marysvale. We called a sportsman to kill a nuisance one on the Paunsagaunt. There wasn't anything at Parker . . .

Layne Torgerson: Teresa wasn't there a camper . . . If I remember right there was one in the newspaper, on the news, at Barker Reservoir.

Teresa Bonzo: Oh at Barker, yes. There was a camper at Barker.

Layne Torgerson: A camper that took a bear at Barker Reservoir.

Teresa Bonzo: Uh huh, down off the edge of Johns Valley. A rancher took one there. So we've got nuisance and other take.

Douglas Messerly: There are several categories. But I guess all those included there were ten or less bears taken by campers, Division of Wildlife and Wildlife services in the Southern Region, which

comprises one third of the geographic area of Utah.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Doug. So the slide that you see there now, I presume all the Southern Region units are included in that slide. And so you can see based on the criteria it looks like we exceed, or at least meet or exceed all the criteria in a management plan. I apologize again John for missing that comment card. We'll get you on Beaver for sure.

RAC Discussion and Vote:

Steve Flinders: Comments, discussion, go ahead Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I just had one question for Justin. If what John was saying was right, Wildlife Services took about 24 bears north of Salt Lake, and there's only 16 permits for the Northern Region, is there a reason that we couldn't up those numbers on that?

Justin Dolling: I'm going off of memory here a little bit but I was Wildlife Services at the cattleman's convention, and I want to say Jerrod said they took about 43 bears statewide. The majority of those bears were taken out of the Manti Strawberry valley.

Clair Woodbury: So 24 wasn't, that was not the right number then north of Salt Lake?

John Keeler (speaking from audience)

Clair Woodbury: And there are 16 tags for the Northern Region. I was just wondering, it seemed like a lot of bears taken by the service.

Justin Dolling: Yeah, the Northern Region has very little depredation take, it's primarily in the Central Region and the Southeastern Region.

Clair Woodbury: Okay.

Steve Flinders: You know there's a lot of changes proposed here tonight. Guys I wonder if we ought to break this down small. It's up to you whether you want to act on those limited entry units, all occur in the Southeast Region. Not that that matters a great deal, if you want to make a motion that includes those changes. It seems to make sense to limit, if there's conflicts to limit that pursuit based on that, maybe rather than pack size. I'm looking at the Federation of Houndsman; there are some statewide issues on there for us to look at. From a Forest Service point of view I'll get my comments out, we're probably most concerned when it comes to bears about public safety, next to that is managing quality habitat so we have a healthy bear population. And when it comes to management, hunting, you know to maximize recreational opportunity with, and I for the diverse groups that are out that and not conflicting, it doesn't sound like we have as the king number of conflicts in the Southern Region that we do in other parts of the state. From a personal point of view I've hunted bears quite a bit in Utah. The mature male I killed on the LaSal, there were 22 dogs on the ground by the time things were over and he never did go up a tree. Those guys knew that bear was in the area and it was something else. This last spring on the Beaver unit my wife was fortunate enough to harvest a ten-year-old mature male, another infamous bear in the community. And he'd killed a number of hounds and hadn't, I don't know that he'd ever had anybody take pictures of him in a tree. She killed him with a bow over bait. And it takes about ten years

to draw a tag in Utah for trophy bears; if you look at the guys with bonus points. So I'll leave those comments and open it up to the RAC. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: I seems to me that...I guess we got a question first, are most of the complaints we're getting are they concerning pursuit or are they concerning hunters?

Justin Dolling: The majority, as I understand it, is summer pursuit.

Steve Dalton: Okay. Well it seems to me that we ought to consider letting the hunters have as many hounds as they need to try to get one of these bigger bears. We've had some big bears on our grazing allotment on the east end of Boulder that we have not been able to tree and we have not been able to capture, and they have killed calves repeatedly. We've set a neck snare, ADC did for this bear, and he left with the neck snare never to be seen again. I don't know how you're going to get these bigger bears if you don't allow these hunters to have all the resources they can muster to try to get these big guys. Anyway that's just a comment that I had.

Steve Flinders: Do you want to clarify (unintelligible)?

Douglas Messerly: Yeah, please. Steve I'm frankly surprised to hear about 150 complaints, and I don't doubt that it happened but it's got to be mostly in the Southeastern Region. I'm not aware, Teresa are you, of any complaints we received from campers or non-hunters about hounds through camps this year?

Teresa Bonzo: No And I asked all the biologists and all of our law enforcement officers in the region if they've had any complaints about summer pursuit. And everyone that responded to me we've never heard a complaint in our region.

Douglas Messerly: As I understand it it's quite a show on the LaSal and Elk Ridge and that country in the springtime. But we haven't experienced that here in the Southern Region that I'm aware of.

Steve Flinders: Again, one of the best things that we've had to deal with bear nuisance bears on the two districts that I work on, are those guys that roll up the road at 6 o'clock in the morning in the middle of the summer, if there's a bear hanging around those disperse camp areas those guys training dogs are running them out. So I think it's a pretty good program that way. Anybody else have any comments? You're thinking about it down there Clair.

Clair Woodbury: I am. I'm just wondering if we can leave those three problem areas in the Southeastern Region to the Southeastern RAC and just move ahead and then make our proposals.

Steve Flinders: That's fine. Let's make sure and focus on or not leave out the statewide proposal from the Division on permit numbers and pack size.

Clair Woodbury: I'm not a bear hunter. I'm not comfortable making this proposal. Maybe there's not any bear hunters but you here Steve.

Steve Flinders; Yeah there is. Go ahead Steve.

Steve Dalton: I'm not a bear hunter but I'll make a proposal. I propose that we accept their recommendation as presented with the exception that we extend the spring season for all the Southern Region by a week. Give an opportunity for these hunters to keep working on the bears they're after, after the livestock go on the mountain. Most of these permits begin the first of June and the bear hunters are done the end of May. And as soon as my cattle show up on the mountain that's when we have the majority of our problems, is that first week those calves are on the mountain those bears are just schmucking them and we've lost our sportsman opportunity. The only thing we can do is ADC or my cowboys have always got a rifle with them. So I'd recommend that they extend that a week in the spring in the Southern Region.

Steve Flinders: I heard a motion in there. Any second?

Dell LeFevre: I'll second that motion.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dell. Giani, do you want to restate that motion? Did you get that?

Giani Julander: I have: accept the recommendation as presented with the exception that we extend the spring hunt by a week in all the Southern Region units. Is that right?

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Dell.

Steve Dalton: I'd like to add to that as well with the number of hounds permitted, at least on the hunt part of the unit. The pursuit I'm not so concerned with. But at least the hunters need to have the opportunity to use as many hounds as they need or as many as they can muster to try and get some of these bigger bears.

Steve Flinders: So if I restate that, an amendment to that motion is that pack size not be limited for those that have permits, kill permits.

Steve Dalton: That's correct, that's correct.

Steve Flinders: Harvest permits. Seconded by Sam. Any discussion? Other amendments? We've heard other things here tonight but we can pick them up in follow-up motions. Does everybody understand the motion? Go ahead Layne.

Layne Torgerson: I've got to think about this for a minute. I would like to amend the motion by making the Pahvant and the Beaver separate units.

Steve Flinders: Let's make that a follow-up motion. We've got a pretty big motion on the table. Hold on to that. Let's vote. Everybody clear on the motion on the table and the amendment? Do we need to restate them?

Clair Woodbury: Steve, could I make one comment on this before we vote? As far as Steve's recommendation we extend that by seven days, I can go along with that but Justin said that's when those she bears are getting killed. Let's make a note that we watch that carefully for the future.

Steve Flinders: So noted. Let's take a vote. All those in favor of the motion with the amendment, show

that by a raise of hands. Those against? It's unanimous. The amendment and the motion.

Steve Dalton made the motion to accept the Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 as presented with the exception that the spring season be extended by one week for all of the Southern Region units. Also that pack size not be limited for hunting, only for pursuit. Dell LeFevre seconded. Sam Carpenter seconded amendment regarding pack size. Motion with amendment passed unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Layne do you want to make another motion?

Layne Torgerson: Yeah. I'd like to make a motion that we look at the Pahvant/ Beaver unit as separate hunt units rather than combining them with the recommended permit numbers from the Division.

Steve Flinders: Some discussion?

Teresa Bonzo: Can I clarify? Since we are dealing with permit numbers on those units also, I believe it's eight and six for the combined.

Steve Flinders: We ought to talk a little about that.

Teresa Bonzo: I mean we could do one and one, for spring and fall for Pahvant. I'm a little uncomfortable doing that without any of my biologists here. They're all over in Torrey at the pre-trap meeting for our pronghorn. But we would have to decide our permit numbers as well. Doug did you have a comment?

Doug Messerly: I do. A little bit of history Layne . . . What happened, as Teresa pointed out corrected, is that we started to get some sightings. This is just north of I-70 in order to get onto the Pahvant. We started to get some sightings of some bears but they weren't very reliable sightings. And to date they're still not very reliable sightings. People were concerned that they had the opportunity to hunt on the Pahvant though. The problem with establishing it as its own unit and issuing permits is that you're sentencing a guy to hunt on a unit that may or many not have a bear on it. And so you end up selling a permit for a unit that's really not very attractive. And it may be very difficult. And with only one or two permits, as Teresa pointed out, it's unlikely that we'll get a bear harvested unless the right guy happens to draw the tag. As it is anybody, there's a much bigger opportunity for anybody who has a Beaver/Pahvant permit to be able to take advantage of a bear that shows up on the Pahvant in order to be able to harvest it. So I'm not sure what the objective of splitting the units would be. But the truth is that I don't think we've harvested a bear on the Pahvant yet even with this opportunity out there. And so what we're doing is creating a complication that limits opportunity and someone will burn their points on a tag for that unit that has very very few bears on it if any. So it's just some information I think you need to consider when considering that motion.

Layne Torgerson: Thanks for the clarification. And that makes more sense to me after it was clarified. I just didn't understand why we were splitting that unit. That was my main question, was what was the reason for splitting that or for combining those unit, I mean.

Steve Flinders: Those bears being transient from the Beaver unit. Do you still want to?

Layne Torgerson: So at this point can I withdraw my motion?

Steve Flinders: You can withdraw your motion.

Layne Torgerson: Thank you.

Steve Flinders: Without a motion. Anybody else want to make a motion? To remind you of some of the things we've heard about, the season ending in October for baiting and for spot and stock and for hounds. We dealt with dog restrictions, tag numbers. Go ahead Sam.

Sam Carpenter: I just want to thank you guys for coming and doing a presentation. I really feel like we don't really know that much about what's going on up north and the recommendations you made are valid and I see where you're coming from on those. But I feel like the reason things went the way they did tonight are because we have other RACs that can represent your recommendations much better than we would be able to. In all fairness I think we did the right thing by just leaving it alone but I hope you'll pursue your dreams on that.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Sam, well put. It sounds like we're ready to move on to agenda item 6, Statewide Beaver Management Plan. Justin you're up again.

Statewide Beaver Management Plan (action) 1:13:04 to 1:27:21 of 1:50:46
- Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator
(see attachment 1)

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Any questions from the RAC? Go ahead Sam.

Questions from the RAC:

Sam Carpenter: You mentioned new technology in non-lethal methods of breaking up these dams and managing these. Can you tough a little more on that? What are they doing with that?

Justin Dolling: Yeah, the trade name they use is Beaver Deceiver and essentially they're either a pond-leveling device that you install in the beaver dam. And there's a drain feature that sits in the ponded area with an outlet that flows out at the base of the dam. It kind of tricks the beaver. The beaver continues to maintain the dam at the current elevation but the water level doesn't go up during runoff events. There's another technique where you can create these trapezoid shaped features in the front of culverts and they deceive the beaver and the beavers don't want to build their dams right in the mouth of a culvert, they'll go upstream or downstream. And those have shown to be very effective. In fact they've had some in place for ten years and the annual maintenance is very minimal.

Sam Carpenter: And are we using any of these methods now in Utah? Is this something we're practicing or just future recommendations?

Justin Dolling: To my knowledge we're not used may of these. There may be a few examples in the state but the plan points at the need to explore these further and look for opportunities to use them, especially if they cost less money in the long run. So yeah the plan advocates the use when appropriate.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the RAC? Question from the public? Just questions concerning the beaver management plan.

Questions from the public:

Steve Flinders: Got a question? Come on up to the mic. Give us your name.

Mark Winch: My name's Mark Winch. We have land holdings here in the Southern Region and also over on the Fish Lake. My question is, since I don't have a plan, where are these beaver going to be located and transported to? Number one, and number two, I'd make the comment that while I can see that they are beneficial we've had experiences where in aspen groves they have totally destroyed an aspen grove. And at time of drought that we see right now those aspen trees are struggling to survive. The introduction of beaver in many locations is not a wise move at the time. Those are my comments and a question.

Justin Dolling: I guess to answer the question, I think as I understood it, where would those introductions occur: there is a list that's been appended to the plan, and I think you all have a copy of. I want to emphasize that's a list that is a starting point. It's a point at which we're going to start to communicate with folks that are associated with those drainages and see whether or not beaver would be appropriate to introduce into those areas that are currently void and have suitable habitat. The last thing we want to do is introduce beaver into an area where they create a problem for our agency. And so we're going to be looking at areas that have the possibility for low conflict, initially, and this list is just a starting point to get, that will lead to further coordination with those involved parties.

Steve Flinders: Question Steve?

Steve Dalton: Yes. This is your first beaver plan for the state then? You're just initiating this, is that, that's where it's at?

Justin Dolling: That's correct.

Steve Flinders: Any other questions from the public? We'll move on to comment cards.

Comments from the public:

Steve Dalton: John Keeler, followed by Robb MacWhorter

John Keeler, Utah Farm Bureau: As a member of the management plan committee we went over many, many, many issues. We would support the plan as it relates to the priority list for translocation or transplanting. We talked about some things that I think should be presented, one of those was that the areas that are looked at for transplanting or translocation should be areas first of all that land management agencies or landowners or concerned people they want them there. Areas where there would be minimal conflict or minimal damage in the second position. But to go with where they're wanted and where there are minimal problems, that was what the group talked about in looking at these areas where they could be translocated or transplanted. Also, as it relates to management of nuisance beaver that when there are problems with water right holders or private landowners those problems be immediately solved by the removal of those problem beaver, because they can be a huge problem and

the longer you wait the bigger problem it becomes.

Steve Flinders: Thanks John. Robb, followed by Mary O'Brien.

Robb MacWhorter, Dixie National Forest: Thank you Steve and the RAC. My name is Robb MacWhorter. I'm the forest supervisor on the Dixie National Forest here in Southern Utah. Would it be okay if Mike Golden follows me instead of Mary O'Brien? Is that okay because Mike and I were going to have comments together as far as the forest service. Is that okay?

Steve Flinders: If that's okay with Mary.

Robb MacWhorter: Is that okay Mary?

Steve Flinders: Sure that's fine.

Robb MacWhorter: Can I move this up? I have a back issue and I don't want to bend over. That's better. Thanks. So again, I'm Robb MacWhorter. Thank you very much for having me be a commenter. I have a couple of comments, one about personal as well about my professional career. I grew up in the great state of West Virginia back east. I was a starving student and one of the ways that I put myself through college was trapping beavers. So I have a knowledge about trapping beavers. I understand about the conflicts and the nuisance but I also understand the trapping issues from a recreational standpoint as well. If you look at the chart back where Justin was showing in the early '80's, late '70's, and again, it was \$25.00 a pelt when I took them to Canada. That was a lot of money for a starving student at that time. That's my personal knowledge about beavers. I'd like to talk about the forest service. We manage a number of resources on national forest land, public land, whether it be timber, wildlife, recreation, range or water. I would like to suggest that the strategy that Justin and the team have pulled together is a good strategy. It covers many of the areas that I believe that a strategy in management of beaver needs to cover. So I fully support what's currently in the strategy. I would like to talk about the ecological benefits. I know there are lots of nuisances but I want to talk about the ecological benefits first. In terms of those areas that I talked about that the forest service manages in terms of water and wildlife, beaver management specifically about the beavers themselves. They can provide quite a bit of recovery in terms of riparian areas, not only from a vegetation standpoint, species composition and integrity; as well as hydrological function in terms of increase of water quality and quantity. Water storage capacity within watersheds as well as they can also assist us in figuring out and working with the potential water releases at certain times of the year rather than it all happening at the beginning of a season or at the end of a season. They also create great wildlife diversity in terms of aquatic as well as terrestrial. So again, I support the plan from an ecological standpoint and from all the other strategies and management that Justin went over. I thought I would also mention that our new secretary of agriculture, one of his two high priority areas for the forest service is water and watershed management; and restoration of watersheds is part of that as well as local collaboration with local landowners and other agencies. And I see that this beaver management plan can accomplish both of those items. Just want to tell you that I'm committed as forest supervisor in the Dixie to make this happen. When I was a district ranger in the state of Oregon I was very successful working with groups just like this as well as the groups that Justin talked about in terms of turning what we used to call a nuisance beaver population into a very beneficial population, yet dealing with the controversial side as well as the beneficial side. I would like to say that not only am I committed in terms of approach because I work for the forest service but I'm also committed in terms of providing funding for things

like working to develop grants and proposals. I'm also very supportive of working with Justin and the Division in terms of figuring out where those habitats are that are low risk, so to speak, where we don't have issues with permittees and we don't have issues with water rights and we don't have issues with all those nuisance things in terms of engineering and roads. But again, I'm very interested in working with the Division in terms of identifying those very suitable habitats, as well as working with the partners that Justin went over. With that I'll close my comments. Thank you very much.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Mike.

Mike Golden, Dixie National Forest: I just want to echo Robb's sentiments. And I also want to thank you guys for having me comment. I also want to thank the Division. They actually have already contacted me. I'm the forest fish biologist for the Dixie National Forest. And I was contacted by Division biologists in the formation of the plan and already asked to provide some input on potential translocation streams. So I have confidence that throughout the implementation of this plan the appropriate people will be contacted to make sure we avoid these kinds of issues that have been brought up. I just want to quickly speak to the benefits that Robb alluded to in terms of watershed restoration from a fisheries and aquatic organism standpoint. On the Dixie we've got several sensitive species of aquatic species that aren't just trout. We also have some trout species that will benefit from beaver. While it was alluded to that there can be problems with trout passage there's also beaver ponds that provide habitat for trout during critical summer and wintertime. They provide a thermal refuge as well as cover. And we also have several species on the forest, particularly amphibian species, which have been in decline as beaver have been eliminated from certain areas and those ponds begin to go into disrepair. They use those areas for breeding. So I think that with the reintroduction and translocation of beaver into specific areas that are targeted to avoid problems and maximize aquatic benefit I think this plan will have a lot of success. And that's my comments. Thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thank you. Mary. And that's the last comment card I have so, if I didn't miss anybody.

Mary O'Brien, Grand Canyon Trust: Yeah, Mary O'Brian. I actually live in the Southeastern Region. I'll be at the RAC meeting tomorrow night over in Green River. But I, in my work with Grand Canyon Trust I've been spending a fair amount of time on the Fish Lake and Dixie looking at historical beaver habitat, currently active beaver habitat, looking at the sediment retention, the wetlands creation and so on. And served on the beaver advisory group. I just think the plan is rather remarkable in, as Justin mentioned beaver can be controversial, but I think this plan is pretty remarkable in addressing both the nuisance aspects or beaver leaving all options on the table for, all options available for removing beaver from conflict situations. And then also setting up the system via the looking for the sites where beaver would be beneficial, emphasizing that in those kinds of situations you may, it's wise for Utah to increase the skills of live trapping. I know one of the things we did early on during this process was bring, I brought Sherri Tippy from Colorado, who has live trapped about a thousand beavers in the last 20 years, and demonstrated how she does it. And about 22 Division folks came to her workshop and were pretty impressed with how she traps whole families at a time, moves them to preplanned sites where they'd be beneficial. And Sam you asked a question about the beaver flow control devices. The trust is going . . . early in 2010 we'll publish a booklet that we've been working with Sherri to write up because she has been building those flow control devices called the beaver deceiver and the castor master. Castor is the genus name of beaver. That's that pipe through the dam and also the trapezoidal structure in front of the culverts. And in that she'll put all the specifications and all the photographs of how that's being done. It actually was started by a fellow named Skip Lyle back in Vermont about 20 years ago. But he's such a

p[erfectionist that he's never gotten around to just flat out writing the specifications and how you build them. But this booklet will spell that out because she's worked with Skip Lyle on building some of these in Colorado. So I just do encourage the adoption of this plan because, as Justin can attest, the process went rather completely smoothly in accommodating both the need to control beaver where they're nuisance and also increase the restoration of beaver where they're wanted. Thanks.

Steve Flinders: Thanks Mary. That concludes public comments.

RAC discussion and vote:

Steve Flinders: RAC comments? Discussion? Go ahead Dell.

Dell LeFevre: I'm not against the plan' but I'm against where you're putting them. Number one, you're putting them in my water. Number two, why don't we put them to the east fork of the Boulder instead of in Chris Lake or to Kings Reservoir. Kings Reservoir has been dredged because of dam safety twenty years ago and they're going to back that up. Where they've really done the good is over in the east fork of the Boulder. Those meadows up there now water just runs straight through them and the little beaver ponds are gone. But Deer Creek Lakes a good place to put them because that water goes nowhere. I'm against putting them in Kings Reservoir, Chris Lake. If you're going to put them in Moseman Lake it's fine. And here about ten years ago you guys are good friends of Trout Unlimited went up and tore the dams out on Moseman and the other big pond going between Deer Creek Lake and Moseman Lake. They tore that beaver pond out; it was when they could kill the fish. All they done was killed the beaver and the fish still lived. Put that rotenone on them. But that would be my recommendation to change, put some up to the head of the east fork of the Boulder.

Steve Flinders: Clair.

Clair Woodbury: Yeah, I'd support Dell one hundred percent on that eastern part of the Boulder. I used to fish those beaver ponds and I was devastated when those were taken out. But other than that I think this is a fantastic plan. For many, many years I've been a huge supporter of beaver and expanding the beaver. I see what it does to the down stream, spring flows steady out a lot. I think this is nothing but a win win proposition and it's got my full support.

Steve Flinders: Anybody else want to comment? Sounds like we're ready for a motion guys.

Dell LeFevre: I'd make a motion we accept the beaver plan with one change, and that's to plant some beaver at the head of the east fork of the Boulder.

Steve Flinders: Seconded by Sam. Did you get that motion okay?

Giani Julander: I think so; the east fork of the head of the Boulder.

Dell LeFevre: Head of the east fork of the Boulder.

Douglas Messerly: The head of the east fork of the Boulder.

Giani Julander: Head of the east fork of the Boulder. Got it.

Steve Flinders: Discussion on the motion? We don't have any maps to show where that is, but it's been seconded. All right, let's take a vote. All those in favor of the motion? Any against? Unanimous.

Dell LeFevre made the motion to accept the Beaver Management plan as presented with the exception of adding a translocation site at the head of the east fork of the Boulder. Seconded by Sam Carpenter. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Thanks very much.

Other Business (contingent)
-Steve Flinders, Chairman

Steve Flinders: I've got one item of other business, behind your agenda that was provided to you tonight is a schedule for next year's meetings. You can see a column of 2009 locations and a column of 2010's proposed. I appreciated several of you getting back to me and commenting via e-mail as to whether to keep all of them in Beaver or whether to move them around. I don't know, hopefully this punishes everybody equally. I don't know, it's a lot of driving. I tried to keep big drives away from some of the winter meetings but it doesn't matter, it depends where you live. So hopefully we won't get too hot in the summer and we won't get run out by houseflies. We've done all that. So we need to pass this tonight, is that right Doug for the next year?

Douglas Messerly: Yeah.

Steve Flinders: April is the Antlerless, down here. September is Richfield. And February for non-consumptive. And I'll tell you right now that meeting's questionable whether we'll hold that. It doesn't sound like there's any statewide issue from the Division coming down. So it's whether we want to press Doug's folks into service to talk to us about tortoises or Virgin River fish. Enjoy the weather in St. George or Hurricane in February. We can talk about that later but it's the schedule that we . . . meeting down there. Sure Sam.

Clair Woodbury: So that's our next meeting is in Hurricane.

Steve Flinders: Yeah. We can do it via e-mail. We'll let you know we're going to have that meeting or not. Let me know your thoughts and interest in That was our thought in putting that meeting down there. Sure Sam.

Sam Carpenter: Can we move one of the meetings you got in Beaver and put Hurricane down there then if we're not going to have that meeting or if it gets changed?

Steve Flinders: Well we could. I struggled with which meeting to move down there. I hate to move something from an interest group, one of the fishing meetings might make sense to have down there. You could do the May meeting down there. We can have them all in Switzerland. Doug calls Beaver Switzerland. It's a long ways from Enterprise.

Douglas Messerly: Beaver's neutral.

Steve Flinders: Beaver's neutral. And it's a five minutes commute for me.

Clair Woodbury: Steve this schedule looks great. I make a motion that we accept it as a RAC.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Clair. Seconded by Sam. Those in favor? Any against? Unanimous.

Clair Woodbury made the motion to accept the Southern Region RAC schedule for 2010 as presented. Sam Carpenter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Steve Flinders: Motion to adjourn?

Dell LeFevre: I move.

Steve Flinders: Motion by Dell. Seconded by Clair. I got to look your way more often. Sorry man.
Dell LeFevre made the motion to adjourn, Clair Woodbury seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:51 pm

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
December 9, 2009 ☞ 6:30 p.m.

Motion Summary

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: To accept the agenda as written

Approval of November 4, 2009 minutes

MOTION: To accept the minutes as written

Passed unanimously

Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33

Motion was made by Derris Jones that all Book Cliffs permits be valid for the entire unit with additional spot and stalk permits valid only for the roadless area(this motion is missing from the motion summary)

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed with a majority vote. Wayne Hoskisson cast an opposing vote.

Motion was made by Blair Eastman that eight dogs be the limit on the spring hunt and pursuit, eight dogs during the summer, and then back to 12 dogs in the fall.

Seconded by Derris Jones(I think it was only summer pursuit that had the 8 dog limit but not positive)

Motion passed with two opposing votes cast by Kevin Albrecht and Wayne Hoskisson.

MOTION: To split the San Juan unit into the Elk Ridge and Blue Mountains unit and to split the seasons as recommended by the Utah Federation of Houndsmen with the following number of permits: 15 resident permits on the Book Cliffs for both seasons, 15 resident permits on Elk Ridge for both seasons, 5 resident permits on the Blue Mountains for both seasons, 12 resident permits on the LaSals for both seasons, and the non-residents would have 2 permits on the Book Cliffs for both seasons, one permit for the second season, two non-resident permits on Elk Ridge for both seasons, one non-resident permit on the Blue Mountains for both seasons.

Passed with one opposing vote

MOTION: To accept the remainder of the bear proclamation and rule as presented.

Passed with one opposing vote

Statewide Beaver Management Plan

MOTION: To accept the beaver management plan as presented.

Passed unanimously

Southeast Region Advisory Council
John Wesley Powell Museum
1765 E. Main, Green River
December 9, 2009 ⌚ 6:30 p.m.

Members Present

Members Absent

Kevin Albrecht, USFS
Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor
Blair Eastman, Agriculture

Jeff Horrocks, Elected Official

Wayne Hoskisson, Non-consumptive
Todd Huntington, At Large
Derris Jones, Sportsmen

Laura Kamala, Non-Consumptive

Walt Maldonado, Sportsmen

Kenneth Maryboy, Navajo Rep.
Charlie Tracy

Christine Micoz, At Large

Travis Pehrson, Sportsmen
Pam Riddle, BLM
Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Charlie Tracy, Agriculture

Others Present

-
- 1) **Approval of the Agenda (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to accept the agenda as written
Seconded by Blair Eastman
Motion passed unanimously

- 2) **Approval of the November 4, 2009 minutes (Action)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2009 meeting.
Seconded by Blair Eastman
Motion passed unanimously

- 3) **Wildlife Board Meeting Update (Information)**
-Terry Sanslow, Chairman

Terry Sanslow: One of the Board's action log items was to remove the archery and muzzleloader proficiency tests from the action log, because hunter education has a basic introduction to both weapon types with an emphasis on safety, ethics and shot placement

with archery as an optional course. They found that Alaska is the only state to have separate muzzleloader curricula and certification. It is believed that adding proficiency testing would provide a barrier to recruitment and is not the best option to improve hunter proficiency. The DWR is trying to ramp up their hunter safety program with alternate courses in archery and muzzleloader, but it was also mentioned that all the archery and muzzleloader clubs offer some kind of training or have youth clubs, so that people can contact them if they want extra training.

For the landowner association permit review, they also removed it from the action log, because the program seems to be working well.

The report on wildlife mortality was closed, although there will be updates on that. A map has been made with locations of deer hits on major highways. This doesn't account for the times deer are hit and wander off the road or deer hits on small county roads. Deer mortalities could be as high as 10-20,000 per year. 75% of the collisions are with does. Travis Pehrson asked who could be contacted in San Juan County so that roadkills there could be counted. If under or overpasses will be built, it would be nice to have these roads considered as well.

Terry Sanslow said the Board made a motion to take the unit by unit proposal and make it an action log item. They will ask the mule deer committee to make recommendations on how to implement it. In the past, there have been issues such as the dedicated hunter program and lifetime license holders that have prevented unit by unit management from working. Kevin Albrecht is our representative on the mule deer committee. We still need an alternate. Todd Huntington volunteered to be an alternate. Kevin Albrecht indicated that meetings may start as early as March.

Other motions passed by the Wildlife Board may be located at the following website:
http://wildlife.utah.gov/public_meetings/board_minutes/

4) **Regional Update (Information)**

-Bill Bates, Regional Supervisor

Bill Bates: Lakes are freezing and ice angling is beginning. The Moab Bighorn Sheep Watch occurred on November 20-21. This has been a very popular event. Law enforcement has had a lot of elk cases they are working on. The Habitat Section has planted thousands of plants on the Matheson Wetlands Preserve last month and has planted bare root sagebrush plants in San Juan County. The East Coal Creek habitat project is underway. Guzzlers have been installed in Grand County in partnership of the BLM. The Wildlife Section is busy with deer classifications and bighorn sheep flights. They have also released seven rehabilitated bear cubs.

Justin Shannon put together some maps, showing the location of the bison that were transplanted last winter on the Book Cliffs. The bison split into two groups. The west group is the one that came from the Ute Tribe. The east group came from the Henry Mountains. Bill gave an account of the movements of the bison season by season.

Derris Jones asked why the bison had not seemed to use the roadless area as much as he had presumed. Bill Bates answered that they didn't know the answer, but that the amount of human activity in the area may have played a role. Derris asked if the January transplant was still going to happen. Bill Bates answered that as far as we know, it was still planned to take place between the 15th and 17th of January.

5) **Bear Proclamation and Rule R657-33 (Action)**

-Justin Dolling, Game Mammals Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Blair Eastman asked if a licensed guide would need a pursuit permit, if the client had a kill permit.

Justin Dolling said that the guide didn't need a pursuit permit to help a client that had a kill permit.

Bill Bates asked if a licensed guide or client needed a pursuit permit to go out and take photographs. Justin Dolling answered that neither the guide nor the client needed a pursuit permit.

Pam Riddle asked how many of the 65 pursuit permit holders on the San Juan unit were licensed guides. Justin Dolling answered that the licensed guide rule didn't come into effect until this year. Pam asked how many of the 65 permit holders participated in the survey. Justin D. answered that he didn't know.

Travis Pehrson asked if the licensed guide process would just allow a houndsman an excuse to go out and chase bears. Justin D. answered that in order to become a licensed guide the procedure was very vigorous. It's not an easy thing to do.

Pam Riddle asked why the licensed guide didn't need to get a pursuit permit.

Justin D. said that the rule was set up so that the client didn't have to have a kill tag. They just have to have a licensed guide go with them. Justin D. said the rule is set up so that we can deal with the commercial component of business. We anticipate there will be very few of situations of this type.

Bill Bates asked what a guide has to go through to become licensed. Justin D. replied that there was a rigorous application process. Derris Jones, who just went through the process, said that you have to have a background check, coupled with a written test and a license from the Division of Occupational Licensing. You have to have a high school degree and 100 days of experience as an outfitter and 100 days of experience as a guide, and one Day of training equals three days of experience of additional training.

Justin D. indicated that a licensed guide would also need to go through the process for obtaining a special use permit from federal land administrators.

Travis Pehrson asked if there was a different set of rules for residents and non-residents.

Justin D. answered that it was equal opportunity for residents and non-residents.

Walt Maldonado asked if licensing was the same in other states. Justin D. answered that he thought that the process was the same in other states.

Chris Micoz said that a license must be applied for in each state. One state license does not carry over to another state. There is no reciprocity.

Walt Maldonado asked that the roadless Book Cliffs restrictions be explained. Justin D. said the thought was to direct some of the pressure into the roadless area, so that bears harvest is increased.

Derris Jones asked how the DWR comes up with adult survival. Justin D. said that they analyze the teeth at the time of harvest. Bears are difficult to survey, so that harvest data is plugged into a population model to develop a population estimate.

Wayne Hoskisson added that the figure is not a survival rate, it's only an estimation. Justin D. said it's the rate that one animal survives from one year to the next.

Bill Bates said it's much the same thing as an insurance company that creates mortality schedules for insured people.

Derris Jones asked if government trapper harvest was taken into account in the graph displayed.

Derris J. asked if the total harvest of females would still be under 40%.

Justin D. answered that it would.

Walt Maldonado asked if federal trappers kept track of sex and age data for the bears they harvested. Justin D. said they have their own data base to keep track of this information and this information is shared with us.

Bill Bates indicated that sometimes a bear is decomposed or covered with yellow jackets, so that sometimes a tooth isn't extracted, so we don't have a full data set. We have a

memorandum of understanding that they keep the same data that we do, but it doesn't always happen.

Derris Jones asked why the permit increase went to fall hunters in the southeast region, whereas the rest of the state had increases mostly in the spring. What was the reason for that?

Kevin Bunnell said some units had seen excessive female harvest in the spring, so they wanted to shift the permits to the fall.

Kevin Albrecht asked about complaints concerning excessive bear pursuit and hunting from non residents. If the state went to limited entry, couldn't we restrict non-residents to 10% of the permits allowed to residents? Justin D. said that if we turn it into a pure recreational activity, we can turn it into a 90/10 or 80/20 split.

Questions from the Public

Brett Guymon asked if the hound restriction represented dogs in the field or dogs in the box. Justin D. said it would represent eight dogs during the actual pursuit.

Kimball _____ asked if there was a mechanism in place with federal trappers so that hunters could be called in to take care of nuisance bears.

Bill Bates said that we have tried that unsuccessfully. The problem is that we have to take care of the problem immediately and the bear doing the damage has to be killed, so the hunter cannot be selective, even if it's a small female. Getting people out immediately just hasn't worked well.

Guy Webster asked if we had looked at the problem we would have with the Book Cliffs roadless area, if dogs run over into the roadless area from the adjoining area. You can't control where a dog is going to go.

Justin D. said the roadless area would still be open to pursuit. If you killed the bear in the roadless area, that would be a problem.

Mike Diem of the U.S. Forest Service asked if the outfitter/guide need to hunt with dogs?

Mike D. then asked what effect the pursuit season has on bears and their ability to build fat. Justin D. said that he didn't have data on that and turned the mic over to Kevin Bunnell.

Kevin Bunnell said they tracked bears with radio collars and they haven't seen evidence to suggest that pursuit interferes with reproductive effort. Fall pursuit is much more critical than summer pursuit.

Kevin Albrecht asked if we have had only summer pursuit for two years. Justin D. said it is the third year statewide, but that we have tracked bear reproduction on the Book Cliffs for 17 years.

Kevin Albrecht asked if we had summer pursuit for those years.

Kevin Bunnell answered that we have had only fall pursuit during that time period, which we assume would be a greater detriment than summer pursuit.

Comments from the Public

Ryan Thornock of the Utah Farm Bureau supported the 15% statewide increase for bear permits. Wildlife Services bear depredation has been up. Their average for the past 15 years was 40 kills. This past year was up 14%. Feedback from livestock growers indicate that depredation has been up this past year. Pursuit is a double edged sword with gates being left open and trespass issues.

Jason Binder of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen provided a hand-out to all RAC members on the association's stance on the issues. The main issue we have is limitation of resident pursuit in southeastern Utah. We propose that the San Juan Elk Ridge unit be split at the causeway and put out 10 permits on the Blue Mountain side and put out 20 permits on the Elk Ridge side. We ask that instead of a 30 day season for summer pursuit, that the season be split in half with two 15 day hunts for improved opportunity. As far as dog restrictions, we ask that the limitation be imposed only during the summer training season,

but be left intact during the fall hunt. We ask that tag numbers remain the same. We would like to see the results of Jordan Pedersen's study before tags are cut.

Michael Diem of the U.S. Forest Service said that his district is most impacted by this issue. As far as background material, he had received 20-30 complaints from forest users in campgrounds about dogs coming in campgrounds or with houndsmen staying in campgrounds. He had had pets killed and noise issues and messy campsites left. They have also had dogs raiding coolers and had campsites left with lots of trash. As far as livestock management, the USFS needs good distribution of livestock in its pastures. Livestock permittees have strict requirements to maintain that distribution. Ten to twelve of their permittees gave feedback that they had hounds disrupting livestock distribution. They have also received a lot of complaints from hunters, especially for limited entry hunters about having their hunts disrupted. The USFS suggests that on the San Juan unit, 15 pursuit permits be issued and on the LaSal unit 10 permits be issued.

Guy Webster voiced opposition to the roadless spot and stalk hunt. He feared that next year, that type of hunt would expand to the LaSals and then to the San Juan unit. Pretty soon we will be like Colorado and just not have the ability to hunt with hounds. If a person wants to hunt spot and stalk, they already have that opportunity. We don't need to isolate an area to allow that type of hunting.

Brett Guymon favored the summer pursuit season and expressed concern about the future of summer pursuit and dropping the number of residents. Where he hunts, the roads don't open until the last two weeks of the season and two weeks during the year isn't enough. It makes it hard to justify feeding dogs for 365 days a year for the two week season. The life of a houndsman is a way of life. It's expensive. He expressed concern with the eight dog limit, but acknowledges that may help the problem, but expressed concern about enforcement when the dogs of two handlers join together.

Chet Young of the Utah Federation of Houndsmen indicated that they gave up the fall pursuit in exchange for the summer training season, so they weren't interfering with big game hunts. Now they are being restricted from some of the best areas. They are asking that the season be split. They are not asking that more hounds be put on the ground, just for an opportunity to hunt for 15 days apiece instead of 30 and a better chance to draw for some of these units. On the eight dog restriction, it is very hard to catch a big mature bear with that number of dogs. For the kill season, he asked to be allowed to use the number of dogs necessary to hunt a big bear. On the summer training season, they would like to hunt with as many as they can let loose, because they like to hunt with family and friends.

RAC Discussion

Terry Sanslow read the statement from Heidi Redd, who asked the RAC to shorten the bear pursuit season. She has had problems with trespass. Terry said that was the only email he had received.

Kevin Albrecht asked if Terry S. had received the email from Leigh Bennett. She had written in the Moab Times Independent about the DWR proposal. She states that she hopes for a reduction in the number of dogs and reduction in season. She proposed that the number of dogs be restricted to no more than six and that the permits be reduced.

Wayne Hoskisson added that Leigh Bennett is the district ranger for the Monticello district. She knows the area very well.

Derris Jones suggested that the RAC break the issues into three discussions—one for the pursuit season, one for spot and stalk hunting, and one for the dog limit.

Terry Sanslow agreed. He suggested they start with spot and stalk. There was one request from Guy Webster that we not reserve the roadless area of the Book Cliffs to spot and stalk.

Blair Eastman asked that a map of the roadless area be displayed.

Travis Pehrson asked if the Book Cliffs had all been one unit.

Justin Dolling indicated that last year it was one unit and would be split this year.

Bill Bates indicated that you could still pursue in the spring and summer but not fall. Travis Pehrson asked why the DWR wanted to split the unit.

Justin Dolling answered that the chances of running a bear off the unit was high with hounds.

Travis Pehrson asked that a study be initiated to see if harvest objectives would be realized with spot and stalk hunting.

Kevin Albrecht added that the number of hunters with hounds who wanted to hunt the roadless area would be quite limited, so if there are spot and stalk hunters in there, the conflict with each other would be limited as well.

Walt Maldonado said he doesn't know where the bears would be pushed off.

Wayne Hoskisson indicated that for spot and stalk hunters, the presence of hounds coming in to the roadless unit would compromise their hunting experience.

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones that all Book Cliffs permits be valid for the entire unit with additional spot and stalk permits valid only for the roadless area(this motion is missing from the motion summary)

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed with a majority vote. Wayne Hoskisson cast an opposing vote.

Terry Sanslow indicated that the RAC would move onto the dog limit. Several persons had recommended a six dog limit. Most people agree with an eight dog limit.

Travis Pehrson indicated that with a limit on dogs, we might see more females in the harvest, because we wouldn't have enough dogs to tree a large boar. During a summer training period, a reduction would be more understandable, but during the fall kill period, a larger number may be necessary.

Terry Sanslow reminded the RAC that part of the reason behind the restriction was the request that came from the U. S. Forest Service, as well as cattlemen, landowners, and campers.

Travis Pehrson acknowledged those reasons. He suggested that we reduce pursuit permits now and see how that works. If we continue to have dog issues, then next year we reduce the dogs during the kill season, if we are still having problems.

Wayne Hoskisson voiced his objection that we use hounds at all. We should not permit the use of dogs to hunt bears. We don't for deer or elk. It's not appropriate for hunting any wildlife.

Terry Sanslow asked if he wanted that to be a motion.

VOTING

Motion was made by Wayne Hoskisson to eliminate all hound hunts.

Seconded by (NO SECOND)

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Kevin Albrecht said that as an agency, the USFS tries to provide an opportunity for a variety of uses. One of those uses is the opportunity for houndsmen to go up on the mountain. Most of the conflict is during the summer with other recreationists and stock growers. The issue is not only chasing, but the number of dogs in a camp. Sometimes there are as many as 40 dogs in a camp. That can be very distracting to others. If eight be the dog limit, that may help with the other conflicts that occur.

Pam Riddle spoke for the Bureau of Land Management in Monticello and said there were a flurry of complaints from people who had been in the mountains. It seems that most complaints relate to the summer season. Reducing the limit to eight dogs might relieve some of the problems. The issue could then be revisited next year.

Blair Eastman agreed with Pam Riddle but would like to see a maximum number of dogs turned out at any one time. He had an experience this summer with a houndsman who turned out around 20 dogs. Blair insisted that no one could control that many dogs. There needs to be a limit on the number of dogs.

Pam Riddle said that as an agency, the BLM tries to protect wildlife during critical times of the year. A large number of dogs running through wildlife habitat is a concern.

Kevin Albrecht asserted that houndsmen do their best to pick up stray dogs, but when the number of dogs is large, it makes it very difficult to pick up the strays in a timely manner. Wildlife and livestock can get scattered. Reducing the pack size would help with these problems.

Derris Jones suggested that during any pursuit with a kill tag that pack size be limited to 10, and that during pursuit only, the pack size be limited to eight.

Travis Pehrson questioned the number ten. He questioned whether big boars could be treed with that many dogs.

Bill Bates said he had had experience with catching bears to attach radio collars. He had been able to catch boars with four dogs. Sometimes he had had six dogs out on a big boar and had not been able to catch him. It depends on the animal and his mood that day.

Blair Eastman suggested that if we separate the limit for pursuit with a different limit for kill, we would just be confusing the issue.

Derris Jones suggested that we limit pack size for public perception. What the upper limit is, is not as important.

VOTING

Motion was made by Blair Eastman that eight dogs be the limit on the spring hunt and pursuit, eight dogs during the summer, and then back to 12 dogs in the fall.

Seconded by Derris Jones(I think it was only summer pursuit that had the 8 dog limit but not positive)

Motion passed with two opposing votes cast by Kevin Albrecht and Wayne Hoskisson.

Derris Jones commented that houndsmen need to work internally to police their own ranks, so that more restrictive measures are not put in place next year.

Chris Micoz commented that she agreed with Wayne that she has a problem with pursuit with dogs and hounds, but she does understand the balance of bears becoming nuisance animals and that's why she voted in agreement with the pursuit.

Blair Eastman suggested that the RAC tie the remainder to the pursuit.

Kevin Albrecht suggested that on the San Juan limited entry unit, the permits be 15 with 10% going to non-residents, and that the permits on the LaSals be 10 with one permit going to non-residents.

Terry Sanslow asked about the suggestion of splitting the Elk Ridge into two units—Blue Mountains and Elk Ridge.

Pam Riddle asked about the rationale for doing that.

Wayne Hoskisson responded that on the Blue Mountains, there were more campgrounds and conflicts.

Derris added that the houndsmen were also willing to give up 15 days to accommodate twice as many people.

Kevin Albrecht indicated that based on the data provided by the DWR, his recommendation would only result in a reduction of five permits at one time.

Travis Pehrson contended the actual reduction would be 30 with the split season.

Terry Sanslow asked Kevin Albrecht to restate his motion.

Travis Pehrson asked if he could move that the San Juan unit be split if Kevin's motion passed. Terry Sanslow said he could not.

VOTING

Motion was made by Kevin Albrecht that on the San Juan limited entry unit the resident permits be 15 with 2 non-resident permits. The LaSal limited entry summer bear pursuit be 10 with 1 non-resident permit. The Book Cliffs would remain the same.

Seconded by Wayne Hoskisson

Motion failed with three votes in favor. These were cast by Pam Riddle, Wayne Hoskisson and Kevin Albrecht. The rest of the RAC members opposed the motion.

Wayne Hoskisson expressed opposition to DWR's permit numbers, based on the agency's unreliable estimates of the bear population. He favored keeping permits at the same level as the year earlier.

Travis Pehrson suggested splitting the San Juan into two units—the Blue Mountains and Elk Ridge, but later retracted the suggestion.

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to go with the remainder of the DWR proposal as presented.

Seconded by Todd Huntington

Motion failed. In favor were: Walt Maldonado, Travis Pehrson, Chris Micoz, and Todd Huntington. Opposed were Wayne Hoskisson, Derris Jones, Pam Riddle, Kevin Albrecht and Blair Eastman.

VOTING

Motion was made by Pam Riddle to accept the houndsmen's proposal to split the dates and split the San Juan unit into two different units—Elk Ridge and Blue Mountains, and cut by half the number of pursuit permits recommended by the Division for all southeast regional units, and then revisit the issue next year to see if this past year's problems have been resolved.

Seconded by Kevin Albrecht

Motion failed with Pam Riddle and Kevin Albrecht in favor and the rest opposed.

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to split the San Juan unit into the Elk Ridge and Blue Mountains unit, and to split the seasons as recommended by the Utah Federation of Houndsmen with the following number of permits: 15 resident permits on the Book Cliffs for both seasons, 15 resident permits on Elk Ridge for both seasons, five resident permits on the Blue Mountains for both seasons, 12 resident permits on the LaSals for both seasons, and the non-residents would have two permits on the Book Cliffs for both seasons, one permit for the second season, two non-resident permits on Elk Ridge for both seasons, one non-resident permit on the Blue Mountains for both seasons.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed with one opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson

VOTING

Motion was made by Derris Jones to accept the remainder of the bear proclamation and rule as presented.

Seconded by Blair Eastman

Motion passed with one opposing vote cast by Wayne Hoskisson

6) **Statewide Beaver Management Plan** (Action)
-Justin Dolling, Game Management Coordinator

Questions from the RAC

Derris Jones asked if beaver numbers were tracked by drainage, so that problem areas and translocation areas could be pin-pointed.

Justin Dolling said they collect data on a county basis and that biologists could best make the call where problem areas were and where beavers needed translocation.

Derris Jones asked about the outreach and education objective, and if there were show case areas and timeframes.

Justin D. said that they hadn't come that far in identifying show case areas.

Derris Jones asked about strategies for watershed restoration. Had there been discussion about development of healthy riparian systems?

Justin D. said there has been discussion about that, but that the committee didn't go as far as identifying those elements that would foster good riparian habitat.

Derris Jones noted that tamarisk removal work was continuing, and that if that were successful, it would help beaver disperse up tributaries. It seems like there should be some statement in support of healthy riparian systems.

Questions from the Public

Comments from the Public

Mary O'Brian of the Grand Canyon Trust urged adoption of the beaver management plan. All options remain available for controlling nuisance beaver, but the potential for restoring beaver to areas, where they are needed for watershed restoration was also there.

David Erley of Castle Valley in Grand County spoke in favor of the plan, being a balanced plan for both beaver protection and dealing with nuisance situations.

Ryan Thornock of the Utah Farm Bureau spoke in support of the plan and said that their concerns were addressed. When translocations are considered, he recommended that landowners be brought in to consider the positive and negative aspects of the translocation.

RAC Discussion

Terry Sanslow indicated that he had received no negative responses to the beaver management plan. He had received a letter from the Western Wildlife Conservancy that they whole heartedly supported the plan.

VOTING

Motion was made by Travis Pehrson to accept the beaver management plan as presented.

Seconded by Walt Maldonado

Motion passed unanimously

7) **Other Business** (Information)

Terry Sanslow indicated that the quagga mussel tests had returned a negative finding for Red Fleet and Electric Lake.

Meeting adjourned at 09:40 p.m.
in attendance

Next RAC meeting Wednesday, February 10th at the John Wesley Powell Museum, 1765 E. Main in Green River.

Wildlife Board Meeting, January 6, 9 a.m., DNR Board room, 1594 W. North Temple